

the act of eating and drinking. Food and drink are on the contrary God's gift, from which we are to partake with enjoyment and gratitude. We fast, not because we despise the divine gift, but so as to make ourselves aware that it is indeed a gift—so as to purify our eating and drinking, and to make them, no longer a concession to greed, but a sacrament and means of communion with the Giver.

But "Christian vegetarianism," with the welfare of animals as its motivation, is nothing more than "Social Gospel" Christianity applied to a new "victim" group.

I expected Friedrich to answer my final question—"As a Catholic, how do you reconcile the Eucharist with vegetarianism?"—by dismissing Christ's words in John 6:53-55 ("In all truth I tell you, if you do not eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. . . . For my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink") as another "parable." Instead, he defended transubstantiation, the Catholic doctrine that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood, and argued that "it's not a violation of the spirit or principle of vegetarianism." But if "Christian vegetarianism" is not based on the avoidance of flesh, then what is its basis? Ultimately, according to Friedrich, "the issue has to do with consent and acting within a being's interest." Christ, in instituting the Eucharist, consented to the eating of his flesh. Animals, however, cannot offer such consent.

Which brings us back to Tucson, to the McCartney's ranch. If the taking of animals' lives is wrong simply because consent can never be given, what about the taking of a human life when consent is given? Could an animal rights activist like Linda McCartney go to Dr. Kevorkian with a clear conscience? Could an animal rights activist like Sir Paul morally stand by and watch his wife end her life? Could Dr. Kevorkian be an animal rights activist in good standing? The answer to all three questions, it would seem, is yes. By elevating animals above their natural position, humans denigrate their own lives, and Christianity is destroyed in the process.

*Scott P. Richert is the assistant editor of Chronicles.*

## ECONOMICS

### Perpetual War for Perpetual Commerce

by Bob Djurdjevic

"Talk is cheap," skeptics say. "Put your money where your mouth is." "Money talks louder than words." If these sayings still apply today, the wallets of the New World Order's elite have spoken loudly and clearly: Russia is still the main bogey!

Forget the cheap talk about a "Partnership for Peace." Conniving "friendships" like that are made in hell. They tend to lead to war, not peace, as the Hitler-Stalin pact of the 1930's proved. Also, forget the cheap talk about "nation building" and "exporting democracy" whenever our government sends money or American troops abroad. The investment decisions of the "Princes of the 20th Century"—the multinational companies—show where they are putting their money. They also prove that democracy is for suckers, and that "free trade" and "globalization" are mankind's latest "black plague."

Unfortunately, all this is "déjà vu all over again." Much of what took place in Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries is now happening in Russia, the United States, and around the world under the New World Order's "globalization" banner. A century ago, the rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the resulting social injustices gave birth to such ideologies as communism. They also led to several revolutions and two world wars. We are facing the same prospects today.

Take the concentration of wealth, for example. In 1881, 2,512 Englishmen owned half the land in the United Kingdom. In 1994, the top 2.6 million (one percent) of Americans had as much after-tax income as did the bottom 88 million (35 percent), according to the Washington-based Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. The disparities between the rich and the poor in China, Russia, Latin America, and other countries which the NWO elite decided to "globalize" (read: colonize) are even

greater than in the United States.

Or take the concentration of industrial production in the cities. In 1696, only a quarter of England's population lived in the cities. As agriculture was the dominant economic activity at the time, these statistics imply that three-quarters of Englishmen were economically self-sufficient, supporting themselves off the land on which they lived. By 1760, however, only half of the population lived in the countryside. And in 1881, with the Industrial Revolution in full swing, only one-third lived in rural areas. Such massive destruction of rural communities forced a radical change in the way of life for millions of people.

In the 1990's, the "Princes" of globalization shift manufacturing activities to countries with low-labor costs, thus causing high unemployment and the devastation of communities in the industrialized world (e.g., the "Rust Belt" of America, the textile mills of Lancashire) and breeding almost continuous labor unrest in France and social unrest in Latin America and Indonesia.

Nor was the British example from the 19th century a natural, voluntary shift of population from the countryside to the cities. Using their economic wealth to buy political clout in Britain's parliamentary system, a tiny minority of powerful landowners and newly minted industrialists (like today's transnationalists) drove the English farmers off the land, forcing them into virtual slave labor in factories. They did it either by buying up the impoverished farmers' land at fire-sale prices or by passing laws in Parliament which led to a break-up of the common ("freeholders") land.

Sound familiar? Remember "Reaganomics," or Margaret Thatcher's celebrated "privatization" in Great Britain in the 1980's? Or similar efforts currently under way in France, Germany, and several other "Old Continent" countries? The New World Order elite and their media outlets are telling the public that privatization is all goodness; that private enterprises can supposedly manage these endeavors more efficiently than governments.

Maybe. But at what price? And more importantly—to whose benefit? Obviously to the benefit of the enterprises' "new" shareholders (after privatization). But what about the interests of the former owners—the public? What about the corporate responsibility for improving instead of impoverishing society?

Look at the Jeffrey Sachs-style “Harvard Capitalism,” which many Russians nowadays justifiably regard as “Harvard Communism.” In a typical Russian enterprise privatized under the Harvard-prescribed “voucher” system, 46 percent of the (grossly understated) value went to workers, five percent to management, 29 percent was sold at cash auctions, and the remaining 20 percent was left in the state’s hands. As Anne Williamson wrote in *How America Built the New Russian Oligarchy*, this meant that “the state’s shareholding dwarfed others’ claims, and therefore, was still the controlling shareholder of any ‘privatized’ Russian asset.”

Oh, but the public now gets a chance to buy shares in the companies being privatized, some will argue. True, but mostly at inflated prices. For stock market trading, where the New World Order architects “coincidentally” chose to place the privatized public assets, is conducted by institutions owned by this very elite. They even get the first crack to buy “public assets” at fire-sale prices. By the time we, the public, the former owners—now disowned by the corrupt politicians—get to bid on such privatized assets, it is usually at inflated prices. Plus we pay a commission, of course, to the transnationalists’ institutions.

This plunder of national assets under the guise of “privatization” and “reform” is occurring around the world. For example, Latin America’s intake of foreign capital rose in 1996 by 52 percent to \$39 billion, the highest increase in the world and a record high for this continent. Investments in Argentina tripled in 1996 to \$4.3 billion. If one compares these figures to the less than \$1 billion per year which Russia averaged in the 1990’s, one would think that Latin Americans are basking in prosperity. Not so.

Carlos Saul Menem, elected president of Argentina in 1989, has ruled like a czar, issuing over 300 decrees, according to a recent article in *Foreign Affairs*. Menem’s globalization of the Argentine economy—meaning the sale of state-owned assets to foreign interests—has caused millions of Argentines to become exiles in their own country. In the province of Jujuy, for example, some 42 percent of the people are unemployed or doing menial work, according to Bishop Marcelo Palentini. “They used to ask for raises; now they ask for jobs,” he told the *New York Times*. YPF, a former state-owned Argentinean oil company, used to employ 5,000 people. It now has only

500 employees. But YPF made a \$900 million profit in 1996, delighting its foreign owners.

“Menem thinks that by putting our country at the service of the International Monetary Fund, he brought us into the First World,” said Carlos Santillan, a union leader in Jujuy. “But workers have lost in a few years rights they fought for over a century. We’re a colony here. All that is missing is to have Clinton come here and plant the American flag.”

But Clinton won’t have to disgrace our flag any more than he has already done, because the “Princes” do it for him. At the Wal-Mart store in Buenos Aires, an Argentine flag flutters over a sign reading, “Proudly in Argentina.” “What is clear is that it is changing the Argentine way of life: families buy their bicycles here, sometimes using dollars; the corner bicycle store is no more,” the *New York Times* reported. Wherever the American dollar is the currency of choice, the “Princes of the 20th Century” have claimed yet another colony.

As the multinationals drove many of Argentina’s small entrepreneurs out of business, some of the American globalist elite—Ted Turner, George Soros, Sylvester Stallone, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and others—have moved in and taken over the lands where gauchos once freely roamed. “There are more fences going up in Patagonia as the internationally wealthy install themselves on newly acquired estates,” the *New York Times* reported. “I used to go and camp or fish but now I hear that Ted Turner is here, Rambo there, the Terminator somewhere else. And I say, no, this is not my Argentina,” said Orlando Mendes, a local resident.

Foreign investors are not impervious, however, to the risks of “divided societies,” as the *New York Times* refers to Brazil, Argentina’s bigger neighbor which has until recently mostly resisted the globalization pressures. But Brazil has now surpassed Mexico as the largest recipient of foreign investments—nearly \$10 billion in 1996 vs. Mexico’s \$7.5 billion. Yet in early 1998, five Wal-Mart stores in Brazil were attacked and robbed by assailants armed with assault rifles. Such social unrest was Brazil’s “reward” for opening its doors to foreign capital, just as has been the case in Russia and other developing countries.

So what are we to conclude from all of this? Where the “Princes” tread, crime, misery, and social unrest soon follow.

Just like when the elite of the Industrial Revolution dislocated and enslaved the formerly independent farmers. “So, the more things change, the more they stay the same”?

Not quite. Sometimes they get worse. The imbalance in capital investments between China and Russia, for example, is bad news for world peace. The fact that such political instability is being caused deliberately makes a mockery of the globalists’ line—“world peace through world trade.” On the contrary, a state of low-grade perpetual war seems to be what Big Business wants.

Why? To answer that question, let’s move on to the Balkans and the Middle East. In the Balkans, American policies have stoked the fires of war, which led to the greatest human and material carnage in Europe since World War II. Since the American-imposed “peace” agreement signed in Dayton, Ohio, in November 1995, 98 percent of foreign investment has ended up in the Muslim-Croat federation. The Serbian half of Bosnia got only two percent of foreign aid. So the war against the Orthodox Christian Serbs continues. It’s just that money has replaced the bombs as the weapon of choice.

Now, which will be the first country where NATO will be deployed? Answer: Bosnia! In fact, NATO has already been deployed in Bosnia for about five years, however surreptitiously. And it is there to stay. Just as American troops never left the Arab lands after the Gulf War.

The similarities between American actions in both areas are striking. Another small country, another “hot” region of the world, another opportunity for the West (America in particular) to flex its muscles.

The United States built up Saddam Hussein’s military capabilities in the 1980’s. During the Iraq-Iran war, for example, the United States and Great Britain supplied Iraq with most of the terrible weapons of mass destruction. The French and the Germans also pitched in. And then, Iraq suddenly becomes a bogey in 1990. If peace in the Middle East were indeed the objective of the New World Order leaders, the Gulf War troops could have easily taken Baghdad and dislodged Saddam Hussein in 1991. But no, George Bush decided to save Saddam for another President to use as a punching bag.

Why would the New World Order leaders want perpetual low-grade wars?

## REGIONALISM

### Maryland, the South's Forgotten Cousin

by Joyce Bennett

Once again, follow the money. What country leads the whole world in the growth of its gross domestic product (GDP)? Answer: Bosnia! Bosnia's GDP increased by 50 percent in 1996, the first post-Dayton year, according to the *Economist*. What nation came second? Albania, another country which has just had a close brush with civil war, and where international troops and monitors are now deployed as "peacekeepers."

Closer to home, we've seen similar tactics at work in Panama, El Salvador, and Haiti. A planeload of American business executives, ready to start writing reconstruction contracts, arrived in Panama City in 1989 while the street fighting was still going on. The former head of OPIC (Overseas Private Investment Corporation), Fred Zeder, told me this when we met in Washington in June 1990. Ron Brown's ill-fated 1996 mission landed in Bosnia and Croatia even before all the I-FOR troops had been deployed.

See a pattern? First destroy them, then take over and rebuild them. It puts a "black humor" spin on an old one-liner: What's the difference between mechanical and civil engineers? Answer: Mechanical engineers build the weapons; civil engineers build the targets. Either way, both the destruction and the rebuilding helps keep the bankers and multinationals humming; either way, Big Business wins.

Isn't it interesting that seemingly unrelated events—Bosnia, the expansion of NATO, the perpetual Middle Eastern crisis—all have one common denominator: increased spending? The object is not to win. It is to prolong the foreign deployment, because this means increased spending. More money for the "Princes"; more tax burdens and body bags for Main Street.

Which is why it's worth recalling President Dwight Eisenhower's warning to the nation in his farewell speech in 1961: "In the councils of government, we must guard against acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of that combination endanger our liberties or democratic process."

*Bob Djurdjevic heads up Annex Research (www.djurdjevic.com) and Truth in Media (www.beograd.com/truth).*

As recently as the 1930's, elderly black people in rural Maryland were still keeping headstrong children in line with the admonition that something called "pattiroll" would "get" them if they didn't behave themselves. "Pattirolls," or patrols, were gangs of Union Army soldiers who rode throughout the moonlit countryside enforcing curfews in occupied Maryland during the War Between the States, and they are just one small aspect of the era's ironic and intriguing history, a history often misquoted by Northern liberal, Southern sellout, and cross-burning bigot, each to his own end.

In the spring of 1967, I saw the Ku Klux Klan parade down York Road in Towson, Maryland. Although their color guard carried the Confederate, the Maryland, and the United States flags, of the three only the Stars and Bars has unfortunately become America's premier symbol of hatred and is most closely connected with the Klan. Any attempt, however, to prove that the flag stands for liberty, not racism, is lost on people whose heads are filled with welfarist legend. Also lost on most is the importance of the events which occurred in Maryland prior to and during the War for Southern Independence, but the drama of this little border state and of her people is central to any serious discussion of Calhoun's irrepressible conflict.

The question of whether Maryland was more Southern or Northern in temperament has been debated, but I believe that the words of our state song, soon to be outlawed by the Northeastern expatriates and homegrown political "Step'n'Fetchits" in Annapolis, would not have survived to this day if the former were not true. A native of the Old Line State, James Ryder Randall, wrote the words to "Maryland, My Maryland" while living in Louisiana, to commemorate the citizens' uprising (called a "riot"

by Northern historians) which occurred on April 19, 1861, when the Sixth Massachusetts came marching through Baltimore. In spite of the fact that "Maryland, My Maryland" was one of the most popular songs among Confederate troops, there was some Southern resentment towards the state because Baltimore merchants were believed to have sold food and other items to the South at inflated prices. But like New Orleans, Baltimore (after it fell to Lincoln's forces) was not in charge of its fortunes, and those controlling Baltimore commerce were not Marylanders. More typical of Baltimore and Maryland were the sisters Constance and Hettie Cary who, using material from their best party dresses, made a Confederate battle flag and presented it to General Pierre Beauregard. Baltimore's ladies also wore red to show their Southern loyalty even after Confederate emblems were banned by the occupation army. And without a penny's profit, countless partisans throughout the state risked death by hanging for smuggling contraband to Virginia to support the Southern cause. But the misconceptions persisted, and even at Chimborazo Hospital in Richmond, Marylanders, wounded and dying for the Confederacy, were shunned by the other patients.

Any Southern ill will directed at Marylanders might have resulted from the high hopes the South had for their state early in the war. A.L. Long, military secretary to General Lee, talked about Lee's disappointment when the Army of Northern Virginia crossed the Potomac into Maryland in September 1862. Lee had expected the people of Maryland to rebel against the iron heel of the North and join the Confederates when his liberation army arrived. But Lee's army was rescuing a state populated by women, children, old men, and Lincoln's garrisons. The fighting men were already fighting for the South and the North, although how many native Marylanders actually served on either side is unknown. Federal records concerning Maryland enlistees and conscripts cannot be trusted any more than can the results of the militarily controlled elections held in the state after 1860. Fearing reprisals from Mr. Lincoln's men, as the Yankee soldiers were known, the families of those who "absconded South" did not advertise the Confederate service of their sons, brothers, and husbands. Maryland was at least as Southern in her sympathies as Kentucky, but Kentucky,