“They shall not cleave one to another”

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: WATCH JUDICIAL NOMINEE PLACEMENTS

“And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters’ clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.”  
—Daniel 2:41-44

Two days ago, on Sunday, May 29, French voters decisively defeated acceptance of the European Union (EU) Constitution, as the overriding governing law of the nation. This was a historic event; for it doomed the latest attempt by the European nations to govern mentally unite.

Here is some information on this most recent desperate effort to unite the nations of Europe and the Mediterranean in a single, cohesive body. It is significant that the foundation stone of this latest attempt was laid in Rome.

Because of the importance of this May 29, 2005 event, as the latest fulfillment of God’s sentence that “they shall not cleave one to another,” I have prepared a more detailed collection of information on this subject than I normally would.

A little less than 2,600 years ago, God declared to King Nebuchadnezzar that, after its dissolution, the territory controlled by the Roman Empire would never reunite into a single governing body.

The division of Rome into the ten kingdoms occurred in the century preceding A.D. 476. In the centuries which followed, Charlemagne, Charles V, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Adolf Hitler all tried to reunite the broken fragments of the Roman Empire—and all failed.

The latest attempt began in the mid-1950s. The legal base of, what is today called, the European Union (EU) is built upon a sequence of treaties extending back to the Treaty of Rome in 1957 (which is still in effect) between its member states, with each new treaty supplementing and enlarging the earlier ones. That treaty, signed on March 25, 1957, laid the foundation for the attempted reunification of Europe.

This Treaty of Rome was signed on March 25, 1957; and, after being ratified by national parliaments over the following months, it came into force on January 1, 1958.

It declared that “the signatory States” were “determined to lay the foundation of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe.” In this way, the member States specifically affirmed the political objective of a progressive political integration.

This treaty was originally signed by France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg on March 25, 1957, under the name European Economic Community (informally called the Common Market in the UK). The name was later changed to the European Community. That treaty is now the “first pillar” of, what has now become, the European Union. The EU has evolved from a trade body (abolishing all tariffs and customs processes in the signatory nations) into an economic and political partnership, involving partial transfer of national sovereignties to a central government.

The 1992 amendment of the Treaty of Rome was the Maastricht Treaty—which established the European Union (EU).

At the present time, the member nations of the European Union have transferred more sovereignty to its central organization than any other earlier attempt at European unification in history. Yet it is destined to fail: smashed by Daniel 2:41-44.

In later years, other nations entered this European organization: When a November 1, 1993 treaty changed the European Community into the European Union, the members were Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom (consisting of Britain and Northern Ireland).

On January 1, 1995, Austria, Finland, and Sweden were also admitted to the EU.

By a recent amendment to the Treaty of Rome (the Treaty of Accession), 10 new member states, entered the EU on May 1, 2004. These 10 are Cyprus (Greek part), the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

—This brought the total membership of the EU up to 25 nations!

Still other nations, which anciently were part of the Roman Empire, are currently seeking admission to the EU. These include Croatia and Turkey.

Romania and Bulgaria are scheduled to become members on January 1, 2007, if they meet certain conditions. Although Norway and Switzerland are not member states, they have special agreements with the Union.

Some will say that the EU does not involve a central government. In reply, we say that the European Union’s activities cover an immense portion of what, formerly, was under the sovereign control of the sepa-
rate nations: all policy areas, from health and economic policy to foreign affairs, defense, monetary affairs, agricultural, trade and environmental policy, social and economic policy, consumer protection, internal affairs, and foreign affairs. Add to this a single market, a customs union, a single currency (adopted by 12 of the 25 member states), a common agricultural policy and a common fisheries policy.

In order to avoid making the citizens nervous at its gradual, centralized takeover of individual national sovereignties, the EU has no official capital and its institutions are divided between several cities. Here are the different parts of this political octopus: Brussels is the seat of the European Commission and of the Council of Ministers. It also hosts the committee meetings and some plenary sessions of the European Parliament. Since the most recent enlargement of the EU, Brussels now also holds all European Council summits. For this reason, it is often regarded as the de facto capital of the EU.

The European Court of Justice and the Parliament’s secretariat are based in Luxembourg. The European Central Bank is located in Frankfurt.

Strasbourg is the seat of the European Parliament and is the host for most plenary sessions. It is also the cradle of the historical institutions of, what Europeans call, the “large Europe”: the Council of Europe, and the European Court of Human Rights, with which the EU cooperate.

Major issues facing the European Union at the moment include its concern to extend its control to more nations in the Mediterranean, its relationship with the United States of America, and the revision of the rules of the Stability and Growth Pact.

But the most important problem confronting this behemoth—is the successful ratification of the European Constitution by its member states.

With the accession of the most recent 10 nations, it was decided that this giant would be unmanageable, unless a central EU Constitution was adopted. This could only be done by a majority vote by the citizens of all 25 nations.

On October 29, 2004, European heads of government signed a Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, which is currently awaiting ratification by individual member states.

However this process faltered in May 2005 as the people of France voted “non” in a referendum on the Constitution. This forced a change of Prime Minister in France.

But then on Sunday, May 29, 2005, the whole thing was shot down, when in a referendum a decisive majority of the citizens of France—one of the largest and most influential nations in Europe—voted to reject this Constitution. They feared to hand their nation over to the EU.

Daniel 2 is a great wall dividing the nations of Europe and the Mediterranean from one another! They just cannot cleave.

At the present time, the European Union has 25 member states, an area of 3,892,685 km and approximately 460 million EU citizens. Were it a country, it would be the seventh largest in the world by area and the third largest by population after China and India.

The governmental leaders of the EU member states had recently agreed to the text of this new constitutional treaty which, if ratified by the citizens of the member states, would become the first official constitution of the EU,—replacing all previous treaties with a single document. It would tie all of these nations together into something closely approximating a single governmental whole. But with its rejection by France, the nations are in confusion. Tomorrow (June 1), the Netherlands will vote on the EU Constitution. Polls reveal that a sizeable majority of that nation will also reject it. Keep in mind that France and the Netherlands were two of the original six signers of the 1957 Treaty of Rome.

Recall with me some history:

Leo III conceived the idea of crowning Charlemagne as “Holy Roman Emperor,” which he did on December 25, 800, in the hope that this would exalt the papacy and encourage Charlemagne in his efforts to unite all Europe under a single ruler.

It was several popes who, in the 16th century, urged Charles V and his successors to war against the Protestants, in the hope that by uniting the continent under a single government,—all the Protestants would be destroyed.

In 1804, in anticipation of his soon conquering all Europe, when Napoleon Bonaparte mentioned to Pope Pius VII that he would like him to come up to Paris and help crown him emperor on December 2, 1904 in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Pius VII was quite happy to make the trip. Perhaps, by doing this, when Napoleon had united Europe, he would make Catholicism the official religion and eliminate all the others.

When, at the beginning of the 20th century, Kaiser Wilhelm decided to conquer Europe, Popes Pius X and Benedict XV quietly cooperated, in the hope that it would work to their favor.

Twenty years later, when Adolf Hitler decided to also unite the continent, Popes Pius XI and XII entered into secret agreements with Hitler. (Pius XI also entered into a very public pact with Mussolini—the Lateran Treaty of February 11, 1929—by which Vatican State came into existence as a sovereign nation.)

At the present time, we are confronted by the latest attempt to unite Europe. And it all started with a treaty in the city of Rome in 1957. To what degree the papacy is involved, we cannot have certainty. But none of the popes appear to be complaining about this latest attempt to unite Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and the nations of the Mediterranean under a single governmental control.
The current Senate battle may appear to be of little consequence; but, in reality, it is highly significant. The question is whether a simple majority of senators can be permitted to approve federal appeals court nominees. That surely does not seem to be a subject for your concern and mine. But consider these facts which I have gleaned:

- Last night, May 24, a centrist group of 14 senators made a deal which appeared to avoid an immediate Senate filibuster crisis; but it will return when the president sends Supreme Court nominees to the Senate.
- Three previously blocked nominees to the federal appeals court (Priscilla Owen, William Pryor, and Janice Rogers Brown) will now be given opportunity to be voted on. All three are strong conservative jurists.
- The Senate has yet to establish whether the minority party can be prevented from filibustering judges who have made it through committee to the floor of the Senate. And that means the question of filibusters on any future Supreme Court nominees remains open.

What is the great significance of all this? Here are some news notes of which you may be unaware:

- Nominees for the U.S. Supreme Court are selected by the president from judges serving on the federal appeals court.
- If the above three nominees are voted to the appeals court, the president will now have three solid conservatives to nominate for upcoming Supreme Court vacancies.
- It is known that Chief Justice William Rehnquist will probably retire within a couple months. But he is already fairly conservative (although perhaps not as much as Owens, Pryor, and Brown). So a conservative to fill that post will not be critical. However, keep in mind that the position of chief justice is quite influential.
- Bush’s potential choices to succeed Rehnquist as chief justice include two sitting justices: Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas. Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas are the three conservatives on the Supreme Court. (As I recall, all three are Catholic.)
- It is expected that at least two more Supreme Court vacancies will occur before President Bush leaves office.
- Scalia and Thomas dissented with Rehnquist from decisions protecting abortion rights, allowing affirmative action, and limiting prayer in public schools.
- Thomas, 57, almost certainly would draw Democratic opposition and possibly a bid to block a vote on his nomination. In 1991 he was confirmed for a slot as an associate justice by a 52-48 vote, following an allegations that he sexually harassed a subordinate at a federal agency. He strongly denied the claim.
- Scalia, 69, might have an easier road to confirmation. He was approved 98-0 by the Senate in 1986.
- The crucial factor is whether conservatives will replace any of the other Supreme Court justices. All, but one of them, always vote liberal (Anthony Kennedy, David Souter, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and Stephen Breyer). That one swing vote is Sandra Day O’Connor, who sometimes votes one way and sometimes the other. (Kennedy formerly was an occasional moderate; now his is fully liberal.)
- Democrats might be more willing to allow a staunch conservative replacement for Rehnquist than for the two older justices, most likely to retire: Sandra Day O’Connor, 75, or John Paul Stevens, 85. Both O’Connor and Stevens have supported abortion rights, affirmative action, and gay rights.
- If any of those non-conservative jurists leaves the Court, to be replaced by conservatives, it would radically affect future Court decisions. The potential balance of the entire Court would shift.
- Supreme Court Justice Anthony M. Kennedy is the special target of the conservatives at this time. On April 9, conservative leaders met in Washington to discuss “Remedies to Judicial Tyranny.” They decided that, because of his extreme decisions, Kennedy (a Ronald Reagan appointee) should be impeached! (It is a little-known fact that the most important thing that a U.S. president ever does is to appoint Supreme Court justices!)
- The group of 14 senators, who made the “deal,” made no commitment to vote for or against a filibuster on two other conservative nominees, William Myers and Henry Saad. According to Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, both will be “filibustered”; so they cannot be appointed to the appeals court. Forty-four Democrats and one independent in the current Senate have each declared that they are willing to filibuster, to stop conservative nominations to federal or Supreme Court judgeships. (A filibuster enables a single senator to stop legislation that a senate majority would otherwise enact!)
- Why is all this so important? —Because when
the U.S. Congress, with presidential approval, enacts a strict National Sunday Law,—it may immediately go to the Supreme Court for consideration. If a majority of conservatives are on that Court, the law will be upheld as the law of the land.

- Ironically, it will also be conservative placements on the Supreme Court which will protect the morals of our citizens! Liberals on the Court are trying to paganize the nation; but conservatives will try to Christianize it.

- No longer does the House or Senate legislate on moral issues. They are afraid to because their constituents (those who vote them into office) are divided on such subjects. But they also avoid such topics because influential lobbying groups pay them to either avoid moral issues or vote against them.

- **What are some of these moral-type issues?**
  - Should homosexuals be permitted to get married?
  - Should polygamy be legalized?
  - Should homosexual “children's books” be permitted in libraries?
  - Should perverted reading matter and pornography be permitted on the internet?
  - Should homosexuals be allowed to adopt and raise children?
  - Should physician-assisted suicide be permitted?
  - In order to avoid taking care of them, should the handicapped and old people be killed?
  - Should Indians be permitted to start gambling casinos all across America?
  - Should all gambling in America be stopped?
  - Should hard drugs be legalized?

(There are other issues which Congress also fears to solve, such as illegal immigration, outsourcing jobs to overseas, imposing protective tariffs, calling our troops home, stopping pork barreling, and making lobbying illegal. But, to appease various political interests, they generally avoid such topics.)

- **Only five people in America decide the moral issues of the nation.** A Supreme Court majority (currently consisting of liberals) decides what is right and what is wrong for the entire nation.

- **Who are the current U.S. Supreme Court Justices, and what are their ages and present status?**

  Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist (born 1924, appointed by Richard Nixon in 1971, and elevated by Ronald Reagan in 1986), 81 years old. He has thyroid cancer and is expected to retire in July. Conservative.

  Justice John Paul Stevens (born 1920, appointed by Gerald Ford in 1975), 85 years old. He is expected to retire before President Bush leaves office. Liberal.

  Justice Sandra Day O'Connor (born 1930, appointed by Ronald Reagan in 1981) is 75 years old. She is expected to retire before President Bush leaves office. Swing voter, but most often liberal.

  Justice Antonin Scalia (born 1936, appointed by Ronald Reagan in 1986), 69 years old. Conservative. It is likely that President Bush will nominate him to the post of chief justice when Rehnquist retires.


  Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg (born 1933, appointed by Bill Clinton in 1993, 72 years old. Liberal.

  Justice Stephen Breyer (born 1938, appointed by Bill Clinton in 1994), 67 years old. Liberal.

- Conservatives used to concentrate their efforts on getting Congress to enact moral laws, but without success. **Now conservatives are focusing on the real solution: getting jurists who believe in morality placed on federal courts.** The Democrats and, apart from labor unions, their primary financial backers (abortion, homosexual, and pornography interests) deeply fear the outcome and are desperately trying to block it. **We, on the other hand, recognize that a National Sunday Law could be the outcome.**