

# All of the political monkeys need to be replaced

I have dutifully watched the recent Democrat and Republicans debates. I listened while twiddle dee and twiddle dum Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton tried to describe the difference between Progressives, Liberals, Socialists. At a town hall meeting in New Hampshire on October 30, senator and presidential candidate Bernie Sanders attempted to clarify in what sense he is a “socialist.” One voter in attendance, echoing the beliefs of many Americans, remarked, “I come from a generation where that’s a pretty radical term – we think of socialism with communism. Can you explain to us exactly what that is?”[1]

Sanders responded, in part “If we go to some countries, what they will have is health care for all as a right. I believe in that. They will have paid family and medical leave. I believe in that. They will have a much stronger childcare system than we have, which is affordable for working families, I believe in that.” Sanders went on to clarify that he regards himself as a democratic socialist: “What I mean by Democratic Socialism is looking at countries in Scandinavia that have much lower rates of child poverty, that have a fairer tax system that guarantees basic necessities of life to working people. Essentially what I mean by that is creating a government that worked for working families, rather than the kind of government we have today which is largely owned and controlled by wealthy individuals and large corporations.”[1]

Sanders, the only self-acknowledged socialist ever to be elected to the U.S. Senate, is careful to distinguish “democratic socialism” which supposedly distinguishes a democratic political system alongside a socialist economic system, from one authoritarian and even totalitarian forms of socialism such as Marxism, Stalinism, Maoism, and communism

generally. Modern socialism's roots may be traced back at least as far as the French Revolution, although earlier experiment in forced communitarianism, such as radical Digger and Leveler movement that sprung up during the English Civil War in the mid-17th century, have also cast long shadows.[1]

Socialism in its many subvarieties is but part of a larger political stream of thought that we might call "Utopianism," which presumes to create a social order contrary in human nature.[1] I wrote a 3-part series in September and October about Robert Owen's dream of a Utopia.

Her's one for you, people!

Robert Dilley wrote in his 1962 book MESSAGE FOR AMERICA had those who were elected and appointed to Government offices upheld the constitution which they took an oath to support, the U.S. would not have begun its course of gradual socialism and encroaching government controls. It is safe to predict that had we kept faith with our great system of freedom and free enterprise, socialism and communism would have failed throughout the world because of the tremendous contrasts. When the U.S. adopted the programs of the socialists and the communists, the issues were so confused that even men in our own government began to think that socialism would result in PROGRESS. Mankind's oldest and most discredited mistakes were and still are being repeated under the title of PROGRESS and it is simple for those in other countries to point out socialistic trends in America and erroneously attribute these measures as the reasons for the success of free enterprise.

Of course, our elected officials did not obey their oaths so now that we have socialism/communism, there are some well known neocons claiming if we just have a "constitutional convention" .... But if they wouldn't obey the original Constitution, what makes us believe they would do better the second time around? For an explanation about the difference between conservatives -vs- neocons, read Kelleigh Nelson's

series on Enemies on the Left, False Friends on the Right. Her recent article describes how the neocons are stacking the debate audiences with Jeb Bush supporters. All of her articles can be found at the top of her articles.

And then we have the Republicans debating the same old issues and using the same old talking points but not one said we should get out of the United Nations. James 3:18 Once again it was a Democrat president, Harry Truman who became a significant contributor to the globalist agenda when he led the U.S. into joining the U.N.

### IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT

In July 1945, U.S. Senate approval of the UN Charter placed our nation into the world today. Impelled by the need to “try something else” in the wake of two costly world wars in less than 30 years, 89 Senators voted in favor, only two said No. There is much in the Charter that should have alarmed the Senators, but consider only the very brief article 25 which states: “The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.” Our nation was now committed to doing the UN’s bidding (unless our veto was employed, which is rare). The Constitution had been trumped. That any U.S. senator who had sworn an oath to abide by the U.S. Constitution could approve the Charter’s Article 25 boggles the mind. But that’s what 89 Senators did.[2]

Then, in 1949, the United States approved creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The pact derives legitimacy from Articles 51-54 of the UN Charter. Secretary of state Dean Acheson stated openly that approval of NATO was “an essential measure for strengthening the United Nations.” Only 13 Senators voted against putting the U.S. in NATO.[2]

After North Korea’s communist forces invaded South Korea in June 1950, the UN Security Council called on member nations to

rush to the aid of pro-Western South Korean. Most didn't, but President Truman did the UN's bidding by sending America into what has labeled a "police action," not a war. Asked where he derived authority to use U.S forces in that conflict without a declaration of war, Truman replied that, because he could send troops to NATO, he could send troops to Korea. NATO had served one of its purposes! Our forces fought in Korea under General James Van Fleet stated that "there must have been information to the enemy from high diplomatic authorities" that impeded the effort. Not alone in registering such a protest, it was clear he was pointing to the UN. With the UN still in charge more than 50 years later, the state of war in Korea has never been terminated.[2]

The UN soon created another UN "Regional Arrangement," the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). President Lyndon Johnson (another Democrat) said it supplied authorization for the Vietnam war, the first war our nation ever lost. SEATO did its job and was soon abolished.[2]

#### BUSH WANTS TO TALK TO MOSES

In 1990, President George H.W. Bush asked the Lord if He could arrange a meeting with Moses for him so the Lord talked to Moses about that possibility but Moses said, "No way. The last time I talked to a bush I was left wandering in the desert for 40 years." Exodus 3:2 Here we are today wandering around the Middle East for nearly 30 years.

In 1990, Republican President George H.W. Bush bypassed Congress and went to the UN for authority to invade Iraq. In 1992, he sought and obtained a Security Council resolution to send U.S. forces into Somalia. In 1993, Democrat Bill Clinton received UN authorizations to send troops into Haiti. In 1994, America's forces responded to a UN resolution and attacked Bosnia. Only days after the horror of 9/11, President George W. Bush said that the actions then being taken against Afghanistan "have been defined by the United Nations." The

second invasion of Iraq in 2003 was authorized by Security Council resolution 678 and 687. And current reports from NATO headquarters in Brussels openly state that whatever our forces undertake in Afghanistan must be approved by NATO.

John F. McManus in his 2011 article entitled: Another War, Another Reason to Get US Out! said in conclusion that space prevented further discussion of the intolerable situation into which our nation and its military arm have been placed. But we do have sufficient room to recommend as strongly as we can that the U.S. withdraw from the United Nations, NATO, and any other international entanglement about which President George Washington had warned.

James 3:18 says there must be righteousness before there can be peace. Wouldn't it be nice if this idea would reach the United Nations and Washington D.C., and all other capitals of the world. There is a day coming, Psalm 85:10 says when peace and righteousness will have kissed each other but today they don't even know each other

#### WHAT ABOUT ADOPTIONS?

In the last debate the issue of abortion came up, GOP candidate Rubio stood firm on his position. Like all the others who followed in Ronald Reagan's stance on the subject, they feel that rape, incest and life of the mother were exceptions. It is very rare that the life of the mother may be in jeopardy which leaves rape and incest OK for abortion. Rubio has it right. We have "Adopt-A-River" program where volunteers clean up waterways and two thousand Oregonians adopt sections of Oregon's lakes, ponds and rivers.[2] We have "Adopt a School Program" with some private investment and even the ACLU approves so long as "no infusion of religious observance into the school system" which would mean no support of adoptions while school personnel smuggles young teenage pregnant girls out the back door to the abortion clinics.

## PSYCHOLOGY 101

If you start with a cage containing four monkeys, and inside the cage hang a banana on a string from the top, and then you place a set of stairs under the banana, before long a monkey will go to the stairs and climb toward the banana.

All the monkeys are sprayed with cold water. After a while, another monkey makes an attempt with the same result. As soon as he touches the stairs, you spray All the monkeys with cold water. Pretty soon, when another monkey tries to climb the stairs, the other monkeys will try to prevent it. Now, put the cold water away. Remove one monkey from the cage and replace it with a new monkey. The new monkey sees the banana and attempts to climb the stairs. To his shock, ALL of the other monkeys beat the crap out of him. After another attempt and attack, he knows that if he tries to climb the stairs he will be assaulted.

Next, remove another of the original four monkeys, replacing it with a new monkey. The newcomer goes to the stairs and is attacked. The previous newcomer takes part in the punishment with enthusiasm – because he is now part of the “team.” Then, replace a third original monkey with a new monkey, followed by the fourth.

Every time the newest monkey takes to the stairs, he is attacked. Now the monkeys that are beating him up have no idea why they were not permitted to climb the stairs. Neither do they know why they are participating in the beating of the newest monkey.

Finally, having replaced all of the original monkeys, none of the remaining monkeys will have ever been sprayed with cold water. Nevertheless, not one of the monkeys will try to climb the stairway for the banana. Why, you ask? Because in their minds, that is the way it has always been!

This how today’s House and Senate operates and this is why

from time to time, ALL OF THE MONKEYS NEED TO BE REPLACED AT THE SAME TIME!

DISCLAIMER: this is meant as no disrespect to monkeys. (Source Unknown)

2016 Betty Freauf – All Rights Reserved

Footnotes:

1. 12/7/2015 New American
2. 4/18/2011 New American (P.44)