



The Conservative Underground



Vol. 2 Issue 17

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

26 May 2009

© Copyright 2009 Individual authors retain copyright to their own submissions

In This Issue:

Creation VS Darwinism: God and Liberty VS Man and Tyranny	p. 1
Freedom: Who Cares?	p. 3
The Power of Hate: How the Extremely Unqualified Democrats Rose to Absolute Power	p. 4
Is Perdue the Best North Carolina Can Do?	p. 5
Mongering Grievances	p. 7
Obama Taking the High Road (Cartoon)	p. 12
Ameristan – The Novel	p. 13

This week in the Conservative Underground finds Linda Kimball blasting the philosophical underpinnings of materialist Darwinism and its outflowing in American culture, while new columnist Carla Harper decried the accelerating assault upon the traditional foundations of American law and civilization. Joe Clarke exposes the hatred which the Left has for those who get in the way of their aspirations for absolute power, and Jamie Freeze points out that North Carolina's governor is in over her pay grade. Tim Dunkin challenges the racist tactics used by the Left, and Charles Welty's *Ameristan* continues the thrilling story of Islamic subversion and deceit against America.

Creation VS Darwinism: God and Liberty VS Man and Tyranny

By Linda Kimball

"At present, science has no satisfactory answer to the question of the origin of life on the earth. Perhaps the appearance of life on the earth is a miracle. Scientists are reluctant to accept that view, but their choices are limited: either life was created on the earth by the will of a being outside the grasp of scientific understanding, or it evolved on our planet spontaneously, through chemical reactions occurring in nonliving matter lying on the surface of the planet. The first theory places the question of the origin of life beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. It is a statement of faith in the power of a Supreme Being not subject to the laws of science. The second theory is also an act of faith. The act of faith consists in assuming that the scientific view of the origin of life is correct, without having concrete evidence to support that belief." (Robert Jastrow, *Until the Sun Dies*, pp. 62-63)

"...the biological theorists don't know that Kant has analyzed why one cannot have an immanentist theory of evolution. One can have empirical observation but no general theory of evolution because the sequence of

forms is a mystery; it just is there and you cannot explain it by any theory. The world cannot be explained. It is a mythical problem, so you have a strong element of myth in the theory of evolution." (Eric Voegelin, *The Combined Works of Eric Voegelin*, Vol. 33, "The Drama of Humanity Conversations, III, Myth as Environment", p. 307)

Out of one side of their mouths, Progressive Darwinists tell us to believe that "God is dead," and with His death, immutable truth, universal morality, original sin, and Nature's Law are dead as well, for these point to eternal verities: "It is a proposition of eternal verity that none can govern while He is despised." (*American Dictionary of the English Language*, 1828). Yet out of the other side of their mouths, it's common for them to brazenly proclaim that in reality, the evidence supporting Darwinism is overwhelming. Some go so far as to claim that evolution is an established fact.

Their claims however, are self-refuting, irrational, and based on a massive edifice of falsehood. Here's why:

Both fact and evidence point back to unchanging truth and reality. Truth is exact accordance with that which is, or has been, or shall be. History, as it unfolds, is a record of truth and

reality; of what works and what does not work; of what is right and true and of what is not. The long-term collective memory of this unfolding historic knowledge is common sense.

Truth, as recorded over and over by history shows that the seed of wheat has never brought forth anything but wheat. We all know this is true; it is common knowledge. Never once in our long history has the seed of wheat brought forth tomatoes, or something never before seen. Yet these miraculous events ought to have happened at least once if evolution is true.

History records the cyclical repetition of the four seasons, year after year, down through the long history of mankind. History likewise records that the return of Spring is always, without fail, accompanied by the return of birds. Each kind pairs off, builds nests peculiar to its own kind, and procreates. Not one time has history recorded the absence of Spring nor a robin mating with a bluebird or a frog. Nor has history ever reported a nest adorned with a porch, TV antenna, or swimming pool. Why not? Because just as the seasons must repeat cyclically, birds must likewise do what birds do. They possess no free will, hence must do as instinct dictates. Yet if evolution is true, one might reasonably expect to hear of extraordinary displacements upsetting the rhythm and pattern of the four seasons as well as to see evolved bird/frogs (broggs?) nesting in terraced penthouse nests.

Refusal to anchor the order in the Creator declares Stanly L. Jaki, cannot "but leave one with the fearful prospect of a radically random state of affairs. There stones would not regularly fall, but just as likely hang in mid-air or take off unexpectedly in any direction. There it would be most unlikely that the hatching of a chicken egg would yield a chick. There a flower would perpetuate its own kind only as an exceptional case. In other words, in a world severed from its Creator, lawfulness would be the miracle, that is, a most unexpected event." (*Miracles and Physics*, p. 29-30)

Truth is clearly on display when mating season arrives and each kind procreates, as they must. Anyone who spends time around animals, such as farmers, ranchers, and hunters knows this to be true. Never once has history recorded lions, cattle, deer, or horses, for example, refusing to procreate. Just as with birds, these animals lack free will and have no choice but to reproduce as

instinct dictates. No, it's only mankind who can freely choose to either procreate or not; to nurture and love babies or to sacrificially kill them on behalf of the great god Hedon (sexual liberation), Mammon, 'saving Gaia', or some such pretext.

Truth says that over the long course of history, not once have stallions deserted their mares in order to "go gay." Nor has history ever witnessed even once, a titmouse dying its crest orange or purple nor a monkey putting rings through its nose, tongue, or naval. Truth reveals that only man possesses the free will to choose to pierce his body and do things contrary to nature, like "coming out gay."

Despite that truth can be clearly known by reason, Progressive evolutionists willfully disbelieve what they cannot help but know is true - that mankind is only of two sexes and has free will, for instance.

"The first dogma which I came to disbelieve was that of free will...." Bertrand Russell, 1872-1970

"Everything, including that which happens in our brains, depends on these and only these: A set of fixed, deterministic laws. A purely random set of accidents." Marvin Minsky, artificial intelligence guru

"We are descended from robots; and composed of robots, and all the intentionality we enjoy is derived from the more fundamental intentionality of these billions of crude intentional systems." Daniel C. Dennett, *Kinds of Minds*

The Darwinian mythos, observed C.S. Lewis, is devised not to seek truth but to keep God out: **(cont. on page 9)**

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



Freedom: Who Cares?

By Carla Harper

In recent months, those that chaff against the very principles of American society have behaved like Walmart shoppers on black Friday. The number of incidents aimed at sanitizing America of her historical laws and social mores are alarming. The system of government created by our founders was based on an understanding of human nature and natural laws: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

Men such as Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and James Madison knew that only a people free to enjoy the fruits of their labor with protection from a just government could thrive. They knew that the Republic which rested as close to the edge of no government (anarchy) would always be vulnerable, yet they rested in the knowledge that the architecture for “a more perfect union” based on the ideas, principles and lessons taken primarily from the Greeks, Romans, Jews, and Christians was sound. Those who gathered in 1776 to sign the Declaration of Independence and later attended the Continental Convention to create the Constitution were well versed in history, science, and reason. They were “enlightened” yet clearly understood the role of a Creator and natural law.

Mark Levin, author of *Liberty and Tyranny* and a constitutional lawyer, explains that those who want to “progress past” our foundations argue that man can know moral order and unalienable rights from reasoning. With this philosophy, people could arbitrarily decide right and wrong; just and unjust. “Those in power could decide that rights do not belong to the individual but of amorphous groups: the poor, the illegal immigrant, the minority, the Muslim, etc. Leaders could decide who is deserving of rights and who is not. Examples of this approach can be found around the world today and throughout history e.g. Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia, North Korea .”

President Barak Obama is unabashedly at the helm of an agenda to rewrite American history and redefine our society on the whole. He eloquently confuses the well-meaning American with words like equality, hope, and fairness. Those who consider themselves socially liberal and not “religious” might not worry over the

statement below repeated many times now in Europe and at home:

"I think that the right might worry a bit more about the dangers of sectarianism. Whatever we once were, we're no longer just a Christian nation; we are also a Jewish nation, a Muslim nation, a Buddhist nation, a Hindu nation, and a nation of nonbelievers. We consider ourselves a nation of citizens who are bound by ideals and a set of values." -Barack Obama

Why does it matter that our President would make such proclamations?

It matters because we are not bound by values. A band of thieves can be bound by values. We are bound by natural law; a belief in an unalienable right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. These are not constructs of reason. They are not ideals or values. They are principles issuing from a single creator – God. Muslim, Buddhist, and Hindu based nations are not bound by unalienable rights. Their beliefs and values about governance are quite contrary to ours. We welcome them as legal immigrants who want to contribute to our society and abide by our laws, customs, and culture.

America was created and has prospered because our governing documents and the intent of our founders were based on “true North” principles. Our system of laws is based in large part on the old testament of the Bible, the Torah to Jews. Yet, for the last forty years those that seek to redefine America into something that more closely resembles an oligarchy based on socialist ideals have chipped away right under our noses. Today, we see those disciples openly working with sledge hammers. The examples are many ranging from Lyndon B. Johnson’s redefining of the black family under the “Great Society” to Clinton’s push for the equivalent of a communist China “Marshall Plan.”

It was 1962 when the Supreme Court in *Engel vs. Vitale* ruled prayer in schools unconstitutional leading to the removal of the Ten Commandments from schools, court rooms or any other public building. Since then a host of cases have set about misinterpreting the First Amendment to the Constitution based on a phrase penned by Thomas Jefferson not within the amendment but in a letter taken out of context: “separation of church and state.” The amendment

actually reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The founders were leery of monarchies and the various forms of tyranny that oppressed people and forced them into worship dictated by the state. What they wanted to avoid was a government created and sanctioned religion. They were not worried about God and his principles influencing government and the people. In fact they urged just that. In his famous farewell address, George Washington said, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness... The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, "Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?"

What part of don't kill, don't steal, be respectful to your parents, etc. do we not like in our society? Why would our leaders seek to take away our freedom; the very goose that has laid the golden eggs? Every act thus far by the Obama Administration and Democratic led Congress has at its root one or all of a three-pronged strategy: increase dependence on government, remove freedom, breakdown the social fabric: government-run health care, cap and trade, fairness doctrine, gay marriage (not civil unions but marriage redefined), more restrictive gun ownership laws, micromanagement of banks and the auto industry, nine trillion dollars and counting in debt, printing one trillion US dollars without backing, taking the census away from Commerce, and the list goes on. Now is the time to begin reading history; ask questions; and get involved. The issues at hand defy party, beliefs, or values. At stake is our blessed freedom. Not many of us alive today know the hell of tyranny. Ask a veteran; ask an immigrant; ask a Holocaust survivor.

"The characteristic mark of this age of dictators, wars, and revolutions is its anticapitalistic bias. Most governments and political parties were eager to restrict the sphere of private initiative and free enterprise." - Ludwig von Mises

NOTORIOUSLY



CONSERVATIVE

Notorious conservatism at its finest, at <http://www.notoriouslyconservative.com/>

The Power of Hate: How the Extremely Unqualified Democrats Rose to Absolute Power

By Joe Clarke

Isaiah 5:20 - Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil

The slobbering White House Press Corps queries President Obama as to what is "most enchanting" about the Presidency, and one female member speaks of her "thrill" of being in the presence of the Prez, while she and her cohorts stand to applaud the Chief Exec's entrance.

This adulation is quite different from their biased, hateful coverage of George W. Bush. Bush only thought about enhancing the Social Security program, and was vilified. President Obama has been floating the idea of cutting Social Security benefits as well as curtailing elder care and geriatric medical treatment because "most medical expenditures occur within the last years of a person's life." In other words, where is AARP who wildly supported Obama? The movie *No Country For Old Men* will come to life in order to cut costs. Say "goodbye" to the 48% of grandmas and grandpas who voted for Obama, and thank them for voting against Bush. I just read a campaign headline from 2008 - "Indian Elderly Pin Hopes On Obama." I think KingOsobby is going to let them down a bit.

African-Americans who, according to my survey of talk radio and cable news, called President Bush everything but a mulatto (not that there's anything wrong with that) and voted over 95% for O. The Black vote composes 25% of the Dem electorate, and for voting against Bush they have been rewarded with even more civil service/government-contracted jobs, but poor blacks will not be treated so well - as proven by the Democrats reluctance to clamp down on the country's huge inner city crime problem, and by perpetuating the failing inner city public schools. PS - Thousands of inner city children wanting to escape the foul and failing public school system have been denied enrollment in better schools such as Sidwell Friends School where Obama's daughters are attending at \$30,000 per year per child, because the Dems have voted down such funding for poor blacks.

The Media certainly had the ultimate in Bush hatred, and they are being rewarded by going out of business. MSNBC, New York Times, Boston Globe etc. will not make it without some bailout help, it looks like. I feel sorry for those who have been losing their jobs in the media, but they have become enemies of the state, religion, conservatives, constitutionalists and everything else that is holy. And, did I mentioned that they really hated (and still do) Bush?

Congressman John Conyers, a chiefest of Bush haters, reigning in the very poor state of Michigan, has so much hate left over, that he will be conducting interrogations of our interrogators who helped Jihadists divulge top secrets, which he does not mind telling the world. Mr. Conyers has been seeking Reparations for descendents of slaves for about 20 years while the State of Michigan has become enslaved to him and his policies. Several trillion dollars will help his Slave Bailout Plan.

The Unions who have had extraordinary Bush-hate may be rewarded with Obama's lawlessness (he really has no respect for traditional or Constitutional or commercial laws and contracts) and be rewarded in auto bankruptcy court with an illegal amount of reward and ownership of one or more car companies.

They also have been rewarded with firings and layoffs. Ask them what is better, a job where they could make \$20.00 an hour working at their job, or making \$50.00 an hour, but no job, and they will take the no job choice. And, boy, did they hate President Bush.

Is Perdue the Best North Carolina Can Do?

by Jamie Freeze

As a recent graduate of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, I found myself reflecting on my four years here at the university. The rousing debates, the protests, the boring classes, the awesome classes, the friends, the stress...all have made my last four years wonderful. As graduation (May 15) loomed, I was enthusiastically looking forward to closing this chapter of my life. Unfortunately, my enthusiasm began a downward spiral ever since I found out Gov. Bev Perdue would be the commencement speaker.

At first, I jokingly accused UNC-G of intentionally having a Democrat speak at this conservative Republican's graduation as part of a left-wing conspiracy. However, given the recent actions of Perdue, Republicans like me aren't the only ones upset that Perdue delivered the commencement address.

UNC-G has undergone some harsh budget cuts in regards to our education. I heard several people complain about registering for a class only to receive an email saying it had been canceled due to budget cuts. I've heard faculty members lament over their increased workload and their fear that it will adversely impact our education. However, UNC-G is not alone in the budget crisis.

North Carolina is experiencing budget woes as well. Next year's state budget is facing a deficit of \$3 billion. A few weeks ago, Perdue signed an executive order that reduced state employee annual pay by a half of a percent (they will receive ten hours of unpaid vacation as compensation). According to the Governor, that cut will add \$65 million to the state coffers. But at what cost?

Will we lose faculty at UNC-G due to salary cuts? Will teachers in our other public schools face financial burdens because of this pay cut? Will other state employees face financial hardship? These are questions that demand an answer.

Repeatedly, Perdue has said that she wants recurring savings instead of one-time cuts. She has asked state agency heads to look for ways to save money and eliminate or reduce programs

that are inefficient, costly, or simply repetitive. I whole-heartedly support that plan, but I'm concerned that Perdue is speaking from both sides of her mouth.

As an Alamance County native, I sat through traffic last year as I-40/85 was paved. A few nights ago, I sat in traffic again because the State is REPAVING I-40/85! Why? The interstate was just paved last year, and it shows no signs of pot holes or damage. Despite this, Perdue lobbied Washington for our state's \$6.1 billion share of the federal stimulus package - a chunk of which went to three road projects. Instead of spending federal money on things we don't need, shouldn't we spend that money on education or some other worthwhile venture?

I've stated in previous columns that I am against the stimulus, but now that it is a reality, North Carolina should use the federal assistance to shore up our budget so that state employees aren't footing the bill. Instead of paving perfectly good roads, why not let state employees keep \$65 million of their hard-earned money? Don't we pay enough in taxes as it is? This pay cut seems to be a perverse form of taxation, and we should protest it.

I know we are facing harsh economic conditions. I know we have to make cuts somewhere. My argument is that we should be cutting unnecessary projects, not salaries. I am not an expert budget analyst, so I can't specifically state which programs or projects should be cut - plus, that is the State Auditor's job. But we could start by eliminating the repaving of I-40/85.

I've heard a lot of rumblings on campus regarding Perdue's executive order. However, no one knew what to do about it. I started my protest by wearing Pat McCrory stickers on my mortarboard during graduation exercises. Several people wanted to know why I had Perdue's Republican challenger on my cap. I took the opportunity to share with them what our illustrious Governor was doing in Raleigh. They were appalled that UNC-G invited her to speak at graduation. However, it wasn't until after Perdue spoke that scores of people came up to me wishing they had protested her.

Perdue, for those of you who have not had the "privilege" to hear her speak, is not the best orator in the world. She began her speech by telling us that she was a former history teacher. It was all downhill from there. In relating the Wright Brothers' airplane adventure, she said that they "left the ISLAND for the ISLANDS." For those of you unfamiliar with North Carolina geography, you have to leave mainland NC to reach the islands of the Outer Banks. Too bad that wasn't Perdue's only Biden-like verbal gaffe. She also mangled the details of the first space landing - that was in addition to chastising President Kennedy for not putting a woman in space.

After witnessing Perdue's embarrassing commencement address, I am confident that anyone can become Governor of North Carolina - even my chihuahua Spike. On a more serious note, I hope that North Carolinians remember Perdue's actions at the next election. We need a governor who is more dedicated to improving North Carolina instead of wasting taxpayer money. Quite simply, we need change we can believe in.



Keep up on all the latest news about the Tea Parties at Tea Party Patriots – a new site dedicated to coordinating future Tea Party activism efforts! Find out what is going on in your city, and get ready for July 4. Drop by for a visit to

<http://www.teapartypatriots.org>

Mongering Grievances

By Tim Dunkin

I'd like to take a moment to discuss Obama's recent choice of Sonia Sotomayor as the replacement for David Souter on the Supreme Court. Not so much what her ideology is (far left wing, of course) nor what her judicial temperament has been from past experience (radically activist). Rather, I'd like to address all the hoopla about her being the first Hispanic on the United States Supreme Court. Once you cut away all the other fluff, this is why she was selected by Obama. She is, essentially, a political trump card, and one that Obama skillfully used.

Obama – whose own personal background and his experience as a community organizer among Chicago's radicalized black community give him a special concern for the issue – is even more skilled at the game of race-baiting than are most of his Democrat colleagues. Either way in the Sotomayor case, he wins. Her race (and to a lesser degree, her gender) give her the perception of untouchability – to criticise, question, or vote against her on the part of the Republicans will be perceived as being tantamount to an admission that they are just racists who hate Hispanics. If confirmed (and the odds against it are long indeed), Sotomayor will play a valuable role to the Left as a voice for racial hatred and tribalism on the Court – a role she has already indicated on several occasions that she will fulfill gladly.

One thing that conservatives need to understand is that the left-wingers are always obsessed with race, because race is one of the tools they use to divide people and set them against each other. Racial animosity is a key part of the Gramscian-Marxist playbook for undermining the stability and solidarity of the American social system. By inciting racial hatred and sensitivity, the Left hopes to maintain themselves at the top of the social heap – able to direct and make policy as they choose (and fleece the system while they're at it) without the bothersome *hoi polloi* getting in the way.

Do you think I'm being a conspiracy theorist here? I'm not. In fact, just this sort of strategy was implemented in the past. After the Civil War and Reconstruction, the white Democrat ruling class did just this to keep poorer whites and blacks separated and at each others' throats. Playing upon the then-current fears of “crazed

rapist Negroes” and the like, the white ruling class in the Southern states fomented the overt and institutional racism against blacks that lasted for over a century. The Democrats are doing the same thing again, except this time the roles are reversed – blacks are the aggrieved group, while whites are the scapegoats.

In a perfect world, there would be no such thing as affirmative action. There would be none in the sense of refusing, for instance, to promote high-scoring firemen to command grades because they were the “wrong” ethnicity (i.e. non-minorities), as happened in the *Ricci v. DeStefano* case. Incidentally, it was Judge Sotomayor who racistly ruled against the rightly-aggrieved white firefighters who saw their chances to advance in their profession stifled because they made the mistake of scoring higher on a proficiency test than did their black colleagues. Likewise, there would be no affirmative action in the sense of making sure that a nominee to the Supreme Court has to fulfill certain racial special-interest group criteria before she is nominated. In a perfect world, the best person for the job - regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, etc. - would get the position.

Unfortunately, that goes against the vested interests of the Democrat Party and the Left in general. If the focus of the discussion were on the *individual* abilities and qualifications of a person, then people might start getting the idea that it's the *individual*, not the group, that matters. The lefties don't want that - to them, garnering votes by inventing and/or exaggerating grievances between racial groups is what matters. To those on the Left, the individual - with his or her individual accomplishments, abilities, etc. - must be subsumed into the tribalistic group structure and then played off like chess pieces against other groups.

Those on the Left have a vested interest in two things:

First, in generating grievances among minority groups through the constant drumbeat of reminders of past injustices, and the present invention of imaginary “racism” on the part of whites. I fully agree that slavery was a terrible injustice. I fully agree that Jim Crow, segregation, lynchings, gunboat diplomacy in Latin America, etc. were terrible injustices. But those were all in the past. I refuse to live in the past. I also do not believe that the United States is an endemically racist country today. Opportunity is open to all, if they will grab the ring and take it.



Do you want to keep America capitalist? Then go to <http://hostileopposition.blogspot.com/>

But the grievance industry among racial minorities in the USA doesn't have this same commitment. It exists to keep minorities in a constant state of agitation about the past – which perversely helps to keep minorities powerless and controlled by the grievance-mongers (which is, of course, the whole point). Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, La Raza, and their gaggle of local imitators in every inner city and *barrio* in America understand clearly an important lesson – a person who is self-sufficient, who lives in the present and strives for the future instead of living in the past, is a person who cannot be controlled by hate and fear-mongering. They don't want that. They want racial minorities in America to remain powerless, so they can be controlled.

Second, the Left has an interest in encouraging reverse racism on the part of minority groups as a means of setting them against the lower and middle class whites with whom they share more natural affinities than they do with rich limousine liberals. Let's face it – your average minority individual who is, say, a mechanic or a construction worker, has much more in common with working class whites who are also mechanics or construction workers, than they have in common with the elite limousine liberal crowd (such as the Obamas) who wear \$500 sneakers to visit homeless shelters.

In short, it's a divide and conquer tactic. See, all other things being equal and lacking the artificial hatreds instilled into them by decades of Democrat indoctrination, blacks and Latinos more naturally would and should be Republicans. Polls have shown that both of these groups tend to be more socially conservative than the average American, and that both groups tend to be open to conservative economic policies such as balanced budgets, lowered taxes, and school choice (so long as the name "Republican" is not attached to them by the pollster). This means that most blacks and Hispanics are actually a lot like working and middle class whites - who tend to share the same views on social issues and whatnot. But, by

continually screeching "racism" about everything under the sun, the lefties have successfully convinced blacks and Latinos to throw in their lot with rich, white, elitist limousine liberals who couldn't care less about poor and middle class minorities, other than to use them as cheap votes.

The single best thing that the Republican Party could do to reach out to minority voters would be to confront them with the truths about what their own "leaders" are doing to them. Conservatives and Republicans need to encourage minority voters to think for themselves instead of blindly following the grievance-mongers. This won't be done through slick multimedia presentations or expensive outreach programs with celebrities and token minorities. The GOP has spent decades of time and millions of dollars trying to court the black vote, only to have that vote turn out in record numbers for Obama – for the most part (if the many blacks I spoke to personally are any indication) *because* he shared their skin color. Before the GOP can make inroads, they first have to figure out a way to break the hold of tribalism and grievance-mongering on the minds of blacks and Hispanics. That may be a tough row to hoe, but it would be worth it to break the back of the Democrat Party by stealing some of its most loyal constituencies.

"The great virtue of the free market system is that it does not care what color people are; it does not care what their religion is; it only cares whether they can produce something you want to buy. It is the most effective system we have discovered to enable people who hate one another to deal with one another and help one another." - Milton Friedman

Would you like to sound off on something you've read in Conservative Underground? If so, then send the editor your thoughts or comments at editor@conservativesunderground.net!

(Creation, cont. from page 2)

"More disquieting still is Professor D.M.S. Watson's defense. "Evolution itself," he wrote, "is accepted by zoologists not because it has been observed to occur or....can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible." Has it come to that? Does the whole vast structure of modern naturalism depend not on positive evidence but simply on an a priori metaphysical prejudice. Was it devised not to get in facts but to keep out God?" (CS Lewis, The Oxford Socratic Club, 1944)

Death of America

Described by Alexis de Tocqueville as the freest, most enlightened civilization in history, America was firmly founded on Judeo-Christian principles. John Adams (1735-1826), signer of the Declaration of Independence, main author of the Constitution of Massachusetts in 1780, Vice-President under George Washington, and 2nd President of the United States, concurs:

"The general principles on which the Fathers achieved independence, were...the general Principles of Christianity...(1813, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson) Religion and Virtue are the only foundations...of republicanism and of all free government..." (<http://summit.org/>)

As early as 1896 however, Progressive intellectuals had begun the work of demolishing America's founding worldview. Liberal theologian Walter Rauschenbusch, leader of the Social Gospel movement, used the pulpit to preach a pantheistic, anti-individual liberty, anti-truth message. "Individualism means tyranny," sermonized Rauschenbusch, by which he meant that "oneness" with nature (pantheism) brings salvation through a divinized God-State controlled by Progressive "god men." In this morally inverted view, moral good is submission to Progressive dictates while moral evil is dissent against it.

This morally-demented nonsense, writes Jonah Goldberg in his book "Liberal Fascism", laid the groundwork for the equally morally insane preachments proclaimed decades later by Marxist Frankfurt School intellectuals such as Herbert Marcuse in the 1960s - "oppressive freedom,"

"repressive tolerance," "defensive violence" (*Liberal Fascism*, p. 86-87)

By the time of President Woodrow Wilson's regime, Progressive intellectuals had speculatively replaced the living Creator with a pantheistic "ineffable force" that works its black-magic "inversion of morality and reality" through Darwinian evolution-magic. By waving the wizard's wand of evolution-magic over our Constitution – presto! - it "came to life," and now "lives, breathes, and evolves." Having unshackled themselves from universal moral law Progressives saw themselves as possessing a divine writ from their divinized ineffable force of nature (spoken of in public as God) for organized cruelty, immorality, lying, power-grabbing, and for furthering their work of destroying America's worldview foundations. Those who stood in the way of "progress," that is, the defenders of America's founding worldview and Constitutional Republic, were demonized as the "other," because says Goldberg, "they were by their very existence blocking the will to power that gave the mob and the avante garde....their reason for existence." (p. 85)

The world's first totalitarian regime was not Soviet Russia nor Italy under Mussolini. Neither was it Hitler's Nazi Germany. No, it was Progressive Fascist America under the Wilson regime, reveals Goldberg. Like Mussolini and Hitler who had jack-booted activist-enforcers at their beck and call, so too did Wilson. In Italy they were called Fascists. In Germany they were called National Socialists. In America, Wilson's badge-carrying goons were called progressives. Nothing has changed, for today, Obama's jack-booted goon squad activists are called progressives.

Viewing themselves as enlightened, scientific, and elite, the West's Progressives, noted Whittaker Chambers, had "rejected the religious roots" of its own civilization for a "new order of beliefs" of which Communism was "one logical expression." (George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, p. 253)

Though differing in degree, Progressive Liberalism nevertheless infects both right (RINOS, for example) and left and is merely the continuation of the 20th century's genocidal totalitarian irreligion. Their common foundation: some form of the Darwinian mythos disguised as science.

Darwinism denies the existence of the transcendent Permanent Things that, grounded in unchanging truth and reality, comprise this nation's founding worldview and give rise to our inalienable individual rights and enduring principles of liberty: our living Creator, Nature's Law, immutable truth, universal moral law, virtue, the individual thinker and 'choice-maker' made in the spiritual image of God, and even the two sexes, male and female. Progressive evolutionism tells us to believe that everything came into being by chance - accidentally, without meaning, purpose, or design - from nonliving matter. Hence, since man is an accidental emergence from "nothing", then he is in the image of "nothing". "Nothing" has no free will, nor should man. "Nothing" owns nothing, nor should man. And since "nothing" is neither male nor female, then neither should man be, rather man ought to be "gay," another word for polymorphously perverse androgyny.

When all men have finally submitted to being ruthlessly pounded down into nothingness, egalitarianism (sameness), social justice and fairness will have been achieved and the immoralists Eden (sinners paradise) - hell on earth - has arrived.

Additionally, we are conditioned to believe that everything remains in continuous movement as it readies itself for the next quantum leap in evolution. By extension of this superstitious illogic, evidence is merely an illusion, for not only is continuous motion anathema to truth, fact, and reality, but these verities along with all activity of the mind (thought, imagination, memory, dreams) are of the immaterial (metaphysical) realm, which Darwinism claims does not exist. Hence the monstrously imbecilic claims made by willfully ignorant Darwinists regarding evidence, fact, and reality in support of evolution refutes evolution's main claim, that truth and reality cannot and do not exist. The foolish King not only has no clothes, but he has no mind!

How can this self-contradictory conundrum be explained?

Massively egoistic Progressive irreligionists immediately respond, "Sinless man is the measure of all things. Put your faith in him!"

But what does history record? It relates that in addition to seeing man choose to do things contrary to nature, it says that since the dawn of history, it has heard man tell lies over and over and over. Man, records history, lies to himself, and he lies to others.

"I do not want to believe in God," confessed Dr. George Wald, Nobel Prize winner and professor emeritus of biology at Harvard

University. "Therefore I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation arising to evolution" Wald admitted to Scientific American magazine.

"I suppose the reason we leaped at the origin of species was because the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores," confessed Sir Julian Huxley, former president of UNESCO and grandson of Darwin's colleague Thomas Huxley.

"We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom," concurred his brother, the late Aldous Huxley.

Writing to his friend and colleague Charles Lyell, Charles Darwin baldly confessed, "Often a cold shudder has run through me, and I have asked myself whether I may have devoted myself to a phantasy."

Darwinism - the Lie

In a letter to a friend, C.S. Lewis writes that he is right in "regarding (evolution) as the central and radical lie in the whole web of falsehood that now governs our lives...." However, Lewis astutely observes, "it is not so much your arguments against it as the fanatical and twisted attitudes of its defenders." (Letter to Bernard Acworth, Spt. 13, 1951)

Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely.

"We have to use any ruse, dodge, trick, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth." V.I. Lenin, progressive anti-hero

Today our Constitutional Republic, called the "shining city on a hill" by Ronald Reagan, is on a dangerous fast-track to totalitarian socialism. What yet remains of our founding worldview and Constitutional Republic is rapidly suffocating and dying under an ever-expanding interlocking matrix of lies, from small lies to Big Lies, all of which are defended by the "fanatical and twisted" tellers of them - immoralist Progressive power-grabbers at every level of government and society who willfully disbelieve what they cannot help but know to be true.

As frightful and evil as this prospect is, there is more. The Progressive dream of utopia is fueled by Gnostic Manichaeism. In this demonically-occluded view, Progressive believers are "inless and good" while the "others" (Conservatives, the Right,

all defenders of American tradition) are automatically evil. Ridding the world of evil becomes a matter of purging it of both the evil others and utterly destroying Western civilization. Toward this goal, Progressives have forged an unholy alliance with Islam. Jamie Glazov writes, "Upon the foundation of their hatred for the United States, its members have forged their alliance with radical Islam, whose wellspring of anti-American hatred runs just as deep. In word and deed, both of these allies make it plain that they consider everything about Western civilization to be evil and unworthy of preservation; that they wish to see freedom and individual rights crushed by any means necessary, including violent revolution." (*United in Hate*, pp. xx-xxi)

What sort of people are immoralists? In the words of Alexis de' Tocqueville they are "they who obey the dictates of their passion..." In other words, they obey everything from virulently inflated narcissism (god man megalomania, psychopathology) and lust for power to sexually perverted lusts, covetousness, gluttony, hatred, resentment, and envy - all fueled by will to power. In this light, political correctness, multiculturalism, hate crime laws and speech codes are seen for what they are: anti-social pathologies translated into politics and perverted law.

John Adams prescient warning speaks to our own time:

"We have no government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion.... Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." (1798)"

The Road Home

C.E.M. Joad, a 20th century progressive philosopher, spent most of his life proclaiming his distaste for the great I AM, the doctrine of Original Sin, and the transcendent Permanent Things. As a Progressive he wholeheartedly embraced revolutionary doctrine and the necessity for socialism. It was the genocide, catastrophic destruction, and massive suffering unleashed by application of Progressive ideas under direction of sinless men unshackled from God and moral law that led to Joad's eventual rejection of Progressivism. In a book entitled *The Recovery of Belief*, Joad documented his transfer of allegiance from Progressivism and evolution back to Christianity, special creation and the Permanent Things that made this nation the freest most enlightened nation in the history of the world.

Joad wisely repented of the dark "dream of destroying the world....and building a utopia on its ashes - that has shaped and represented the modern progressive movement." (Jamie Glazov, *United in Hate*, p. 2)

Not so Lenin. Only after Russia flowed with the blood of millions of people and his hands were darkly red with their blood would he finally admit:

"I committed a great error. My nightmare is to have the feeling that I'm lost in an ocean of blood from the innumerable victims. It is too late to return. To save our country, Russia, we would have needed men like Francis of Assisi...." (Richard Wurmbrand, *Marx and Satan*, p. 50)

Additional Sources:

Darwin Day in America, John G. West

The Spiritual Brain, Mario Beauregard, Ph.D. & Denyse O'Leary

"Why Academics Embrace Evolution", Marylou Barry, WND, Apr. 27, 2009

Permanent Things, Andrew Tadie & Michael MacDonald

The Deadliest Monster, J.F. Baldwin

Linda Kimball is a writer and author of numerous published articles and essays on culture, politics, and worldview. She is a member of the New Media Alliance, Grassroots.org, and MoveOff.

Would you like to read more of Linda Kimball's essays on liberty and tradition?
Visit <http://patriotsandliberty.com/>



Obama Taking The High Road - CIA, National Defense, Abortion, Israel, Constitution, Economy, SCOTUS

By Joe Clarke



Fight FOCA

Sign the Fight FOCA Petition
at FightFOCA.com



FOCA Would Wipe Away Every Restriction on Abortion Nationwide!


This would eradicate state and federal laws that the majority of Americans support, such as:

- ◆ Bans on Partial Birth Abortions
- ◆ Requirements that women be given information about the risks of getting an abortion
- ◆ Only licensed physicians can perform abortions
- ◆ Parents must be informed and give consent to their minor daughter's abortion

FOCA (the Freedom of Choice Act) would erase these laws and prevent states from enacting similar protective measures in the future!

Find out how to fight FOCA – go to <http://www.fightfoca.com>, sign the petition, and get involved!

Charles Welty's *Ameristan*



To order the full novel *NOW*, visit <http://www.lulu.com/content/475490> and get your copy today! If you'd like to order the newly published screenplay of *Ameristan*, then go to <http://www.lulu.com/content/5779867>!

Now, *Ameristan* continues from last week....

Surah 17 – The Star of Medina

Captain Schlesser closed his eyes and listened to the sound of the water. It was a test. Just by focusing on the gentle rhythm of splash from his rubber dinghy, could he tell how close he was to the port side of the Star of Medina? Sounds like....four meters.

He opened his eyes. *Ja*. Four meters away. On other assignments, he had needed that ability.

Although this was a moonless night in New York Harbor, the distant glow of a million city lights afforded him plenty of visibility. This mission was almost too easy. Schlesser had to test himself simply to make it seem more challenging.

He grasped a rope hung over the side of the ship, moored his dinghy and climbed the ladder to the deck. The soft squeak of his rubber-soled boots was the only sound coming from this luxurious yacht, anchored alongside so many other

lifeless private crafts, most of which were considerably smaller.

Schlesser knew he could be identified by his limp. But stealth wasn't important now. This was his vessel, his crew. And in a few days, the fate of this yacht would be meaningless. Schlesser would be out of this stinking harbor, far away from this weak and miserable country. He would have enough money to live the rest of his life in comfort.

Standing before his cabin door, Schlesser turned to see the floodlit figure of the Statue of Liberty in the distance. He cleared his throat and hocked a wad of phlegm over the side, then unlocked the door.

Inside the captain's quarters, Schlesser carefully re-locked the door, limped around the queen-sized bed and approached the large wooden crate which sat atop a luggage stand. He remembered his deep concern about this crate

when it was first lifted onboard during the midnight run off the coast of Yemen.

Schlesser took a small crowbar from beside his small desk and carefully pried off the top of the wooden crate. With equal care, he pulled back the sides, exposing a steamer trunk with a combination lock.

The captain removed his stocking cap, tossed it on the bed and wiped a trickle of sweat from above his gray eyebrows. He slowly turned the combination lock in one direction, then the other, then back again, and the lock popped open.

As he lifted the trunk's lid, Schlesser saw the international symbol for radiation. He knew he'd be in no danger as long as he performed all his tasks with his trademark German efficiency. Schlesser wiped his hands on his jeans.

First, he set the digital date readout to "11 SEP." Then he carefully tapped the buttons above the words "ENGAGE REMOTE DETONATION." Schlesser kept clicking until he set the time to 9:11 AM. It brought a smile.

He pressed another button, and the words "PASSWORD REQUIRED" appear on an LCD display. Schlesser punched in 5-4-4-2-3. The nuclear suitcase bomb was happy. Its display read, "PASSWORD ACCEPTED. REMOTE DETONATION ENABLED AT 09:11."

Schlesser slowly latched the case closed, smirking at his own overcautiousness. He'd been taught that this thing wouldn't go off accidentally even if he dropped an anchor on it.

The captain locked his cabin door from the outside, surveyed his 150-foot vessel for a moment in the quiet nighttime shadows, then limped toward the bridge.

One crewman stood watch on the bridge while the others slept. As Schlesser expected, the crewman was aware that his captain had returned to the ship, and he opened the bridge door for him.

"All is well, sir?" The crewman was dressed in black, as ordered.

"Yes. It's time to move her to the harbor. I'll be going ashore for the rest of the night. A tender will bring me out tomorrow morning. We'll weigh anchor at oh-nine-hundred.

"Aye, Captain."

Schlesser nodded, left the bridge and limped down the gangplank toward the dock. His face revealed nothing. No smile. No regret. All business.

Next Issue – Surah 18 – When There's No Place to Hide