

# Is America about to fall apart?

compiled by the *Christian Crusade Newspaper* staff  
excerpted from the June 2010 edition

How much longer will Old Glory wave?

Conservative columnist and Baptist preacher Chuck Baldwin says the United States is about to break apart. He says states are going to start seceding from the Union – and that Washington, D.C. will be unable to do anything about it.

Attorney and fellow conservative columnist Dr. Edwin Vieira thinks such an announcement is absurd.

“Baldwin,” writes Vieira, “asserts that the ‘breakup of the U.S. is inevitable! Short of another Great Awakening, nothing can stop it.’

“Well,” counters Vieira, “I wonder if anything ‘in the course of human events’ (as the Declaration of Independence put it) is truly ‘inevitable,’ if enough people, sufficiently committed to another outcome, oppose it.”

However, Dr. Vieira concedes “as Pastor Baldwin himself correctly observes, ‘freedom-loving people are reaching a point of frustration – and even fury.’”

Liberal magazine *Slate*, owned by the *Washington Post* newspaper, which also publishes *Newsweek*, recently asked several “futurists” to predict whether the United States is on the verge of collapse.

One of the futurists that reporter Josh Levin consulted was Peter Schwartz of the Global Business Network. Back in the 1980s, it was Schwartz who advised the Royal Shell petroleum company to watch out for an obscure Russian politician, Mikhail Gorbachev. If he were to rise to a leadership position, Schwartz advised Shell 20 years ago, it would be a strong indication that the USSR would open to the West and oil and natural gas prices would drop.

“When the price plunge came,” recalls Levin. “Shell execs – having anticipated this eventuality – swooped in and bought oil reserves at a discounted rate.”

So with that kind of track record, what does Schwartz predict about America? Is it falling apart? He sees no collapse in the immediate future, but says it could happen by 2050. One threat, he says, is racial warfare.

“By 2050,” writes Levin, “whites will no longer be a majority in the United States and Hispanics will make up an estimated 29 percent of the population.

“Most violence is committed by males 18 to 35,” Schwartz explained to Levin. “Now picture a very large, low-employed Hispanic population of males not too pleased with their lot or their ability to control a white-dominated world. That population then becomes violent and disruptive. And now you get into racial and identity politics – it’s all those illegal immigrants we let across the border.”

Add in a weak economy, and such possibilities as drought in the Southwest, and the collapse of Mexico into a Colombia-like drug state. Such a threat to America, says Schwartz is real.

However, “Despite the fun of imagining America succumbing,” writes Levin, “Schwartz believes the most likely scenario for the next 100 years is ‘that the city of Washington will still be a capital of a nation-state on this continent.’”

How can he believe this?

“America has abundant natural resources, relatively low population density, and – with oceans on both coasts – a built-in security system,” explains Levin. “The collapse of a country with those inherent advantages sometime in the next century would require a low-probability series of events.”

Another possible scenario leading to America’s collapse, Levin writes, is favored by Joel Garreau, a longtime *Washington Post* writer and editor. In this scenario, America has become weak after a series of catastrophes such as an epidemic and/or nuclear war. A catastrophe that breeds internal division, he argues, is more likely to eradicate America than any kind of external threat.

According to Levin, “A country is like a family, he theorizes. If you feel threatened from the outside, you band together.”

Garreau points out that rather than tear the United States apart, the September 11 attacks “galvanized us against a common enemy. The laggard response to Hurricane Katrina, on the other hand, meant that our own government became the common enemy. A long, uninterrupted series of nationwide Katrinas – and a concomitant series of bungled federal responses – is the recipe for collapse.”

But, he reminds, he doesn’t see it happening very quickly.

Schwartz doubts that government incompetence will be enough to trigger America’s implosion.

“After all,” writes Levin, “we could always just vote out the bozos who let us down.”

What would be required to destroy the country, Schwartz argues, “is Zimbabwe-sized corruption: a succession of executives who pilfer the national treasury and refuse to hold free elections. In that case, the country could fall apart as our national creeds of freedom, democracy and openness are gradually abandoned.”

In a different possible scenario, Levin reports, America dissolves peacefully because the cost of running a large nation becomes unmanageable.

“Schwartz likens this to the breakup of the Soviet Union,” writes Levin, “a case where the cost of holding the country together proved too great and the advantages too small.”

In fact, Russian author Igor Panarin says America will fall apart this year. Schwartz disagrees, saying that “making parallels with the USSR seems a bit dubious.” Unlike the Eastern bloc, the United States isn’t a conglomeration of states with strong ethnic identities. Texas may have an independent identity, but it is not anything like Lithuania, which has its own long-standing culture and language and held a deep hatred of Moscow. Similarly, the former Soviet republics of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan or Turkmenistan are predominantly Muslim. They chafed for decades under Russian domination.

“In modern America, where English predominates and a highly mobile population flits from place to place,” writes Levin, “is it possible that some state or region could develop enough distinctiveness to split from the union?” He does not think so.

Futurist Michael Costigan suggests another scenario in which liberals and socialists migrate to Democratic cities while conservatives and free-market proponents cluster in rural strongholds. In such a scenario, the U.S. could reach a point where the redder-than-red states and the bluer-than-blue states decide to part ways. But he doubts that we are anywhere close to that possibility.

Schwartz then outlines another scenario which would lead to America’s collapse – the rise of a global government. In this possibility, “America’s national government declines in importance relative to the world community.” However, he doubts that can happen very quickly.

“The United States is nowhere near willing to cede its position as the greatest of the world’s great powers,” says Schwartz.

*Slate* contributor Robert Wright disagrees. The liberal, pro-global government author argues in his book *Nonzero* that humankind must come under a one-world system.

“Wright tells me,” writes Levin, “that you wouldn’t need something so centralized as a souped-up United Nations. He believes that if in the next 100 years ‘America’s identity has not dissolved into some sort of larger body of global governance, then chaos will reign.’”

However, there is a way, writes Levin, that a one-world government could come about. It is familiar to Christians who have long been wary of the rise of the Antichrist. Levin writes about the rise of “a global Napoleon, a much more empowered Hitler” or “a super-Mao” who conquers America and the rest of the world via brute force.

Schwartz classifies such a scenario as the least likely of all the possibilities. He says it’s harder to subjugate the world than it used to be. He notes there are “more people with military competence spread across the world” who simply would not allow their countries to be absorbed by a world power.

So, why does Pastor Baldwin think America is about to fall apart? He says it’s “a historical fact that no empire can sustain itself. And America is more and more becoming a global empire. Folks,” he writes, “this new American empire is not sustainable. Mark it down: the American empire will follow every other notable empire of antiquity and collapse of its own weight. The signs are already ubiquitous.”

Dr. Vieira responds: “Amen! But is ‘the American empire’ actually America? Or is it the twisted, unconstitutional, unholy perversion of America that has been temporarily imposed upon We, the People? If ‘the American empire’ were to collapse – as I, for one, anticipate that it will – why should the real America founded upon the quite anti-imperialistic principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, have to collapse with it?”

In other words, Dr. Vieira thinks that America may diminish as the world’s policeman. However, that may be a good thing, he says.

“Is it not possible that, with and even because of the collapse of ‘the American empire,’ the real America could be restored and rejuvenated?” Dr. Vieira writes, “And would not that be a desirable result?”

Meanwhile, Baldwin completely disagrees with the liberal futurists as well as fellow conservative Vieira.

Baldwin says the end of our nation is near.

“Growing numbers of concerned, dedicated Americans are joining the nationwide protests against ever-higher taxes,” agrees conservative columnist Tom DeWeese. They are upset about “the outrage of Obamacare; the bailouts and the Federal Reserve; the growing government surveillance society, and the destruction of private property rights through policies including sustainable development. The question now among these new activists is ‘What’s the next step?’ It’s time for action. If we stand firm against federal mandates and international policies, we can go a long way toward limiting the power and growth of the federal government.”

The answer, says Baldwin, is to dissolve the Union.

“People all over America are discussing freedom’s future. In short, they are worried. Many are actually talking about state secession,” he writes. “In coffee shops and cafes, and around dining room tables, millions of people are speaking favorably of states breaking away from the union. Not since the turn of the twentieth century have this many people thought (and spoken) this

favorably about the prospect of a state (or group of states) exiting the union. In my mind, this is a good thing.

“Even many of those who oppose the prospect of secession understand the increasing tyrannical nature of the current central government in Washington, D.C., and that something must be done about it. Even a casual observer would have to conclude that most of the actions proceeding forth from D.C. today match the very type of tyranny that prompted the American Revolution.

The American colonies revolted and seceded from the British Empire.

“We exist because in the late 1700s a group of men dared to say America is a free nation and declared war against those who ruled us, England,” agrees conservative author Marilyn M. Barnewall. “Our army was small, theirs was huge. We and the soldiers who fought so bravely with us earned the right to govern. We wrote a Bill of Rights and a Constitution and declared the guidelines by which this nation would be governed.”

However, our current government has abandoned those principles, she says.

“They steal freedom by stealth, through lies,” writes Barnewall. “We allow it by accepting their lies and claims to power as truth. It’s clear that today’s ‘progressive’ society makes it appear that law-abiding folks are at a disadvantage. Law breakers have no problems violating truth or laws. Honest people do. It’s a little like the confiscation of guns. The only people who will give them up on demand are those who don’t use them to commit a crime.

“In 1777, George Washington’s tired, starving, defeated army escaped to Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, to regroup and train for the fight ahead. They went on to defeat the most powerful army in the world.”

Exactly, says Baldwin. Washington seceded from Britain. Now, insists Baldwin, it is time for states to secede from Washington.

“I say again, the breakup of the United States is inevitable. It is only a matter of time. The real question is not if the U.S. will break up, but when and how. Take a look at the staggering debt that this government in Washington, D.C., has burdened the American people with. To talk numbers is meaningless: they total more than we can possibly begin to fathom. These numbers shock sensibilities and strain comprehension. In this regard, toss away all notions of partisan politics. Both major parties in D.C. have forever plunged our children and grandchildren’s future into a chasm of indebtedness so deep that it can never be recovered. Never!

“So, all of those who want to parade around and pontificate about the ‘unconstitutionality’ and ‘impracticality’ of secession can do so to their hearts’ content. It changes nothing. The breakup is coming.

“What is yet to be seen, of course, is if there will be enough states (the last vanguards of liberty) with the foresight to recognize the rise of tyranny and globalism as it approaches,” writes Baldwin, “and muster the courage and fortitude to do what principled patriots and lovers of liberty have always done: draw their line in the sand for freedom.

“Call it what you will; debate the definitions and language all you like; it all comes down to the same thing: either men fight for freedom and independence or they allow themselves and their children to be sold into slavery.

“At some point in the future (how far in the future, no one knows), we Americans will, once again, have to face that decision.

“In the meantime, keep talking about freedom around your coffee tables. Keep writing about freedom in your books and columns. Keep praying about freedom in your churches and closets. Keep dreaming about freedom in your hearts and minds.

“Real freedom – where a man can be left alone, where a man can keep what he earns, where a man can make his own choices, where a man’s property is his own, where harassing agents of an oppressive central government are nowhere to be found, where a man doesn’t have to sell his soul in order to sell his wares, where a man’s worship of God is not subject to political correctness (or the IRS), and where a man can actually exchange commerce and correspondence without the prying eyes of Big Brother – is worth any price.”

All that is true, counters Dr. Vieira, who at Harvard University earned bachelor’s and master’s degrees as well as a doctorate and a law degree. For more than 30 years he has practiced law, arguing before the U.S. Supreme Court the landmark decisions *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, *Chicago Teachers Union v. Hudson*, and *Communications Workers of America v. Beck*, which established constitutional and statutory limitations on the uses to which labor unions can force non-union workers to pay union dues.

Baldwin, writes Dr. Vieira, “sets out a provocative thesis in support of secession.” Essentially, Baldwin’s argument is that the United States is about to break up into small fragments, that such a disintegration fits into the plan of the global elitists to construct a world government, and that American patriots should welcome, participate in, assist and even accelerate this breakup through the secession of one or more states.

And, Dr. Vieira adds, Baldwin believes that such secession “will defeat the New World Order.” That is illogical says Dr. Vieira, who is a staunch conservative.

“It may simply be that my mind is not sufficiently plastic to wrap itself around this argument,” he writes, “but I sense that something is missing here. He makes rather a large leap of logic to conclude that ‘state secession is, very properly, the last best option for freedomists to maintain fidelity to the principles of liberty.’”

“Second, Pastor Baldwin tells us that ‘globalists are already planning America’s breakup. Indeed, their plans for the future global economy demand that America fracture. Now, there can be no doubt that, on this score, Pastor Baldwin is accurate. The globalists’ New World Order cannot survive, or even come into existence, with an intact, economically and militarily strong, and legally sovereign America standing against it.”

“America frustrated the globalists’ first scheme for ‘world government’ – the League of Nations,” writes Dr. Vieira. “And although America was roped in to their next scheme – the United Nations – a large proportion of her population has always been (and now remains) at least suspicious of, and even openly antagonistic to, that institution.”

“So, if America cannot be absorbed into some supra-national ‘halfway house’ to global government, such as the projected North American Union, the globalists would like to see her balkanized into a number of mutually quarrelsome mini-states that the globalists can manage politically by the age-old device of ‘divide and rule.’”

“My question to Pastor Baldwin,” writes Dr. Vieira, “is: ‘Divide and rule’ being the globalists’ own strategy for bringing America down and setting the New World Order up, why should patriots assist them, through ‘secession’ or in any other way?”

Dr. Vieira says it is a serious mistake for conservatives to believe secession of any state from the Union “is the best way, or even any way, to deal with the situation.”

“Certainly, if secession were both constitutional and practical, it would be worthy of consideration.” But the U.S. Civil War proved that secession will not be tolerated, he noted. Thus, if secession is “both unconstitutional and impractical,” asks Dr. Vieira, “how can it be (as Pastor Baldwin claims) ‘the last best option to maintain fidelity to the principles of liberty?’”

“I suspect,” continues Dr. Vieira, “that, far from fearing secession, the globalists would actually welcome it, because they anticipate that a single seceding state or even a gaggle of seceding states could not possibly stand up to the New World Order.

“And every move towards secession would accelerate the breakup of America, upon which the globalists’ plans depend.”

No, writes Dr. Vieira, the best defense of freedom is a united America, “operating according to her Constitution and uncompromisingly asserting her national sovereignty under the Declaration of Independence.”

That, he says, “could successfully fend off the New World Order – although, perhaps, it might be a long-drawn-out and close-run thing. I believe that the globalists think so, too, and are doubtlessly sore disturbed by that distinct possibility.”

But, let’s consider the possibility that secession is a good idea. Could it ever work?

“But what lone state or little group of states could put up such resistance?” asks Vieira. “Any state which attempts to secede will simply be jumping from the frying pan into the fire, because no state is prepared – in terms of territorial expanse, size of population, natural resources, economic development, and especially military preparedness – for both secession and subsequent protracted conflict.”

None of the American states, writes Dr. Vieira, has taken the first step either towards actually adopting an alternative currency or towards revitalizing a militia, let alone both. Such would be required if a state were to secede.

“If there is a single state which is now ready, politically and practically, for secession,” writes Dr. Vieira, “I should appreciate having someone identify that state.

“How secession might actually be accomplished,” he concludes, “is more important than whether secession might be a good idea.

“If secession cannot be made to work, it hardly seems worth discussing.”

In short, he writes, “the only prudent course for patriots is to do whatever can be done to retake America – as a whole – to restore her to true constitutional government and to reassert her sovereignty under the Declaration of Independence.”