

F.A.C.S. REPORT

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES
P.O. Box 241 Engadine NSW 2233

Registered by Australia Post, Registration No. NBH 5760

Vol. 12, No. 3

©Copyright

March, 1993

I am pulling copyright protection from this issue, placing it in the public domain. Reprint all the copies you want. I do this occasionally when I deal with problems that I regard as fundamental. The problems I discuss in this issue are the most fundamental that I have dealt with since I began writing this newsletter in 1974. The problem is this: *the systematic sell-out of the conservative movement from within, deliberately leading to a sell-out of this nation's sovereignty.* I am not one to mince words. We are coming to a true turning point in the history of the West, and its elected defenders are already writing the terms of surrender. Some of "our people" have already signed in our name. It is time to say, "No deal."

Economics are involved, but the issue is far more important than economics. Still, we should begin with economics. People understand pocketbook issues better than they understand politics. I ask: Short of a military defeat, what is the worst-case economic scenario? The traditional economic answer is "taxation, regulation, and inflation." But this answer is too limited. *The worst-case economic scenario is the loss of your freedom.* Ultimately, the issue is political, not economic. You have reached rock bottom when your wealth can't buy your way out. We are now headed toward that grim scenario: the lobster trap of UN sovereignty.

We have now reached a turning point in world civilization. We have arrived, after a delay of about 2,000 years, at the most difficult decision of all: how to increase our economic freedom without losing our political freedom. Those who favor economic decentralization — free market economists — usually favor free trade. But free trade seems to be politically possible only when a larger political unit supervises the reduction of trade barriers. That is our dilemma today.

Let's consider our own history. In 1787-88, the U.S. Constitution was substituted for the Articles of Confederation. Why was the Constitutional convention called? Two main reasons were given: (1) the states could issue their own currency, and this was producing price inflation; (2) the states

The Next-to-the-Last Phase of the Revolution has Begun

by Gary North

Reprinted from Dr Gary North's Remnant Review, P.O. Box 84906, Phoenix AZ 85071 USA, January 22 1993 edition. Subscription rates for Australian readers: \$US133 per annum (air mail).

could erect trade barriers against the exports of other states, thereby reducing the size of the U.S. market. There were other reasons, including independent foreign policies of each state, the necessity of unanimity, and the absence of a military commander-in-chief. But fiat money and tariffs were the two major excuses for the convention.

In short, the centralization of political power was regarded as necessary to the creation of a large decentralized economic market. *We are now seeing a replay of the same arguments.* In Europe, voters in 1992 came perilously close to creating a new nation from which secession is impossible. The justification? The need for a central currency and single central bank (private, of course); the need for a single trade area. The cost: the loss of national political sovereignty. More trade, but more bureaucracy. More trade, but more regulations produced by a distant, politically immune bureaucracy located in Brussels. That is, the promise of *economic decentralization*, but at the expense of *political centralization*.

In short, Europeans were asked: *Do you trust the bureaucrats?* Denmark said no by one-half of one percent of those voting. Then the currency markets said no in September. Meanwhile, many tariffs went zero, as scheduled, on January 1. The bureaucrats may have destroyed their case for political centralization. Europe may now reap the rewards of greater

trade but without the political quid pro quo. The Eurocrats are frantic. *The train to greater economic freedom is slowly pulling out of the station, but there is no Brussels-licensed engineer firmly in control.*

In this country, we are witnessing a parallel move. The North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA) is more than an economic treaty to lower trade barriers; it has broad political ramifications. But far more important than NAFTA is the move to expand the authority of the United Nations Organization (UNO), better known as the UN. Americans — and not just Americans — are being subjected to the most remarkable propaganda campaign that I have seen since I became politically aware in 1956. What is new is this: the conservatives are being singled out as the voting bloc to persuade. This was not true in 1956; we had no clout then. I am not just talking about American conservatives: the Thatcherites in England are also being targeted. A barrage of propaganda began in November, 1992.

If we lose this battle, we will lose everything. It will establish the foundation for the worst-case scenario. This is the moment of decision.

Conservative Spokesman

Every movement has spokesmen. Conservatives, being decentralists, have many. But those who speak loudest are those who lead large organizations, and these days, there are no large conservative organizations as

F.A.C.S. REPORT is published monthly by the **FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES**, a non-denominational educational organization. A free six month subscription is available upon request. Donations are invited, and those who send a donation of \$15 or more will receive a full year's subscription. Foreign subscriptions: a minimum donation of \$30, payable in Australian currency, is required for a year's subscription. Cheques should be made payable to **F.A.C.S.**

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES

P.O. Box 241
Engadine NSW 2233
Tel: (02) 548 1886

Permission to reprint material from **F.A.C.S. REPORT** is granted provided the article is reprinted in full and the name and address of **F.A.C.S. REPORT** is given.

Editor: Ian Hodge

such; there are a few groups with large mailing lists. *But if there is a single conservative spokesman today in the U.S., it is Rush Limbaugh.* God willing, he will not be used as a stalking horse by his ideological peers. If he follows their lead, we are in big trouble.

Let us begin with the columnists. These people articulate the vision of the conservative movement. What I am seeing is something that I never would have believed possible: *piéd pipers within the conservative movement are now endorsing the extension of internationally binding military sovereignty to the UN.*

Conservatives have fought the UN from its creation in 1945. That its first moderator was Alger Hiss did not endear the UN to conservatives after Whittaker Chambers went public with his story in 1948. (By the way, the Soviet KGB archivist and general who supposedly cleared Hiss of espionage activities last November reversed himself in December, saying that he did not consult the GRU's military intelligence files. I'll bet your local newspaper did not run the follow-up story.) I came into the conservative movement in 1956. I can think of no unifying cry which better expressed the universal attitude of conservatives than the phrase: "Get the US out of the UN, and get the UN out of the US." That unanimity died last November.

William F. Buckley, who in the late 1950's and early 1960's was the spokesman for American conservatism, began his attack in December. He identified Somalia as "A stark naked challenge to the new world order." Bush had announced his plan to send in the troops. The violation of another nation's sovereignty, said Buckley, must be "a disinterested act." He offered the US invasion of Panama as an example. Second, it must be militarily feasible. Third, "there has to be an international sanction of the effort. If conditions 1 and 2 are met, there is

likely to be e.g., United Nations approval." Will the American electorate favor such a move? Yes, he said: "My guess is that it would resoundingly approve the venture. Because the alternative would leave us feeling sick and ashamed, and to spare ourselves that debasement, sacrifices are justified." (*Dallas Morning News*, Dec. 3, 1992.)

But why would Americans have felt sick and ashamed? *Because of months of unending propaganda film clips on the major networks that preceded the invasion.* As Gwen Dyer noted in a January 1 column in the *Washington Times*, there are always five famines going on at any time. The networks cannot cover all of them. They choose one, at most. There is just so much time available for TV news, so much space in newspapers. Very few people can run a "reality check," as she calls it, on international news. No matter if the number of dreadful things happening worldwide drops from 30 to 25, we will be shown at least four of them either way. "It will feel exactly the same." At the end of 1992, the world was in better political shape than it has been in decades, she argued, yet it doesn't feel that way.

That isn't strong enough: *it feels worse.* Watch the rhetoric in the press. We are facing a much worse situation, we are told, because the USSR has disintegrated. Yet from 1946 until 1991, we were told (correctly, in my view) that the USSR constituted the major threat to the West. Now it is gone, yet things are somehow worse. *This theme is pure propaganda, not disinterested analysis.*

On December 15, Buckley reinforced his December 3 column. He cited an article by Paul Johnson, author of *Modern Times*. Johnson may be the most eloquent historian of our time — certainly he is the most skilled conservative one. I'm a professionally trained historian, and I regard *Modern Times* as a masterpiece. But Johnson has now become an apologist for the UN. He wrote an article for the UN. He wrote an article for Buckley's *National Review* (Dec. 14) titled, "Wanted: A New Imperialism." *NR* summarized:

The world is now on the brink of a golden era, if we make the right choices now. The trick, Paul Johnson suggests, lies in true international cooperation — i.e., getting the nations of the West to cooperate in remaking the rest of the world in our image (p. 2).

But how? By vastly strengthening the UN:

During the rest of this decade, we will be building on the foundations laid by our handling of the Kuwait invasion, and completing the process whereby an ineffectual and

It is surprising the attitude that many parents have toward some aspects of their children's education. Normally, it would be expected that parents would do their utmost for a child to encourage, motivate, and ensure he learns as much as possible.

Music, however, exhibits some of the worst aspects of parents' attitude toward education.

Many parents wish to have their child educated on some musical instrument, and the piano is often the preferred choice. Pianos, however, are costly items. Entry level cost for a reasonable second hand instrument is approximately \$2,000 upwards. This is an instrument that holds its tune somewhat, and sounds something like an ordinary piano, not a honky-tonk.

Since the parents are unsure of their child's talents and gifts in this area, they are reluctant to spend too much money on what might be (to them) a wasted item. So they spend as little as possible. And what do they buy? An instrument that looks like a piano, but has had the insides destroyed through neglect and abuse over the years. They don't hold their tune (pitch) properly, and in many cases cannot be tuned because of the internal damage to the frame or through parts that are worn. Such instruments can be obtained for just a few hundred dollars.

It is such an instrument that is supposed to inspire the young child to learn his music. Is it any wonder that so many children drop out of music lessons. They do not have the equipment necessary to train either their ears or their fingers. Naturally, since they aren't altogether stupid, they know this instrument is of poor quality and consequently figure that if Dad and Mum think so highly of music that this is all he gets for his efforts, then music cannot be that important.

To succeed a child needs to be taught, amongst other things, to recognise his achievements. But on such an instrument he can have no achievements, since they are impossible to obtain. The child needs to learn to delight in the sounds that he makes on the keyboard, but such an opportunity is denied the child right from the beginning.

This you could call the "cheapskate" approach to education, and so many parents are cheapskates when it comes to music tuition.

Investing is thought by some to be a very serious business. Laughter, fun and games do not necessarily belong within the hallowed walls of the financial institutions. Thus, in the 1870s, you could be fined \$10 for throwing a paper dart in the New York Stock Exchange.

The Dutch once held to a very conservative and evangelical Calvinistic faith. Times, however, have changed. And the Dutch are on the leading edge of radical social change.

hypocritical General Assembly UN is transformed into what it was always intended to be, a realistic and forceful Security Council UN. . . . The permanent members, despite some remaining ideological differences, will slowly become accustomed to working together as the "inner cabinet" of the world community. Hitherto, the United States, as the sole superpower, has had reluctantly to take on the role of world policeman, while protesting it is doing no such thing. It will continue to provide the core of the enforcement process, but by the early years of the twenty-first century we will begin to see the Security Council emerge as the collective functioning agent of the policing system. That will be a giant step toward the realization of an international rule of law (p. 29).

However, and here we come to the second pillar of the new wisdom, we must also transform collective security from a reactive and negative force into a true watchdog, engaged in foreseeing and forestalling — crime prevention and disaster avoidance. It was good that the world was able to reverse the Kuwait outrage. It would have been better — and possible — to stop it from ever happening. Crises are almost invariably dealt with more easily in their early stages. . . . (pp. 29-30).

What we will have to develop, and will develop in the next ten years, is international contingency-planning. Like the traditional great powers and their general staffs, the Security Council must learn to devise diplomatic, military and logistical plans for all foreseeable disturbances. It will set up, as it were, a global Disaster Survey, plotting the likely emergencies and devising ways to deal with them. It will regularly present to member-states the levels of force, transport, and relief supplies required to meet the contingencies listed. . . . UN service will become a regular part of the careers of officials and military of all the major powers and many minor ones, until the spirit and technology of collective security becomes an integral part of their training and experience. We will cease to think of the UN as well-meaning but contemptible, and regard it increasingly as a formidable and professional instrument of world crisis management (p. 30).

. . . . We are now poised on the verge of a great adventure in international political and economic coming-together, which can turn the twenty-first century into the period when the first global society is forged. The next ten years will see whether this is likely to happen or not. They are going to be invigorating, exciting years, and I am looking

forward to them with relish (p. 34).

If you doubt the accuracy of my reprints of these extracts, mail \$5 to National Review, 150 East 35th St., New York, NY 10016. Request a copy of the December 14 issue. The article is actually much worse than these brief extracts indicate. *This is betrayal!* No weaker word does justice to Johnson's monstrous defection.

Did Buckley use his December 15 *Washington Times* column to attack this article? No, indeed; he quoted it verbatim at considerable length (just as I have done) without a single negative comment. He closed with these words: "President Bush has initiated [in Somalia] what may be the defining diplomatic act of the close of the century." Indeed, Bush has done exactly that.

We have moved our troops into a sovereign nation that did not attack any other nation. We have done this under the UN's authority. We have moved these troops, not to defend American interests, but to save people from starving. We have legitimized the UN as an agency of international economic aid, *using U.S. resources to deliver this aid*. A President of the United States has ratified what American conservatives have for almost half a century said that the UN had always planned: to get the U.S. government to extract money from U.S. taxpayers and send this money to the United Nations for distribution under the UN's auspices. There have been no organized protests. "All those in favor of starving babies please stand up!"

What does this mean? Find out for yourself. I want you to "invest" (as President Clinton refers to spending) \$24.95. Order a copy of the public relations videotape produced by the UN called, "About United Nations Peacekeeping." Order videotape E.91.I.26 from the United Nations Publications, Sales Section, Room DC2-0853, New York, NY 10017, or order with your credit card from 1-800-253-9646.

I agree with military analyst Col. Harry Summers. The Somalia invasion has established the U.S. military as the international nanny. It will transform our forces from a fighting force designed to defend this nation from aggressors into a completely different organization, a kind of Peace Corps. This, as Summers says, is extremely dangerous, for two reasons. First, it may seriously weaken the military as a fighting force. Second, it creates a justification for military intervention at home in order to calm the people, heal the people, and control the people should crises break out here. He cites an essay in *Parameters*, the publication of the National War College, in which the author writes a retroactive look at the military coup in 2112, a

This change was forecast by one of the best Christian thinkers of last century, G. Groen van Prinsterer. In a series of lectures, *Ongeloof en Revolutie*, which have come to us in English as *Unbelief and Revolution*, given in The Hague during the winter of 1845-46, van Prinsterer analysed the Revolution that was sweeping across Europe. It began, he thought, in the eighteenth century, culminating in the French Revolution. But it had not died. This Revolution of unbelief was about to radically change the world as it was then known.

For van Prinsterer, "atheism in religion and radicalism in politics are not only not an exaggeration, misuse or distortion, but that they are in fact the consistent and faithful application, of a principle which sets aside the God of Revelation in favour of the supremacy of Reason."

"The defining feature of the Revolution," van Prinsterer observed, "is its hatred of the Gospel, its anti-Christian nature. This feature marks the Revolution, not, mind you, when it 'deviates from its course' and 'lapses into excesses,' but, on the contrary, precisely when it holds to its course and reaches the conclusion of its system, the true end of its logical development. This mark belongs to the Revolution. The Revolution can never shake it off. It is inherent in its very principle, and expresses and reflects its essence. It is the sign of its origin. It is the mark of hell."

Consequently, for van Prinsterer there was no "Enlightenment." In unbelief "there was no progress, but regress." For, "without the light of the sun no human wisdom can make the field fruitful. They that labour with intellect and genius to produce ideas and chart vast systems labour in vain when they withdraw from the rays of the wisdom that is from above; when they renounce dependence upon principles and thus confound freedom of the mind with independence of the mind — a distinction which philosophy too must acknowledge."

The Revolution of unbelief was about to wreak havoc on the European institutions which had been handed down by a millennium of Christian influence. "Just as all truth rests upon the truth that is from God, so the common foundation of all rights and duties lies in the sovereignty of God. When that Sovereignty is lost, when God is denied or (what amounts to the same thing) banished to heaven because His kingdom is not of this world, what becomes then of the fountain of authority, of law, of every sacred and dutiful relation in state, society and family? . . ."

Having abandoned the Fountain of all wisdom, Jesus Christ, and followed the Revolution of unbelief, the Dutch Parliament has now legalised euthanasia. This is not just the passive activity of doctors disconnecting life support systems, but is the active participation by the medical profession in assisting people in ending their life. It might be by administering drugs, or some other procedures. But it amounts to helping people suicide — all in the name of medical ethics.

Human life is at a low premium in the world of the Revolution. This is what van Prinsterer saw so clearly. "What can be learned from the experience of the revolu-

coup based on the need of U.S. troops to quell a domestic breakdown.

In other words, *once the military's assignment is shifted from national defence to the preservation of social tranquility and social justice, it becomes an agency for social salvation*. Worse: U.S. troops will very likely be operating under UN sovereignty, if Paul Johnson's dream comes true.

Georgie Anne Geyer is a conservative columnist. She has written a critical biography of Fidel Castro. She is sufficiently despised by the Left that the husband-and-wife Hollywood producers, the Thomasons (of Bill Clinton's promotional movie fame, "The Man From Hope"), have created a character for their weekly TV sitcom that is a vicious parody of her. Mike Royko, usually a humorous columnist, wrote a very serious piece defending her from this unfair attack, but the Thomasons refuse to remove the character. And what does Miss Geyer think about the UN?

The United Nations is hated in more and more places today because it refuses to use appropriate force to stop these slaughters — and, particularly in Bosnia, refuses to allow the victims the means to defend themselves. . . .

The United Nations insists it is operating meticulously under mandates laid down for it on the restricted use of force. This is untrue. The U.N. rules are extremely flexible, and there is always the early example of the Congo, where full U.N. armies fought. . . .

The sad part is that this world badly needs an effective United Nations. It is the only organization that can address many of the world's desperately pressing problems.

This column was published in the conservative *Washington Times* (Jan. 8). Miss Geyer understands exactly what she is saying. Her January 3 column announced:

Already we can observe forms of this new-style intervention, of the United Nations and of individual countries, in places as disparate as Kurdistan, Bosnia, and Somalia. But even in those places, purely humanitarian intervention, without the use of force and some form of enforced political trusteeship, is not going to last for the simple reason that it will be eaten alive by the new forces and quandaries it provokes.

Notice the key phrase, "political trusteeship." It becomes quite clear: *these conservative columnists are calling for a new colonialism, a new imperialism, justified by the legitimate international sovereignty of the United Nations*.

This is an international propaganda effort. In England, the deservedly prestigious conservative weekly magazine *The Economist* has taken up the same theme. Here is the Party Line, announced in the lead editorial (Dec. 19-25):

But the need is for a world cop, and NATO is a North Atlantic organization; even if it expands its horizons, it cannot act everywhere. And even where it can act, it will not always want to, because in some places a western defence organization will be a politically inappropriate policeman. For these reasons Mr. Clinton would do well to hasten the refashioning of the UN as alternative peace-enforcer. That will really mean the creation of a specially trained force of soldiers put at the UN's disposal. The structure of their command would have to be clear — as clear as that of NATO, the only multinational outfit capable of packing the punch that any intervention force needs. That in turn will require big changes at the UN, but they are not impossible ones. And if made, Mr. Clinton then would have no good reason to withhold American units from future UN operations commanded by non-Americans.

Then there is the cover of this issue. It is a water color of the raising of the flag at Iwo Jima: the most emotionally powerful military photograph in U.S. history. But the flag is the UN's. The editors understand the power of symbols.

When U.S. newscasts began featuring the Somalian famine, a propaganda campaign began. By the time the U.S. sent in its 28,000 troops under UN auspices, in the words of *The Economist* (Dec. 12), "There had been no need to soften up public opinion. Americans, harrowed by months of television pictures from the Horn of Africa, have been quick to approve of Operation Restore Hope." The "man from Hope," Mr. Clinton, immediately sanctioned President Bush's decision. Commented *The Economist*: "For though this was Mr. Bush's initiative, there can be no doubt that it is also Mr. Clinton's cause. The outgoing Bush administration, far from acting high-handedly, seems to have been infused with some of the foreign-policy philosophy of the administration-in-waiting. That philosophy — call it neo-Wilsonian — has a strong moral dimension to it." The editors went on: "Neo-Wilsonianism is not confined to Haiti and Somalia" (Dec. 12). Correct again!

Conclusion

Future historians may want to date the visible smash-up of American

tionary era? That man, without God, even with the circumstances in his favour, can do nothing but work his own destruction."

The euthanasia laws apparently do not even provide for the protection of the individual's request: it can be made by others. Where, however, will the line be drawn? It is a small step to move from the permission of relatives to the permission of the state. After all, in the revolutionary world, the state is man's new kingdom of god, his new environment. "Self interest and injustices of all kinds are covered with the cloak called *the happiness of the people*. The moment the rulers pass themselves off as the first officials of the nation, their wars become national wars, their debts national debts, their needs state needs. Conscription, arbitrary taxes and every other kind of forced service are quite conveniently justified by the concepts of a public establishment and of the sovereignty of the people. Private rights and agreements made with individuals or corporations no longer have any value the moment everything must be subservient to the alleged ends of the state, to the interest of the majority, or to the presumed will of the people, which is even presented as the source of all justice."

How long before his "source of all justice" demands that it, and it alone, determines who shall continue to live? And how long before Australia reaches the same position of ugliness in human relationships? And perhaps even more importantly, what are you, dear reader, prepared to do about it?

* * * *

conservatism. They should use the December 1992 invasion of Somalia as the date. While the divisions within conservatism had been present from the beginning, in 1948, when Whitaker Chambers blew the whistle on Alger Hiss, they had been held in check by anti-Communism and by opposition to the United Nations. Libertarians and conservatives agreed: the UN is a disaster conceptually — big government at its bureaucratic worst. The best anyone could say for it was that it was not armed. Conservatism was divided between interventionists and non-interventionists (e.g., Robert A. Taft), but there was no debate about the UN.

This unity has now ended. Spokesmen of traditional conservative opinion have begun to move into the camp of the long-feared enemy. Some of the neo-conservatives have bought this new Party Line, although the UN's stand on Israel may alienate a lot of them. But three groups surely will not buy the new line: libertarians, paleo-conservatives (Taft-types), and the Christian Right.

. . . We are coming to the final stage of an old campaign.