



The Conservative Underground



Vol. 1 Issue 1

“Printing what they don’t want you to see,”
Teaching what they don’t want you to know”

9 December 2008

© Copyright 2008 Individual authors retain copyright to their own submissions

A Statement of Purpose from the Editor

By Tim Dunkin

Like many conservatives, I woke up the morning of Wednesday, November 5 to find that a disaster had struck this country. Our nation had elected – and not by a razor-thin margin – an avowed socialist to the highest office in the land. What was worse, as the dust settled, it appeared that many self-identifying Republicans and conservatives had allowed themselves to be gulled by the news media and the smooth promises made by the Obama campaign, and many others had simply not voted.

“How could this be?”, we asked ourselves. I believe it is because many people in this country have forgotten the conservative principles that have guided this nation for more than two centuries. They have forgotten what Reagan re-taught us during his tenure in office. Many professing conservatives don’t really know (or care) why capitalism, individualism, traditional values, and constitutional government are *really* all that important, and why these are areas where we shouldn’t compromise our principles.

The Left controls most of the various media and other institutions of propagating information to the people. The media, in turn, advances its intellectually and morally stultifying agenda through its power to shape opinion. With

the potential for the re-imposition of the “Fairness” Doctrine, conservatism’s primary outlet – talk radio – may end up being muzzled. Even on the internet, many of the mainstream conservative outlets are drifting leftward and seem to be losing their way. The “viral” internet underground could be the last best hope for true free speech, and will be where liberty’s tools are applied to the framework of this nation’s minds.

We intend for *Conservative Underground* to be one such tool. It is our hope that we can provide interested and informed lovers of liberty with the arguments, the philosophy, and the knowledge to add to their own arsenals, which they will then use to educate their fellow Americans. Our intention is to serve as a means of getting around the leftist-driven information blockade and the caricature of conservatism that it promotes, and bring the true ideology of liberty to the people of this nation once again. We employ a viral approach – using the by-ways of the internet to circumvent the blockade and bring the message of liberty directly to your inbox. From there, we depend upon our readers to confront their friends, family, and neighbors with this message, teaching them what many of them have perhaps forgotten. We’re counting on you!

Cultural Marxism

By Linda Kimball

There are two misconceptions held by many Americans. The first is that communism ceased to be a threat when the Soviet Union imploded. The second is that the New Left of the Sixties collapsed and disappeared as well. “The Sixties are dead,” wrote columnist George Will (“Slamming the Doors,” *Newsweek*, Mar. 25, 1991).

Because the New Left lacked cohesion, it fell apart as a political movement. However, its revolutionaries reorganized themselves into a

multitude of single-issue groups. Thus we now have for example, radical feminists, black extremists, anti-war ‘peace’ activists, animal rights groups, radical environmentalists, and ‘gay’ rights groups. All of these groups pursue their piece of the radical agenda through a complex network of organizations such as the Gay Straight Lesbian Educators Network (GSLEN), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), People for the American Way, United for Peace and Justice, Planned Parenthood, Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), and Code Pink for Peace. (cont. on pg. 4)



<http://hostileopposition.blogspot.com>

Capitalism as a Mechanism for Change

By Michael J. Payne

Recently, we have heard various pundits, politicians, and everyday citizens all clamoring for “change”. Just what this mythical ideal is, no one can quite explain, they all just agree that it is good and that they want it. If one pushes aside the question of what exactly this change entails and, for a moment, focuses on the mechanism best suited to initiate efficient change within a social structure, one arrives at an outcome that is in contradiction to the recent electoral results. If the results of the recent election are to be understood as an endorsement for “change” then one must also agree that the body politic believes that the party best suited to affect said change is the same party that endorses collectivist policies such as wealth redistribution, corporate welfare, and a punitive tax structure. This only goes to demonstrate the failings of our modern educational system and the prevailing ignorance where matters of economics and social theory, among others, are concerned. The most efficient, painless, and rapid method for altering society is not collectivism but competitive capitalism.

Through the competition inherent in the capitalist system, change is initiated not by the design of man, but through an organic Darwinism of ideas. Ideas are brought up and evaluated. Most are abandoned, some are put into practice only to have them fail due to inefficiency or undesired results, and still fewer are implemented on a long-term basis. This competition is possible only through the critical component of capitalism, freedom. This freedom manifests itself in many forms; the ability to determine to what task ones labor is applied and at what reward, or the manner in which the individuals private capital is to be invested. It is this sovereignty of the person, inherent in the choices made by the individual, which provides the impetus for change within the natural order. (cont. on pg. 3)

Turning up the Heat: Concealed Carry on Campus

By Jamie Freeze

I rarely ask for much from my government. All I ask is that they protect my life, liberty, and property. It really isn't a tall order. However, the crime rates in America make me doubt the government's ability to protect me in any capacity. Greensboro is consistently above the national average in violent crimes and property crimes. Are you feeling any safer? I'm not. Now, I have a couple of options at my disposal. I can have the police on speed dial, or I can obtain a concealed weapon permit and arm myself. I know the idea of a conservative female with a gun scares a lot of people, but the idea of a criminal with a gun scares me more. I'm glad I have the option of defending my life and property. However, that option ends the moment I step foot on UNCG's property.

In North Carolina, it is a Class I felony to possess a weapon on an educational facility--despite the fact that you may have a concealed weapon permit. Your constitutional right to bear arms ends at the intersection of Aycock and Spring Garden. While you have the option of arming yourself against the criminal who is invading your home, you can't have the option of arming yourself against the criminal who is invading your dorm or classroom. Is it really too much to ask that North Carolina allow its citizens to exercise their constitutional right to bear arms?

The easiest way to scare school administrators is to bring up the issue of concealed carry on campus. One of the most common arguments against concealed carry on campus is that it will increase violent crimes. However, of the eleven colleges that allow concealed carry none have had a single incident of gun violence, a single gun accident, or a single gun theft. Reports also show that licensed concealed handgun owners are five times less likely than non-licensed holders to commit violent crimes. (cont. on pg. 3)

(Capitalism, cont. from pg. 2) Without freedom, social change has its origins in the will of one single person, a dictator, or through the collective will of a few select individuals who comprise the ruling elite. There is no mechanism through which new ideas constituting a “change” are vetted and evaluated in the public square. The process of evaluation and implementation is left to the devices of a chosen few who, as is often the case with men, serve their own self interests and neglect the needs and desires of the populace. This serves only the masters’ will by imposing their ideas of social change, which often run contrary to the intent of the electorate. Despotism ensues due to the conflict between the interests of the public and the will of the dictator, who through acts of force and intimidation will always emerge victorious.

Capitalism presents us with the opportunity to achieve social change, not through force or coercion, but through the will of the people. There is no overall controlling force that determines what constitutes a positive change as it is arrived at organically through the actions of the citizenry. Those who call for social change through the enactment of collectivist policies or actions are only acting in the interest of increasing or maintaining their power over society and desire only to see their own particular vision of society emerge, ignoring the desires of those who have chosen them to represent their desires. Society then becomes a caricature of the social ills, as perceived by the dictator or ruling class, which, I might add, often falls well short of reality, thereby resulting in the disaffection of the citizenry. The end result is an authoritarian dictatorship that molds society in ways that offend or alarm the members of said society, resulting in a radical attempt to regain the power to change society through violence, insurrection, and eventually open rebellion.

Capitalism therefore allows us the opportunity to effect social change by peaceful means through which every member of society has some, all be it limited, input in the amplitude or reach of this adjustment. It is done through the subconscious actions of the individual who possess a better judgment of society’s needs, since they are immersed in it every day as opposed to a despot so far removed from everyday life that his perception of society’s needs are the product of his own warped perceptions.

I think that nothing is so important for freedom as recognizing in the law each individual’s natural right to property, and giving individuals a sense that they own something that they’re responsible for, that they have control over, and that they can dispose of. – Milton Friedman

(Packing, cont. from pg 2) Think about it. You would be less likely to assault someone if you knew they might be packing heat. However, on a college campus, you know no one (other than the police) have guns, so there is no incentive not to attack. College students are prime targets! Unless a police officer is by their side or unless they can take out a person with their pinky, the average college student is relatively defenseless. And if you do plan to take the bad guy out with your pinky, you better hope your pinky is faster than his bullet!

Another argument I often hear against concealed carry on campus is that college students are too emotionally unstable (due to alcohol, a failed exam, a bad relationship, etc.) to be trusted with firearms. I laugh every time I hear that argument because it is so ridiculous. It’s not like I want to hand out guns to every college student. Rather, I want the college students who are eligible for concealed carry permits elsewhere in North Carolina to be allowed to use that permit on campus. In North Carolina, you have to be twenty-one years old, complete a concealed carry course, and register with the sheriff’s office in order to obtain a concealed carry permit. If you have a history of mental instability or a felony criminal record, you will be turned down. If I can be a responsible adult in the community, I can be a responsible adult on campus.

Finally, my all-time favorite liberal argument against concealed carry on campus is that the answer to violence is not more guns. While guns may not be the only answer, they sure don’t hurt! Simple statistical analysis shows that when gun control laws (which amount to bans) are implemented (like they were in New York in 1911 or in England after World War II) the crime rate goes up. After all, the law-abiding citizens are the ones giving up their guns, not the law-breaking criminals! I understand that crime is a complex problem with complex solutions. However, if one of the proven solutions is carrying a gun, why does our state deny that option to college students?

Don’t misunderstand me. I am not advocating for every Joe Shmoe to carry a pistol to English class. What I am advocating is that the students or faculty members who possess concealed carry permits be allowed to use that permit on campus. College students and faculty are citizens too! We should not be forced to lay down our constitutional rights at the door of a university. If I can carry my gun to the grocery store, I should be able to carry my gun to college.

(**Marxism**, cont. from pg 1) Both communism and the New Left are alive and thriving here in America. They favor code words: tolerance, social justice, economic justice, peace, reproductive rights, sex education and safe sex, safe schools, inclusion, diversity, and sensitivity. All together, this is Cultural Marxism disguised as multiculturalism.

Birth of Multiculturalism

In anticipation of the revolutionary storm that would baptize the world in an inferno of red terror, leading to its rebirth as the promised land of social justice and proletarian equality-Friedrich Engels wrote,

“All the...large and small nationalities are destined to perish...in the revolutionary world storm... (A general war will) wipe out all...nations, down to their very names. The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only reactionary classes...but...reactionary peoples.” (“The Magyar Struggle,” *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Jan. 13, 1849)

By the end of WWI, socialists realized that something was amiss, for the world’s proletariat had not heeded Marx’s call to rise up in opposition to evil capitalism and to embrace communism instead. They wondered what had gone wrong.

Separately, two Marxist theorists - Antonio Gramsci of Italy and Georg Lukacs of Hungary - concluded that the Christianized West was the obstacle standing in the way of a communist new world order. The West would have to be conquered first. Gramsci posited that because Christianity had been dominant in the West for over 2000 years, not only was it fused with Western civilization, but it had corrupted the working class. The West would have to be de-Christianized, said Gramsci, by means of a “long march through the culture.” Additionally, a new proletariat must be created. In his “Prison Notebooks,” he suggested that the new proletariat be comprised of many criminals, women, and racial minorities.

The new battleground, reasoned Gramsci, must become the culture, starting with the traditional family and completely engulfing churches, schools, media, entertainment, civic organizations, literature, science, and history. All of these things must be radically transformed and the social and cultural order gradually turned

upside-down with the new proletariat placed in power at the top.

The Prototype

In 1919, Georg Lukacs became Deputy Commissar for Culture in the short-lived Bolshevik Bela Kun regime in Hungary. He immediately set plans in motion to de-Christianize Hungary. Reasoning that if Christian sexual ethics could be undermined among children, then both the hated patriarchal family and the Church would be dealt a crippling blow. Lukacs launched a radical sex education program in the schools. Sex lectures were organized and literature handed out which graphically instructed youth in free love (promiscuity) and sexual intercourse while simultaneously encouraging them to deride and reject Christian moral ethics, monogamy, and parental and church authority. All of this was accompanied by a reign of cultural terror perpetrated against parents, priests, and dissenters.

Hungary’s youth, having been fed a steady diet of values-neutral (atheism) and radical sex education, while being simultaneously encouraged to rebel against all authority, easily turned into delinquents ranging from bullies and petty thieves to sex predators, murderers, and sociopaths.

Gramsci’s prescription and Lukacs’ plans were the precursor to what Cultural Marxism in the guise of SIECUS, GSLEN, and the ACLU - acting as judicially-powered enforcers - later brought into American schools.

Building a Base

In 1923, the Frankfurt School - a Marxist think-tank - was founded in Weimar Germany. Among its founders were Georg Lukacs, Herbert Marcuse, and Theodor Adorno. The school was a multidisciplinary effort which included sociologists, sexologists, and psychologists.

The primary goal of the Frankfurt School was to translate Marxism from economic terms into cultural terms. It would provide the ideas on which to base a new political theory of revolution based on culture, harnessing new oppressed groups for the faithless proletariat. Smashing religion and morals, it would also build a constituency among academics, who could build careers studying and writing about the new oppression.

Toward this end, Marcuse - who favored polymorphous perversion - expanded the ranks of Gramsci's new proletariat by including homosexuals, lesbians, and transsexuals. Into this was spliced Lukacs' radical sex education and cultural terrorism tactics. Gramsci's 'long march' was added to the mix, and then all of this was wedded to Freudian psychoanalysis and psychological conditioning techniques. The end product was Cultural Marxism, now known in the West as multiculturalism.

Additional intellectual firepower was required: a theory to pathologize what was to be destroyed. In 1950, the Frankfurt School augmented Cultural Marxism with Theodor Adorno's idea of the 'authoritarian personality.' This concept is premised on the notion that Christianity, capitalism, and the traditional family create a character prone to racism and fascism. Thus, anyone who upholds America's traditional moral values and institutions is both racist and fascist. Children raised by traditional values parents, we are told to believe, will almost certainly become racists and fascists. By extension, if fascism and racism are endemic to America's traditional culture, then everyone raised in the traditions of God, family, patriotism, gun ownership, or free markets is in need of psychological help.

The pernicious influence of Adorno's 'authoritarian personality' idea can be clearly seen in some of the research that gets public money,

"In Aug. 2003, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) announced the results of their \$1.2 million tax-payer funded study. It stated, essentially, that traditionalists are mentally disturbed. Scholars from the Universities of Maryland, California at Berkeley, and Stanford had determined that social conservatives...suffer from 'mental rigidity,' 'dogmatism,' and 'uncertainty avoidance,' together with associated indicators for mental illness." (<http://www.edwatch.org/> "Social and Emotional Learning" Jan. 26, 2005)

The Orwellian cast of the pathologies named shows how far Gramsci's long march has led us.

A corresponding and diabolically crafted idea is political correctness. The strong suggestion here is that in order for one not to be thought of as racist or fascist, then one must not only be nonjudgmental but must also embrace

the 'new' moral absolutes: diversity, choice, sensitivity, sexual orientation, and tolerance. Political correctness is a Machiavellian psychological 'command and control' device. Its purpose is the imposition of uniformity in thought, speech, and behavior.

Critical theory is yet another psychological 'command and control' device. As stated by Daniel J. Flynn,

"Critical Theory, as its name implies, criticizes. What deconstruction does to literature, Critical Theory does to societies." (Intellectual Morons, p 15-16)

Critical Theory is an ongoing and brutal assault via vicious criticism relentlessly leveled against Christians, Christmas, the Boy Scouts, Ten Commandments, our military, and all other aspects of traditional American culture and society.

Both political correctness and Critical Theory are in essence, psychological bullying. They are the psycho-political battering rams by which Frankfurt School disciples such as the ACLU are forcing Americans to submit to and to obey the will and the way of the Left. These devious devices are but psychological versions of Georg Lukacs and Laventi Beria's 'cultural terrorism' tactics. In the words of Beria,

"Obedience is the result of force...Force is the antithesis of humanizing actions. It is so synonymous in the human mind with savageness, lawlessness, brutality, and barbarism, that it is only necessary to display an inhuman attitude toward people to be granted by those people the possessions of force." (The Russian Manual on Psychopolitics: Obedience, by Laventi Beria, head of Soviet Secret Police and Stalin's right-hand man)

Double-thinking 'fence-sitters', otherwise known as moderates, centrists, and RINOs bear the imprint of these psychological 'obedience' techniques. These people - in some cases literally afraid of incurring the wrath of name-calling obedience trainers - have opted to straddle the fence lest they be found guilty of possessing an opinion, one way or another. At the merest hint of displeasure from the obedience-trainers, up goes the yellow flag of surrender upon which it is boldly written:

"I believe in nothing and am tolerant of everything!"

Cultural Determinism

The linchpin of Cultural Marxism is cultural determinism, the parent of identity politics and group solidarity. In its turn, cultural determinism was birthed by the Darwinian idea that man is but a soulless animal and therefore his identity is determined by, for example, his skin color or his sexual and/or erotic preferences. This proposition rejects the concepts of the human spirit, individuality, free will, and morally informed conscience (paired with personal accountability and responsibility) because it emphatically denies the existence of the God of the Bible.

Consequently, and by extension, it also rejects the first principles of our liberty enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. These are our “unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Cultural Marxism must reject these because these principles of liberty “are endowed by our Creator,” who made man in His image. Cultural determinism, states David Horowitz, is

“Identity politics - the politics of radical feminism, queer revolution, and Afro-centrism - which is the basis of academic multiculturalism...a form of intellectual fascism and, insofar as it has any politics, of political fascism as well.” (Mussolini and Neo-Fascist Tribalism: Up from Multiculturalism, by David Horowitz, Jan. 1998)

It is said that courage is the first of the virtues because without it fear will paralyze man, thus keeping him from acting upon his moral convictions and speaking truth. Thus bringing about a general state of paralyzing fear, apathy, and submission - the chains of tyranny - is the purpose behind psychopolitical cultural terrorism, for the communist Left’s revolutionary agenda must, at all costs, be clothed in darkness.

The antidote is courage and the light of truth. If we are to win this cultural war and reclaim and rebuild America so our children and their children’s children can live in a ‘Shining City on the Hill’ where liberty, families, opportunity, free markets, and decency flourish, we must muster the courage to fearlessly expose the communist Left’s revolutionary agenda to the Light of Truth. Truth and the courage to speak it will set us free.

Advertise with us!

Find out how – contact the editor at
tqcinnatus@yahoo.com



Free Republic – The best conservative forum on the internet! Sign in today and start getting informed! – <http://www.freerepublic.com>

Subsidiarity: A Better Approach to the Abortion Issue

By Tim Dunkin

It has been said that opposition to abortion in this nation never grew faster than the day after the Roe v. Wade decision was handed down by the Supreme Court in 1973. While it is unfortunate that social conservatives in America waited until *after* this travesty to begin to get serious about opposing this practice, at least their attention was finally focused, and the court case can fairly be said to be one of the primary motivating factors in awakening the slumbering political giant of conservative American Christianity.

Unfortunately, the means by which most of the mainstream pro-life movement has tried to turn back the codification of abortion as an inalienable right have been useless, at least on a national level. And that’s the problem – they’ve been trying to deal with it from a *national* level, instead of applying an approach which, when used, has proven to be more successful in actually curtailing the number of abortions.

Looking back on the history of the pro-life movement’s fight to save lives, we see a mixed record of success. But it is *how* this record is mixed that is of interest to us here. The approach most vocally favored by many pro-lifers is that of amending the Constitution, most recently with the Human Life Amendment. As we know, this approach has failed dismally. This is because the likelihood of successfully amending the Constitution for such a divisive, polarizing issue as abortion is nil. Even at the height of Republican control of the Congress, conservatives could not garner the two-thirds majority in both houses necessary to bring an amendment forward, and even had they, it is unlikely that three-fourths of the state legislatures would have approved it anyway. The only other route – getting enough states to call for a constitutional convention – is so

frightenly fraught with potential hazards to every other liberty we have that no conservative ought even to seriously consider it. Pragmatically speaking, any idea of amending the Constitution to overturn *Roe v. Wade* and outlaw abortion was dead in the water before it even started.

Above, I said that the record of turning back abortion is “mixed”. There *have* been successes in limiting abortion – successes which have come at the state level. And this is where the principle of subsidiarity – federalism, if you will - comes into play. This principle posits that areas of policy and practice in government should be carried out by lower, less centralized competent authorities. In our context, this would mean that the states, not the federal government, should be the involved authority in the issue of abortion, per the mostly-forgotten 10th amendment to the Constitution.

Not only does this approach have the advantage of reviving respect for the Constitution, it also...works. The various states, even with the hobbling caused by slavish federal court adherence to *Roe v. Wade*, have been able to place all kinds of limits, regulations, and obstacles onto the abortion industry. From parental notification laws, to laws forbidding the crossing of state lines to obtain an abortion, to laws requiring a woman to receive an ultrasound of her child before she can receive an abortion, we have seen the number of abortions in highly restrictive states go down.

Federalism applies the “death by a thousand cuts” to the abortion industry. The result has been that abortion clinics have been put out of business, and little babies’ lives have been saved. Louisiana even began to utilize its health and safety laws for medical facilities to put a number of clinics under. At their high point in the 1990s, there were over 2000 abortion mills operating in the United States, now there are 748. In some of the smaller states (Mississippi, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming), there is now only a single clinic in the entire state. Many more states, including some fairly large ones, have clinics numbering in the single digits. Clearly, subsidiarity works, and has saved the lives of more little babies than have three decades of scrambling for a one-size-fits-all constitutional amendment.

This should not surprise us in the least. In a nation as large and as diverse as ours, the will of the people will be best satisfied by local control. The Republicans understood this when they came to power in 1994, having the mandate given them to devolve power over education,

welfare, and many other policy areas from the federal government to the states. So it is with abortion. The reason a constitutional amendment will never be a feasible means of ending abortion is because not every state and every region in this country thinks the same way on this issue as conservatives do. Many states – and the legislators they elect – won’t touch an anti-abortion amendment with a ten-foot pole. Subsidiarity allows those states that *will* to do so, and to enact the will of the local people on this issue.

I would call upon my fellow conservatives to consider the direction of our efforts to end abortion, and to consider the testimony of history. Legalized abortion did not appear overnight with *Roe v. Wade*. Many states were liberalizing their abortion laws for two decades before that decision. In other words, the principle of subsidiarity was working then – only it was being used by the pro-abortion crowd to advance their agenda. Eventually, the weight of legal precedent altered both public and judicial opinion to the point where *Roe v. Wade*, as a national policy, became feasible, and eventually, unstoppable. Our program for ending abortion must act to precisely reverse this, by using subsidiarian approaches to create an inexorable movement against abortion as people conceive the inconceivable – that maybe, just maybe, *Roe v. Wade* isn’t as judicially sacrosanct as they’ve been led to believe.

The propitious smiles of Heaven, can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained. – George Washington

TEN MYTHS ABOUT ISLAM

Learn the Truth About Islam

- How did the Qur’an *really* come to be?
- Is Allah *really* the God of the Bible?
- Is violence in Islam *really* just for fringe groups?
- Was Mohammed *really* a prophet?

Find the answers to these questions and more!

http://www.studytoanswer.net/islam_myths.html