

Why Are We In Bosnia?



By
Willie Martin

Why Are We In Bosnia?

By
Willie Martin

January 1, 1996

PRESIDENT CLINTON, AS HE WAS ORDERING THE U.S. ARMED FORCES TO BOSNIA, stated that we needed to make the Bosnian country "a shining symbol of multi-ethnic tolerance." Was that simply a brash statement made by the President for political purposes or was there a broader, more sinister reason for sending 25,000 troops and another 50,000 in support personnel into the infamous "Tuzla Pocket?"

Rudyard Kipling wrote:-

"The East is East and the West is West and never the
twain shall meet."

This study will reveal some of the history of the peoples of the East as they came into contact with the peoples of the West. As we shall see, the most important area of contact of these two peoples is the area now known as the Balkan States. Because of the limitation of space we will report on only some of the more important incidents throughout history and particularly as they pertain to the current affairs in this area. Rudyard Kipling was an astute observer of these people and his famous statement has more than once proven to be true.

There are other very important matters to consider besides the race issue in that part of the world. The entire world's geopolitical affairs for well over a millennium have been associated with this territory and its people. The major conflict within all of Christianity (The Eastern Orthodox Church versus the Roman Catholic Church) is centred in this area. We must also realize that the Protestant denominations came out of the Roman Catholic Church so that part of Christianity, too, is involved.

Intermingled with this enormous conflict within Christianity is the likewise major conflict with the Mohammedans. The Balkan States were an integral part of the Ottoman Empire for a large share of the past 2000 years. Thus, today, there are many Muslims still living within the area even though the Ottoman Empire has disappeared. This fact is one of the major reasons why our troops in the Tuzla Pocket are sitting on a powder keg.

We must also consider that the major conflict within the world's Imperialist Empires centres in that region of the world and that conflict still rages to this day. There is a need to review that history also. The modern definition of the word imperialism is,

"The policy and practice of forming and maintaining an empire, characterized by a struggle for the control of raw materials and world markets, the subjugation and control of territories, the establishment of colonies, etc."

It become obvious that a royal family is not necessarily a part of the definition. There are many ways that one country and its government can act in an imperialistic fashion over other countries. The opposite of imperialism is nationalism and that means,

"the doctrine that national interests, security, etc., are more important than international considerations."

These two diametrically opposed concepts are paramount in the Balkan crisis.

Intertwined within all of this have been the ever-present international bankers and, in particular, the Rothschild Dynasty. It take money, huge sums of it, to further imperialist aggression and the military wars that are always associated with it.

Finally, but most importantly, what does all of this mean for the United States, as a nation and not as a country? What does the Word of God say about all of this and are we, as a nation, obeying Him?

"By thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches: Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God; Behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness. They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas." [1]

Some years ago we wrote a short essay titled "The Balkanisation of the United States." Even at that time the United States were rapidly becoming a multi-ethnic society. The extent of that massive influx of aliens has increased ten-fold. We also prepared a message titled "The Immigration Scam" which reflects the manner in which mongrelization was legalized. Note that the word mongrelization was used in the general sense. In the case of the Balkans the word is used in the literal sense. Thus we start this short review of Balkan history with the people who now inhabit this part of the world.

In the sixth century B.C., in the days of King Cyrus, Persia was determined to annexe all of the Eastern Mediterranean under Persian control (imperialism by a king with the sword). Cyrus's successors, Darius and Xerxes, decided to attempt the annexation of the city-state country of the Greeks.

The loosely knit Greek states defeated the invading Persians at such places as Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea. These brilliant victories reflected the superiority of a free political organization over the might of a despotic king (or a president).

Then, it was Alexander of Macedonia (a part of the Balkans as now defined) and his federation of loosely knit city-states who in turn invaded Persia. He marched across Asia Minor into the Euphrates valley (the birthplace of Western Civilization) and destroyed the Persian Empire. Alexander intended to create a one-world government, a one-world people, and a one-world religion. One of Alexander's goals in his newly conquered empire was therefore identical to President Clinton's statement as he sent troops to Bosnia, "a shining symbol of multi-ethnic tolerance!" Another

Alexander the Great, Clinton isn't! If Alexander couldn't do it, what makes President Clinton think he can?

Alas, the Roman Empire then conquered the Greeks in the second century before Christ. The Romans for the first time brought organization with the essential matters of roads, police and justice. Their civil administration was without equal throughout the world. It was the Romans who conquered the peoples of the Balkans and brought these rugged "barbarous people" to political dependence.

It was then, in the fourth century A.D., that Constantine transferred the headquarters of the empire from Rome to Constantinople. This set the stage for the drama of many centuries that followed. The Roman government under Constantine built roads, developed commerce with the East and brought the entire area under western civilization; at least as far as the administration of it was concerned. The great caravan routes from Asia originated at Constantinople. From the fourth century A.D., to the present, nearly two thousand years, Constantinople played an eminent role in the affairs of the eastern Mediterranean because it is, from the geopolitical point of view, a control position, thus, some of the "wars and rumours of wars" of which Jesus spoke centred in this area.

Shortly after Constantinople was founded, the great Byzantine Empire took shape. The western Roman Empire centre at Rome lost its eminence after the repeated attacks by the Europeans from the north, mainly Germanic. The eastern Roman Empire at Constantinople was so different in its structure and civilization that historians conferred on it the new name of Byzantine.

Justinian became Emperor of the Byzantine empire following his famous uncle Emperor Justin. It was under Justinian that the western part of the Roman Empire was conquered. Thus, the Byzantine headquarters at Constantinople was the undisputed head of the whole old Roman Empire. It was Justinian who declared that the ruler was also to be the head of the church, administratively and with regard to faith and doctrine.

Historians have termed this relationship as Caesaropapism as compared to the absolute head of the church and state in the West being the Pope. The use of icons in the church, were the major reasons for the split between the Roman Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church which persists to this day. Caesaropapism was inaugurated at the time of Justinian and anti-iconoclasm was decreed by a succeeding emperor named Leo.

As a part of the current unrest, Croatia for example, is in the extreme Northwestern part of what is called the Balkans. The Croatians are a part of the Slavic people and thus are ethnically a part of the Balkans. However, Croatia is closely aligned with Western Europe, in customs, mores, and most importantly they are of the Western Roman Catholic persuasion. This last point is prominent in the ongoing current struggle even though all of these people came recently out of Tito's Yugoslavia.

The empire under Justinian was under constant attack from peoples from the North and East, the Slavs and the Mongolians. The Slavs were White Men of the Caucasian race with their homeland in the plains and swamps of eastern Europe. The Mongolians, on the other hand, were of the yellow race and consisted of many tribes and groups of the East. Justinian, for some reason, did not aggressively repel these invaders who took up residence.

The Slavs were a strong people physically and keen mentally but they were backward in the arts and other refinements. They were natural Communists in that they owned all of their property in common and contributed the proceeds from their labour in the same manner. Karl Marx could very well have obtained his concept of government from the Slavic people of that period.

His phrase, "From each according to his abilities and to each according to his needs," was the natural method of life among the Slavs at the time of their encroachment into the Byzantine Empire under Justinian. But the Slavs excelled in Agriculture. They were magnificent farmers and they freely gave their taxes in the form of grain and produce to the government. They proved to be an attribute in that regard. Another very basic trait of the Slavs was, and is, that they are jealous of each other. They engaged

freely in inter-tribal warfare and they would rarely combine against a common foe. They also resented being ruled by anyone and they refused to form any meaningful governmental system. In modern terms they would have been anarchists. But through all of this the Slav was, and is, an outstanding guerrilla type fighter.

Their favourite device used in guerrilla warfare was to totally disappear under water using a reed to breath through, all the while being deep in the water. They would use this technique to escape after a daring raid on another village. They were extremely clever at devising unique ways to entrap their current enemy, whoever that may have been at the time. Keep that in mind with regard to the current situation in Bosnia.

The Slavs are comprised of four distinct groups, the Slovenes, the Croats, the Serbs, and the Bulgars. But because of their refusal to cooperate with each other, there has been internecine wars from the sixth century to this very day.

The Mongolian invaders came from many tribes of the East. They were of a different physical stature entirely. They were short and stocky, with flat faces, slanted eyes and wore their jet black hair long in the back. They were bow-legged from riding their small shaggy horses and could fight only on horseback. Their military organization and discipline, along with their horsemanship, allowed them to conquer the Slavs, take their spoil, and return to their homeland. Thus, this was a perfect example of how organization, devotion and discipline would always win over any form of libertine anarchy.

However, throughout the years of the Byzantine Empire, the Slavs and the Mongolians periodically attacked Constantinople. Because of the strategic location of the city, they were always repelled. Sometimes the Slavs would attack other Slavs with the obvious long term distrust, fear and hate associated with those misadventures. Other times the Mongolians would attack the Slavs to again take a spoil. Throughout this long period of time (from the sixth tot the fifteenth centuries) the Byzantine Empire absorbed these people, both the Slavs and the Mongolians. The results are obvious, particularly so in the case of the Bulgars. The statement that

Clinton made, the need for the American troops to make the Balkans "a shining symbol of multi-ethnic tolerance" is obviously impossible. We will see why that is the truth of the matter.

The Bulgars were originally a Slavic people. According to Ferdinand Schevill, author of the book *A History of the Balkans* (Dorset Press, New York, ISBN 0-88029-697-6), the Bulgars developed from a mixture of Slavs with a Mongolian race of conquerors who came to the peninsula in the seventh century.

Further, according to Arthur Koestler, author of *The Thirteenth Tribe* (Random House, New York, ISBN 0-394-40284-7) the Khazars, a Turkish-Mongol cross which later totally converted to Judaism in the ninth century, invaded the Bulgars in 641 A.D. The Bulgars were conquered and became a part of the Khazarian Empire. So, according to Koestler, it was the Khazars who were described by Schevill as the conquerors. The modern Eastern Ashkenazi Jew (which comprises 95% of world Jewry, according to Arthur Koestler) comes from the Khazars.

The Khazars went on to conquer not only the Slavs in the area now known as Bulgaria but the Burtas, Ghuzz, Magars (Hungarians), the Gothic and Greek colonies of the Crimea, and the Slavonic tribes in the Northwestern woodlands. Again, according to Koestler, the Khazars also raided Georgia and Armenia.

The Byzantine Empire (or the Eastern Roman Empire) was extremely occupied with defending itself from the rise to power of the Arabs in the eighth century. They did not have the opportunity to defend that portion of the Byzantine Empire (known as Moesia in Roman days) from the onslaught of the Khazars into the newly formed empire of the Bulgars. But as soon as a lull in the fighting with the Arabs occurred, the Byzantine Emperor Constantine V felt free to attack the Bulgar power.

Constantine V found the Bulgars to be so well consolidated that he was unable to deal them a decisive blow. Incidentally, Constantine V took as his wife a Khazar princess who bore him a son, the future Emperor Constantine VI ("The East is East and the West is West...").

We read of the atrocities that have occurred in the recent Bosnian conflict. We have seen the type of warfare that is common in that part of the world. This is nothing new but rather the normal method of combat which has come down through the ages. As an example of these atrocities, the Bulgar Khan, named Krum, mounted an attack against the Byzantine Empire itself, perhaps in retaliation for the earlier engagement by Constantine. Krum, boldly executed an entrapment of the Byzantine army, under the command of the then Emperor Nicephorus.

The entire Byzantine army was wiped out with only a very few men left alive. Nicephorus, himself, was killed and Krum ordered his head severed from his body and the skull made into a drinking cup to be used by his captains during later meals that Krum would have with them. This, then, was the normal methods used for warfare among these people. The relationship, between the Bulgars and the Byzantines was at times cordial with intervening periods of animosity, again, much as it is today in the area.

But, according to Schevill in his book A History of the Balkans, after two hundred years of living side by side with the Slavs, the Bulgars gave up their language and customs inherited from the Mongols. They freely intermarried with the Slavs and through the years became indistinguishable from them. The Bulgars became essentially a Slavic state. Obviously, not all of the Slavs were among those who intermarried but apparently there were enough to cause the situation that Schevill reports.

This new Bulgaria converted to Christianity. Their dream was to bring all of the Slavs throughout the region under their control. It was their leader, Simeon, who conquered large sections of Macedonia and Thrace, both parts of the Byzantine Empire.

He attempted four times to capture Constantinople but failed because of a lack of sea power. These conflicts reduced the Byzantine empire in size and power to the point where they became demoralized. Simeon and his now Slavic Bulgaria ventured further North and West into the land of the Croats. Historians state that it was Simeon, in his now Slavic Bulgaria,

who united all of the heretofore independent Slavs into one nation. He appointed himself the title of Tzar of the Slavs. The word Tzar is a Slavic word meaning the same as Caesar in Roman days.

But the power of Bulgaria was short-lived. The nation did not have a solid racial fabric with which to remain strong. It was a government of a strong mixture of unwilling and conquered peoples. There is a lesson for us to consider in this fact of history. Simeon was a strong leader. When he died in 927, Bulgaria started to crumble just as any nation does with a weak fabric of people and a strong leader followed by a weak leader. Simeon was followed by Peter, a weak man, both politically and militarily.

The tug-of-war between diverse peoples continued. The Byzantine Empire again became strong under the leadership of Basil, a Macedonian and Slav by blood. He again stabilized the empire. Basil chose as his military commander a general named Nicephorus Phocas who had been raised among guerrilla type fighters and his entire life had been in combat against the Arab assaults from the West. Nicephorus made an allegiance with another group of Slavs, theretofore unheard of, the Russians. The Russians were Slavs by blood and under the rulership at the time by Scandinavian Norsemen called the Russ. The Russians attacked the Bulgars from the North and conquered the Eastern part of Bulgaria. The Byzantines lost a valuable part of their empire and now the Russians, Slavs themselves, owned part of the Balkans.

The animosities between the different races of peoples run deep. In all of these conflicts there have been atrocities. The atrocities among these Eastern peoples are usually on a personal scale where bodily contact is made in the act. Today, particularly in the West, the acts are called "surgical strikes" or "mass bombing" of cities containing civilians.

The Russians were there for only a short time, certainly not long enough to establish themselves as a country. The successor to Nicephorus (who had been assassinated by his own people), John Zimisces drove out the Russians from Bulgaria. But he, too, was short-lived. John was succeeded at Constantinople by Basil. But, alas, the Bulgars were not to be beaten. A very strong leader, Tzar Samuel, again attacked the old Roman Empire,

the Byzantines. He attacked deep into Greece as far as Corinth. Basil could not stop him because of serious rebellion at home. Tzar Samuel revelled in his victory by building a number of castles in Macedonia.

Again, Constantinople was not to be outdone. Basil reinvigorated his country with sound financial affairs and rebuilt the military into an outstanding fighting machine. When he was ready, he attacked the Tzar Samuel and totally destroyed the last great army of the Tzars of Bulgaria. Samuel himself barely escaped with his life. What follows is but another example of the atrocities of the East. Only fifteen thousand soldiers were left of the Bulgarian army.

Basil ordered that the fifteen thousand be separated into groups of one hundred. Then he ordered that all men, except one man, in each group be blinded. That one man was to have only one eye put out because he was to act as the guide to return his troupe to Bulgaria. The entire fifteen thousand returned to Bulgaria in that fashion! There is an old saying that undoubtedly originated because of this atrocity, "In the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king!"

One can readily see the animosities, the hatred that exists between the people of different tribes and races in this region of the world. Here we have people of different tribes and races gathered together, with leaders rising and falling with their desire for rulership over the entire area. Intermingled with all of those different races were those who freely intermarried and thus became a mixed people. They were converted to Christianity but even that was not without tribulations.

What was it that allowed the Byzantine Empire to succeed, even after disastrous defeats? It was because of the solid foundation of Roman Administration and its system of personal and property rights.

The individual felt secure in his person and he owned his property with security. This is one of the primary characteristics of a society that considers itself civilized. It was Christianity that secured that system. There are lessons for us to learn from this in this country today. Just what has been reported so far is enough to show the circumstances which are

now occurring in the Balkans. But there is more heartache and bloodshed. This was from the coming of the Muslims, the Ottoman Empire. This, too, we already know to be a great stumbling block in the current unrest.

The Byzantine Empire fell because of the loss of the middle-class citizens! The Empire was taken over by the ascent of large landholders who lived in Constantinople and their lands were worked by tenants. The nobility and other leaders of society, including the church and clergy, were among the large landholders. Thus, property and personal rights and security were destroyed.

The middle-class in the Byzantine Empire, just as in the United States today, was not to be outdone. They became the artisans, shopkeepers and merchants. The Byzantine Empire was forced to exist on the handling and manipulation of goods made by other peoples. Isn't this combination of conditions what is being accomplished in our beloved country today? Isn't that what Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book, *Between Two Ages*, said? He stated that the United States would become a service and information oriented society. Our production base, including agriculture, would be taken over by the world's landlords. Texe Mars [2], reports that as many as 85 percent of North American farmers have gone bankrupt in the past 15 years! If we refuse to learn simple Biblical principles from history, we deserve to repeat it.

Again, Civilization is judged by the citizens' personal and property rights. When a society is forced to operate by the ways of the Universal Commercial Code, it may highly succeed for a period of time. However, without those property rights assured by God, such a society is bound to fail.

"And Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree, from Dan even to Beersheba, all the days of Solomon." [3]

The middle-class of the Byzantine Empire turned that empire into the commercial capital of the world at the time. The trade routes between East and West were secured by these resilient people. No despotic ruler can destroy the middle-class if they will communicate and work together!

However, now the entire Balkan area was desired for another reason, that being the commercial worth to be exploited for the taking. The next great conquerors of the Balkans were the Normans of Southern Italy. They were of the same Normans from Northern France who conquered England under William the Conqueror in 1066. They moved in with their superior fighting ability, along with wily diplomacy, and literally took over the seats of government of the Byzantine Empire.

But they, too, were removed by the conquering hordes of the Turks. So, again, we will see an infusion of people into the civilization of the Balkans that has created intense problems to this very day. The Turks were Mongolian nomads, crossed with Japhetic blood (one of Noah's sons) from Central Asia. They were related to the Mongolian tribes of the Huns, Avars, Bulgars and Khazars. They lived by raids which were on the scale of large military operations.

Over a period of some years, the "Terrible Turks" finally wore down the here-to-fore impregnable Byzantine Empire. But the Empire died from within. One of the problems was that the leadership of the empire was taken over by a series of women.

The two daughters of the effeminate Constantine VIII, Zoe and Theodora, shared the control of the empire with a succession of husbands and lovers. They systematically promoted disorganization. The resulting confusion was no match for the Turks, even though there was even a short period of time that some very able and effective rulers made a last ditch stand. There is a lesson here, too.

"And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable. When a man shall take hold of his brother of the house of his father, saying, Thou has clothing, be thou our ruler, and let this ruin be under thy hand—As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." [4]

But then, we are told that God is a chauvinist!

It was at the battle of Manzikert in Albania (1071 A.D.) that the Turks totally annihilated the Byzantine forces which were led by the last able leader, Romanus IV. Up until that time, Byzantine, and the Balkans, was European in organization, Greek in culture, and totally Christian. An entirely new dimension now came into existence. The Turks systematically oppressed and exterminated the Christian population.

The Mongolian Turks steadily poured into the region. This race movement replaced the White people with yellow people, Christians with the Muslims. There is a lesson to be learned here, too. The Turks did it with the sword. We are doing it with the pen by our own leaders. Up until the turn of this century, the United States' immigration policy was primarily "to provide for the uniform immigration of white people from the European nations." That was the content of the first immigration law enacted by the government shortly after the Constitution was ratified. Either by the sword of conquerors or the pen of traitors, the loss is the same to the yeomen of the land.

The Ottoman Empire began in a rather plebeian, or ignoble, fashion. As the decadent Byzantine Empire was disintegrating, a young chieftain of one of the Turkish tribes surrounding Constantinople by the name of Osman, began integrating his tribe with disgruntled Christians who no longer could respect the decadent Christian Church.

Osman used the typically tolerant Turkish method of influencing the Christians into the Muslim faith, as compared to the fanatic approach of the Arabs who were also Muslims, of course. The Turks were Mongols and fierce in combat but they were tolerant in their civility.

The Christians thus converted were the people of the area, Greeks and Slavs. Within several generations the Turks took on the Caucasian physical characteristics of colour, hair, stature and facial features. Historians openly state that the Turks were totally cosmopolitan. They had the physical features of Europeans but the mentality of the Turks. The name Osman, or Osmani, has been changed down through the years to Ottoman. The

Ottomans simply accepted the culture and civilization of the European Byzantines as their own.

They slowly, piece by piece, absorbed the Christian lands around them. The Christian Church was priest-ridden and was not capable of developing that deep devotion to a good cause that makes men suffer martyrdom, if necessary, rather than betray their principles. Christians in droves gave up Christ for Mohammed. Within the Western Christian nations today, including the United States, we see the same phenomena occurring. Many Christians have become disillusioned and are deserting to the Muslim faith. It has been reported that the Muslim faith is the fastest growing religion in the West.

The Ottomans were shrewd. They made the most of the "iron fist in the velvet glove." They reasoned that gentleness and persuasion was needed to reach the Christians. Yet, they knew that their fledgling empire was to rest on the strength of their army. Their system of government was simple. The army was the government! Their system was that Muslims would be the landlords. The landlords would provide the cavalry. The captives of war, along with purchased Christian slaves, would provide the "cannon fodder," so to speak, for their conquering armies. Whenever they conquered a new territory of Christians, they took more captives of war and bought more Christian slaves for their next conflict.

They moved North and West. They captured the Dardanelles, then on to Thrace. It was here that the Christians were more adamant in their faith. So they tried another tactic. They offered the Christians the retention of their faith in exchange for the surrender of their weapon and a head-tax! No, there truly is nothing new under the sun!

The alternative was to be captured and forced into the army. But the Turks needed the Christians to run the government because of the superior intelligence as compared to their own people. So they showed their shrewdness again by inducting a substantial number of young boys into a training camp. It was called the devchurne. Being away from their families and their church, these young men slowly were converted to the Muslim faith.

By the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, these youth groups became so numerous that they became very influential. They became like the Pretorian guards of Rome and eventually held the destiny of the Ottoman Empire in their hands. So, strangely, enough, the Turks developed their Muslim empire using Christian brains and muscle.

They now turned to Bulgaria and Macedonia, then on to Serbia. We must take note that all of this was accomplished because of irreconcilable differences between the various Christian enclaves and states. But finally, history gives the honour to the Serbs for standing up to the onslaught of the Ottomans. A true leader named Lazar used all of the charisma he could muster and rallied the Christian forces against an onslaught of overwhelming proportions.

At a place called Kosovo, an amphitheatre in the Macedonian mountains, the Christians and the Moslems met to determine the fate of the entire Balkans. But it was too late. Balkan Christianity succumbed to the Moslems. But to this day, Kosovo is considered the grave of Serbian liberty. We repeatedly read about the Kosovo history as it applies to the situation today. So this, too, must be considered in our assessment of our current presence in Bosnia, protecting the Moslems.

The Moslems went on to conquer the entire Balkan area. From the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire ruled over a Christian people. Passionate Christians were held in bondage by equally passionate but arrogant Moslems.

The Biblical story of the Children of Israel (and that does not mean the Jews, for they are not Israelites) in bondage to the Egyptians is the only place in history where such a terrible experience has been suffered by a people in bondage for such a long period of time. It was accomplished with shrewdness but after the conquest ended, it was ruthless.

There is such a thing as DNA race memory. The memories brought down through families of all these years are such that true, genuine hatred will not disappear, Clinton and his trip to Tuzla notwithstanding. With that equally short history overview, we can now turn to the imperialist phase

of the Balkans. This, too, plays a dominant role in the current politics. In reality, the imperialist phase is still being played out. Again, imperialism by the modern definition means, "The policy and practice of forming and maintaining an empire; it is characterised by a struggle for the control of raw materials and world markets, the subjugation and control of territories, the establishment of colonies, etc."

The imperialist conflict that so immensely has affected the Balkans (and still does) is which country will maintain the greatest market for its produced goods as well as the control of the necessary raw materials needed for that production. This conflict has generally included the subjugation and/or control of the target countries.

The control and subjugation of the Balkans in modern times had originally been the pressing desire of three imperialist nations, England, France and Russia. It is not the Balkan countries themselves which are the immediate target, not that there isn't a market there nor desirable raw materials, but it was because it is the overland gateway to the East. From the start of the nineteenth century, the problem has centred around Germany. As we learned in high school history, Germany had been devastated by the wars in and around it during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Germany was reduced to a pitiful state even though she possessed some of the best technical, social and spiritual brains in the world.

England, on the other hand, had risen to be the most powerful nation on earth. The development of the world trade centre in the "City" of London started at the time of William the Conqueror and the special agreement made between Oliver Cromwell and Manasseh Ben Israel where, together, England would rule the world. England had the world's foremost navy with which to ship produced goods to any part of the world as well as the fighting ships to secure more colonies by conquest.

During this same period of time the Industrial Revolution began. We have always read that this marvel of modern man started in England. Actually, inventions were originating from most of the European nations and the most prolific nation for inventions was our own United States. But England was the most aggressive in its imperialism and it had the money

barons to finance it. England possessed the navy to bring raw materials to the production plants in England. The infamous "sweat shops" were developed as well as the equally infamous child labour practices with which to produce goods at a very low cost.

Markets had to be found; consequently, the practice of conquering backward, native countries and forcing them into the empire was developed. Consumers for these goods had to be found and so they developed them. Simultaneously, most of these backward, native countries had raw materials. All that was needed was to train the natives to produce the raw materials (mining, timber, etc.) which, in turn, needed administrative oversight. Thus, an empire was created! But, most importantly, England had the vast oceans at her disposal. All that was needed was to block any other country from access to the oceans and England had a monopoly!

Germany, on the other hand was basically an inland nation with the only access to the oceans being through the North Sea. England controlled the English channel and thus, by extension, the North Sea. Germany's engineers, scientists and production people were likewise manufacturing goods that could be sold to the world market for the sake of raising the standard of living for their people.

Germany was rebuilding its population from the devastation caused by the wars on the continent but her land mass had been drastically reduced because of those wars. There were two options for their leaders. One was to conquer new lands to colonize them just as the English and the French had done. Germany's other opponent for survival was Russia to the East but that country didn't have a shortage of land so new colonies were not a foremost problem. But Russia desired international recognition and status, along with markets.

The other option for Germany was to find markets for their goods without conquering it first by war. That method is called "peaceful penetration." That solution would provide the work for their increasing labour pool. But the English Channel was the only way out for shipping. The dangers of travel in the North Sea during the winter months were immense.

Overriding that was the constant threat of attacks by the English navy. The one thing left for Germany to do was to build a consortium, the symbiotic relationship, with Austria, Hungary, the Balkan States, and Turkey. Such an arrangement would control a land route stretching from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. The railroad had been invented and railroads were already in existence. Consequently, Germany envisioned an overland rail route stretching from the Rhine, through the Danube valleys, to Constantinople, through Turkey and on to Baghdad.

Such a move would provide immense markets for Germany's goods. Germany would again become a nation with international influence commensurate with her leadership abilities in the arts and sciences. Such a move would remove the threat of England's navy to her commerce. It would be the developing of an empire, imperialism by definition, by acquiring those inland nations within their sphere of interest. When the news of these German intentions reached England, an immediate howl of protest was heard throughout the English Empire. "Pan-Germanism" was the cry. Such a term in those days was equal to the word "Nazi" today.

Meanwhile, England had already possessed the largest imperial empire the world had ever known. Her possessions rested on every continent on the globe. Perhaps the word that would define those actions used to acquire that empire would be "Pan-Angloism."

According to Roland G. Usher, in his book *Pan-Germanism* (Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1913), "Pan-Germanism," coined because of these intentions of Germany, "was a defensive movement for self-preservation, for escaping the pressure of France and Russia, both bent on her destruction." At the same time, Usher stated that it was "an offensive movement directed against England, its object, the conquest of the English possession in the Mediterranean and in Asia. She expects thus to obtain an outlet for her surplus population and manufactures and to create an empire as little vulnerable politically, economically, or strategically as any the world has yet seen." According to Usher, Germany reasoned that England and France had their imperialist empires already secured. Now they wanted to establish new moral, ethical and legal precepts against Germany.

Germany was assured of the money needed for the Baghdad Railroad. But that assurance came from the same Rothschild dynasty as England used as their source of money! So the wheels began to turn to stop Germany and with the intent to ultimately obliterate the German people forever! Serbia and the Balkans were to be used as the bait. First, the money for the Bagdad Railroad was denied Germany.

Then, in 1908, the same year as the first Jewish-led Bolshevik revolution was attempted, Russia suggested that Austria annexe Bosnia and Herzegovina. Russia, all the while, was and is, the Serbian protector because they are basically of the same ethnic background (Slavs). Of course, Russia didn't tell Serbia of this suggestion to Austria. Austria took the opportunity and completed the annexation of these two countries. Thus, we have a double cross by the same people that gave the world communism.

Serbia, as can readily be realized from the preceding short history lesson, is extensively mixed as a people. Yet, they are immensely nationalistic, which normally is race related. Two Serbian nationalists assassinated the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria. Austria, in turn, began plans to make a punitive expedition into the Balkans to chastise the Serbs, just like the United States did with Pancho Villa in Mexico in 1914. Germany stated she would approve of the Austrian venture only if Austria made it a local affair to circumvent a wide European war.

France, a major imperialist nation, made secret negotiations with Russia assuring them that France would not object if Russia came to the support of the Serbs. Russia had already stated that she wanted Constantinople. France and England apparently thought that was a fair swap in order to rid the world of Germany.

France and Russia did not want to go to war with Germany without England and her navy. So England had to be persuaded with planted disinformation. According to Harry Elmer Barnes, the father of historical revisionism, the American Minister to Constantinople during World War I was Henry Morgenthau. He published throughout the Allied World that there had been a conference held at Potsdam on July 5, 1914 at which the

German Kaiser met with Austrian officials along with financial leaders of the Central Powers. Morgenthau reported that the Kaiser revealed to them his intentions to precipitate a general European war and that they had only three weeks to prepare for it. That Meeting Did Not Occur, So It Was Planted Disinformation! Of course, England, France and Russia would have been told privately on July 16, 1914. By the end of July, England was convinced.

So World War I was over the imperialistic concepts of empire and Serbian Jews initiated it with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. We know that the Versailles Treaty which followed was, as Schevill writes, "probably as harsh a product of the ruthless spirit of victory as is recorded in history." Of course, Schevill had not yet written the history of World War II. That treaty was intended to destroy Germany. It also heavily dictated to the Balkan states. These actions guaranteed World War II. Interestingly, it was the son of Henry Morgenthau who developed the plan after World War II to reduce Germany to a totally agrarian society. The book *Germany Must Perish*, by Theodore Kaufman, written in 1941, reflected that mentality.

What have we learned from this sordid history? It is obvious that the Balkan States truly are what political scientists call a control position. Throughout history all of the countries of Europe have wanted to possess that territory or, at least, pass through it. Obviously there is an enormous amount of nationalism in the Serbian element. Apparently this exists among those Serbs who have not mongrelised throughout the years (and there are many of them). To this day they stubbornly resist any encroachment by other peoples but they historically have fought even among themselves.

Nationalism is a desired trait in God's view. But for any nationalist movement to succeed, it must be cohesive. The love for one another is paramount. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." [5] Also, for nationalism to succeed, it must be totally separate from any aspects of imperialism or empire. The very concept of empire or imperialism is the antipathy of nationalism. G. Lowes Dickinson in his book *International Anarchy* made this profound statement:

"One can conceive a world in which Austria would not have wished to hold down a nationality against its will. But that would not be the world of history, past or present. Never has an empire resigned before the disruptive forces of nationality."

Remember the definition of imperialism and empire.

The United States is no longer the republic that was intended by our forefathers. Imperialism and empire was not in the minds of our founders at that time but we have become an imperialist empire. Theoretically we have done it through "peaceful penetration" but by whatever means, we have done it.

Thus, President Clinton sent troops to Bosnia for the real reason of protecting imperialism and empire. President Washington warned us of meddling in foreign affairs. Our forefathers understood that because we were nationalists. Are we brave enough to return to it?

Notes

[1] Ezekiel 28:5-8.

[2] Living Truth Ministries, 1708 Patterson Road, Austin, Texas 78733.

[3] 1 Kings 4:25.

[4] Isaiah 3:4-6, 12.

[5] Matthew 22:39.



The 1996 Bosnian War



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

