

In search of a Big Brother to restore sanity to an insane world Part II

by Daniel Borchers
November 1996

In Part I we examined balkanization, the first of four growing trends. In Part II we will look at the remaining three trends and see how they relate to one another.

Globalization

We have viewed the disintegration and chaos accelerating worldwide. However, there is another important trend underway – *globalization*.

On a national level, movements towards centralization and integration have progressed for decades, with a power shift progressively flowing from individual to local, to state, to federal levels. Concurrent with this power paradigm shift has been a progressive encroachment upon individual liberty. A battle between Supreme Court and judicial activists pitted against local authorities and rugged individualists has left liberty hanging in the balance. Americans are drowning in a sea of picayune rules and regulations springing forth from unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats. The Clinton administration has launched a *national* volunteer force and a *national* police force, seizing further power from local and state levels. *Nationalized* health care was temporarily thwarted. Will the Republican Revolution *devolve* power to the states, or is this a temporary consolidation of power?

On the international and supranational levels globalization is emerging in economics, commerce, and communications. NAFTA, GATT, and WTO are the most recent manifestations of “economic globalization.”¹ Momentum is gaining for the creation of a standing United Nations Army, composed primarily of American troops (under U.N. command). The United Nations has, for decades, brought us global conventions on everything under the sun, most recently on Children's Rights and Women's Rights. [The subject of a coming New World Order will be presented in greater depth in a future issue of *BrotherWatch*. – Ed.]

The United Nations has sponsored numerous mega-events designed to expand the scope of its power and implement its globalist aspirations. Among them, The Earth Summit (Rio, 1992), the Population Summit (Cairo, 1994), the Social Development Summit (Copenhagen, 1995), the Women's Summit (Beijing, 1995), and the City Summit (Istanbul, 1996).

Although the U.N. Charter explicitly prohibits the United Nations from intervening in the *internal* politics of member nations, UNESCO is but one example of their failure to abide by their charter. The Management of Social Transformations (MOST) is a revealing UNESCO program replete with feminist, environmentalist and socialist schemes designed to *manage* “*social transformations*.” The underlying premise is that the United Nations *must* intervene in internal politics, *must socially transform* societies – with or without the consent of the people – in order to achieve world peace (their Charter goal).

President Clinton's Vision

In a speech at the annual meeting of the IMF and World Bank (10/11/95), President Clinton said that in the emerging global economy “we are all neighbors” and, as such, are obligated to help one another. In just a few words he revealed his contempt for national sovereignty: “it is now meaningless to speak of a sharp dividing line between foreign and domestic policy ... we can't divide that which is domestic from that which is global. ... [my administration] tried to become a better international citizen ... my fellow citizens of our shared planet, economic interdependence is a fact of life.” In conclusion, our president offered “extreme nationalism,” [we just can't escape those “extremists” can we?] as one of the forces which must be combated to achieve world peace and prosperity. Hillary Clinton has supplemented this vision with her *It Takes a Village* approach to human relationships.

Remarkably, President Clinton addressed many of these issues in a St. Patrick's Day speech before the United Jewish Appeal Young Leadership Conference in Washington, D.C.

Clinton transformed the *nature* of global conflict from one between groups with differences to one between progressives and reactionaries. The great divide “is not between those of different religions or ethnic groups, just as it is no longer between Croatian, Serbs, and Muslim in Bosnia, or between Catholic and Protestant in Northern Ireland. It really is between those who are reaching for a better tomorrow and those who have retreated into the pointless, bloody hostility of yesterday.” Translation: If you're not part of *his* program you're an *enemy* of the future.

In presenting his recurrent theme of a global economy President Clinton reminds us “that nations are like children” – and, apparently, he is the Big Daddy. Globalism is a central tenet of Clintonism: “It's in our people's interest to do what is right in the world.”

Clinton applauds cultural diversity while promoting globalism (“In one county in America alone there are over 150 different racial and ethnic groups. And that is a great gift for our country on a global society.”). He advocates cultural democracy (“to build the American community, to forge a new unity amidst all of our cultural diversity based on shared values and genuine honest respect for diversity.” Also, “You don't have to give up your own heritage to try to stand in another person's shoes.”) while calling for unity (“[division] is a very dangerous tendency in a global society when we need to be pulling together”).

The President looks to the *power* of government (e.g., enacting “counterterrorism legislation”) and champions its *legitimacy* (“we have to continue to try to inspire more faith and trust in the American people in their government”). We are to have a *faith* in government? (So much for the separation of church and state.)

Bigger is not necessarily *better*.

Convergence of Balkanization and Globalization

Globalization is a process of integration, a growing interdependence, a spreading global village. *Balkanization* is a process of disintegration, fragmentation, localization. Both globalization and balkanization are taking place on national, international and supranational levels. Yet, on the surface one would perceive them as opposites requiring an inverse relationship. Yet, globalization is a growing counterpart to balkanization. In reality, they are *complementary*, not competing, trends. How can this be?

Very real human tendencies toward self-interest all contribute to the cultural disintegration and confusion

which is overwhelming us. The desire for someone else to be accountable for our actions is part of human nature. Globalization and balkanization both lead to an abdication of *personal* responsibility coinciding with *collective* demands upon regional, national and international authorities.

National interests and concerns no longer concern our elites. Rather, groups and sub-groups, races and ethnicities – or being part of a universal collective one world government – these are at the forefront of today's elitism.

While balkanization fragments people into ever smaller groups, disempowering individuals, globalization usurps the perceived power of those fragile groups to crush individuals and groups. [These themes will be expanded in Part III.]

Technophilia and technophobia are opposite sides of the same coin. "Today, two zealous camps dominate public discourse over our future. Techno-utopian Pollyanna's are busy proclaiming the unadorned good of information technology while the neo-Luddites oppose the same technological changes."²

Technophilia

Throughout history mankind has sought to discover new things, explore new worlds, think new thoughts, develop new ideas. This pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge has brought many benefits, including higher standards of living, freedom from devastating diseases, and greater opportunities to pursue whatever goals we have set before us. The flip side is that the love of technology can also augur unexpected problems and distract us from the important realities of life.

The Information Age has created a society in which many people live in cocoons, isolated from one another. Historian Daniel J. Boorstin writes: "While technology seems to bring us together, it does so only by making new ways of separating us from one another. The 'One World' of Americans in the future will be a world of millions of private-compartments."³ Also "the experience of the present actually uproots us and separates us from our own special time and place. For technology aims to insulate and immunize us against the peculiar chances, perils, and opportunities of our natural climate, our natural landscape."⁴

Boorstin believes the revolution in technology has a tendency toward advancing the globalist trend we noted earlier. "The supreme law of the Republic of Technology is convergence, the tendency for everything to become more like everything else. Now the distinction is seldom made between nations that are 'civilized' and those that are 'uncivilized.' Today, when we rely on the distinction between the 'developed' and the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' countries, we see the experience of all peoples converging."⁵

Another downside of technophilia is the dehumanization of humanity. The Pendulum Gallery had an Internet exhibit entitled "From Technophobia to Technophilia."⁶ The exhibit's creator, Rod Jacka, writes: "Information technology may raise many pathways and potentials for our society but equally it raises as many spectres and ghosts." He suggests "we risk the dehumanizing of our society" and warns against its "depersonalizing" nature.⁷

"The rise of modern technology and science, however, led many to see man as nothing more than a machine, while Darwin claimed that man was little more than an advanced ape."⁸ Behaviorism contends that "We are biological machines and do not consciously act; rather we *react* to stimuli."⁹ Biological machines. Humanity without a soul. While lowering humans to the level of animals, we simultaneously elevate machines to our level. Witness Data, the android on *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, who seeks to

know what it is to be human, and is treated as if he were just like one of us. As one humanist put it: “From now on, evolution is what we make it.”¹⁰

Robert Wright, in *Time*, ponders this man-machine question.¹¹ He writes: “First Copernicus said we’re not the center of the universe. Then Darwin said we’re just protozoans with a long list of add-ons – mere ‘survival machines,’ as modern Darwinians put it.” Are we, then, merely “soulless machines?” Was Gilbert Ryle right, in 1949, when he “dismissed the idea of a human soul” as a “ghost in the machine?”

Technophilia also presents this dilemma: in a scientific age objective standards are essential, yet those at the forefront of scientific experimentation often dismiss standards of ethics and morality in their pursuit of knowledge. As early as the 1950s, Irving Kristol warned of the growing “religion of technology” which was “opposed to any authority, moral, philosophical or political, that would set ‘arbitrary’ limits to the way in which the increases of technological knowledge shapes our world.”¹²

In Communist China, the Eastern Express sold the bodies of aborted children as a *health* food. One Chinese doctor claimed to have “eaten more than 100 fetuses in the past six months.” Yet, President Clinton, Sen. Ted Kennedy and Rep. Joseph Kennedy have sought to justify fetal tissue research in America, supporting the cannibalization of “body parts in the name of ‘science.’”¹³ [Is this an example of reverse imperialism?]

Technophobia

“Rage against the machine.” – bumper sticker

At the opposite end are those who *fear* technology. They discern some of the dangers of where we’re headed but have gone to a “Chicken Little” extreme by rejecting *all* technology.

The environmental and animal rights movements present perhaps the best examples of technophobia today. Animal rights activists are attempting to stop research which could save *human* lives and lead to healthier and happier lives. Barbara Ledeen, executive director of Independent Women’s Forum, writes: “The thousands of women who will be rallying in Washington for animal rights will be proclaiming their willingness to sacrifice their health, perhaps even their lives – and the lives of their sisters – for the sake of mice.”¹⁴ (See sidebar: “In Their Words.”)

Thus we see a twisting of perspectives and distortion of values which is both injurious to society and deadly to individuals. But this is not the first such instance. “Many individuals in Nazi Germany genuinely believed in the ‘rights’ of non-human animals, yet they simultaneously were capable of cruel behavior against members of the Jewish faith. Not only that, but they went as far as using animal protection as a *justification* for their inhumanity to the Jewish people ...”¹⁵

The corporate world has been invaded by these values. It seems that every major corporation has gone “green” and implemented some form of recycling or other “environmentally correct” program. Technophobia Limited goes further by refusing to “do business with any company, organization or individual who are involved in any activity that causes harm to the earth or its creatures.”¹⁶ Of course, therein lies the rub. Who defines “harm?” How expansive is the definition? And when, if ever, do the needs of humans outweigh the needs of the planet? [The loggers-Spotted Owl controversy is but one example.]

Movies and Television

The cultural elite envision many “specters and ghosts,” more often imagined than real. The Cold War provided the backdrop for endless movies and television plots revolving around nuclear holocaust or a nuclear winter. *Dr. Strangelove* (‘64) and *Fail Safe* (‘64) epitomize the cultural elite’s fear of a nuclear holocaust. In *Omega Man* (‘75) a nuclear war causes the genetic mutation of humans into vampire-like creatures who destroy the very technology which could cure them. But the times they are a changing. Doomsayers junked dire predictions of global cooling for global warming and seem prepared now to switch from a nuclear winter scenario to a wormwood winter.¹⁷

Since the end of the Cold War warnings of *nuclear* apocalypse have become passé, to be replaced by *other* equally destructive scenarios. *Cassandra Crossing* (‘77) and *Virus* (‘80) present scenarios of self-destruction via *biological* weapons gone awry. Lethal viruses and plagues play a prominent role in Hollywood. Mankind is all but made extinct in *Things to Come* (‘36), *The Last Man on Earth* (‘64), *Omega Man* (‘71), *Virus* (‘80), *The Terror Within* (‘88) and *The Terror Within II* (‘92), *The Twelve Monkeys* (‘95). Deadly viruses originate from outer space in *Andromeda Strain* (‘71) and from secret medical labs in *Cassandra Crossing* (‘77), *Outbreak* (‘95), and the Stephen King miniseries *The Stand* (‘94). Terrorists place a virus bomb on an airplane in *Executive Decision* (‘96).

Overpopulation is the threat in *Soylent Green* (‘73) with its shocking revelation of the truth behind a new source of food – *humans*. In *Z.P.G.* (‘72) *reproduction* a capital crime. *Zardoz* (‘73) offered a world where technology ran amok. *The Handmaid’s Tale* (‘90) predicted a feminist nightmare: a patriarchal society where women are forced to be incubators to preserve the human race. The latest incarnation of *The Island of Dr. Moreau* (‘96) follows in the horror tradition of Mary Shelley’s classic *Frankenstein* (‘31) generally credited as the first mad scientist novel.¹⁸ Michael Crichton’s *Terminal Man* (‘74) showed how brain experiments could change human behavior, while his *Jurassic Park* (‘93) featured genetically-engineered dinosaurs.

The 1996-97 TV season is replete with examples ecological holocaust. The *Burning Zone* is built around such things: one episode has the ubiquitous virus on board an airplane. An episode of *Profiler* includes the threat of a contaminated water supply.

This year, the media-hyped miniseries *Pandora’s Clock* debuted over the Veteran’s Day weekend. NBC promotions highlighted “the potentially lethal maze of biological warfare, international terrorism, and political duplicity” and quoted Lawrence Altman, who wrote “... Jet airplanes have increased the threat of spread of infections because people incubating a deadly virus can travel from an infected area to another area of the world before becoming ill”¹⁹ [See Sidebar: “*Pandora’s Clock*.”]

The movie’s protagonists refer to this “doomsday virus” as “the biological equivalent of thermonuclear war” threatening a “viral holocaust.” The heroine says: “It’s a pyramid plan for Armageddon. I’ve long held that the world’s airline system is a potential instrument for environmental holocaust.”

Convergence of Technophilia and Technophobia

At first it would seem that technophobes and technophiles have little in common. Such is not the case. While technophobes pursue the elimination of beneficial science and technology (gasoline engines, CFCs, irradiation of food, pesticides, nuclear energy), technophiles seek any advancement – regardless of immorality – in the pursuit of knowledge (fetal tissue research, surrogate mothers, etc.).

Technophobes glorify *primitive* man and exalt nature; technophiles *dehumanize* man. Neither view humans as both *part* of nature and *superior* to nature. Technophiles view technology as the *solution*; technophobes see it as the *problem*. Both neglect the *spiritual* dimension. Technophiles *play* God while

technophobes exalt *nature* as God. Neither accord a correct relationship among God, man and nature: God as Creator; man created in His image and given dominion over nature with responsibility to tend the garden of God. And, finally, both look to government for the answers; one to sponsor and expand technological development, the other to prohibit and control it.

[Part III will appear in the January 1997 issue and will show the convergence of these four trends. – *Ed.*]

Endnotes:

- ¹ Samuel Francis, December 24, 1994.
- ² Richard F. O'Donnell, "Republican Dreaming," The Progress & Freedom Foundation, undated.
- ³ Daniel J. Boorstin, *Hidden History: Exploring Our Secret Past*, Vintage Books, 1987, pg. 312.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, pg. 308.
- ⁶ [Http://www.node-pub.com.au/techno.html](http://www.node-pub.com.au/techno.html), October 3, 1996.
- ⁷ [Http://www.node-pub.com.au/techno/intro.html](http://www.node-pub.com.au/techno/intro.html), October 3, 1996.
- ⁸ Gary DeMar, *War of the Worldviews: A Christian Defense Manual*, American Vision, 1994, pg. 97.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, pg. 99.
- ¹⁰ Humanist Herman J. Muller, "One Hundred Years Without Darwinism Are Enough," *The Humanist*, XIX, 1959.
- ¹¹ Robert Wright, "Can Machines Think?," *Time*, March 25, 1996.
- ¹² Irving Kristol, "Keeping Up With Ourselves," *The End of Ideology*, ed. Chaim I. Waxman, Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.
- ¹³ Kathleen Howley, "Fetal Tissue Consumption/Research," Living Word Syndicate, 1994.
- ¹⁴ Independent Women's Forum press releases, June 18, 1996.
- ¹⁵ Martin G. Hulsey, "The Implications of Nazi Animal Protection," undated.
- ¹⁶ [Http://www.technophobia.com/ethics.html](http://www.technophobia.com/ethics.html), July 26, 1996.
- ¹⁷ Nuclear winter was a theory that a nuclear holocaust would create atmospheric conditions which would cause the earth to be beset by arctic weather conditions, a global ice age. Wormwood refers to the ecological apocalypse of the Third Trumpet (Revelation 8:10-11).
- ¹⁸ See also Mark E. Howerter, "Society Has Become a Modern-Day Dr. Frankenstein," *The Other Side*, July 18, 1996. The monster has been featured in at least 17 movies.
- ¹⁹ Lawrence K. Altman, *The New York Times*, May 11, 1995; found on NBC's website for the movie.