



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 43, Number 4

April 2003

## Inside

### NATO's Left Turn

by John Laughland, Page 4

Are they looking for "reform" or revolution? And who will pick up the tab?



### Radical "Peace" Movement

by David Horowitz, Page 5

"The 'Peace' movement isn't about peace..."



### An Open Letter to Student Anti-War Protesters

by Brian Sayre, Page 6

How does it feel to be duped by the communists? Read this former student's story.

And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. Ephesians 5:11

## Christian Anti-Communism Crusade's 50th Anniversary 1953-2003

### Reds, Still

The story no one wants to hear about the antiwar movement  
by Byron York

When thousands of protesters marched down Pennsylvania Avenue during the big antiwar demonstration in Washington on January 18, they just happened to pass the national headquarters of the College Republicans. And on that afternoon there just happened to be some young Republicans inside, drinking wine and hanging out. When they heard all the commotion outside and saw the protest going by—they hadn't known their office was on the route—they couldn't help making a statement.

The students pulled a dry-erase board off the wall and wrote a simple message: "Hippies Go Home." They took it out to their second-floor balcony overlooking the march, and what followed was what diplomats sometimes call a frank exchange of ideas.

"F\*\*\* YOU!" a group of the protesters yelled. "Nazis!" someone shouted. Others began chanting: "Hey hey! Ho ho! Yuppie f\*\*\*s have got to go!" The College Republicans seemed to enjoy it all, smiling and waving and making peace signs. They enjoyed it so much that after a while, they found another board and made a sign that said: "Saddam Kills." That seemed to particularly agitate the protesters. "Bush kills too!" they screamed. "Bush kills too!"

It all made for good street theater, but in one sense the young Republicans had it wrong. If they had really wanted to get to the heart of the matter, they might have raised a sign that said, "Commies Go Home." While that wouldn't have been fair to most of the marchers, it would have been a direct hit at the people who organized the demonstration—and who are the most forceful voices in today's antiwar movement.

The protest was put together by a group called International ANSWER, which stands for Act Now to Stop War and End Racism. ANSWER is an outgrowth of another group called the International Action Center, a San Francisco-based organization that showcases the work of Ramsey Clark, the Johnson administration attorney general who has specialized in anti-American causes. Both ANSWER and the International Action Center are closely allied with a small but energetic Marxist-Leninist organization known as the Workers World Party, which in its turbulent history has supported the Soviet interventions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the Chinese government's crackdown in Tiananmen Square. Today, the WWP devotes much of its energy to supporting the regimes in Iraq and North Korea.

*Dwell on the past and you'll lose an eye; forget the past and you'll lose both eyes." Old Russian Proverb*

At the demonstration, which many media reports portrayed as a gathering of mainstream Americans, speaker after speaker condemned the United States with ancient Communist rhetoric: “revolution,” “struggle,” “oppressed peoples,” “imperialism,” and “liberation.” One speaker even addressed her fellow protesters as “comrades.” Given the impressive strength of the public-address system, it felt like a literal blast from the past. And if the subject had not been so serious, it might have seemed almost quaint.

But the demonstration’s organizers, perhaps unwittingly, made a very serious point: More than a decade after the fall of the Soviet Union, and long after most Americans stopped worrying about the Red Menace, a significant part of the movement that has risen up in opposition to war in Iraq is, in essence, a Communist front.

#### COMRADE BRIAN

Perhaps the most visible face of the demonstration was its co-director and chief spokesman, Brian Becker. Becker got a lot of exposure in the days leading up to the rally; he was quoted in newspaper articles, appeared on TV, and did radio interviews to promote the event. A member of the secretariat of the Workers World Party—and called by some the party’s house intellectual—Becker is a contributor to the party’s newspaper, *Workers World*, as well as a top official of International ANSWER and the International Action Center.

There is an almost central-casting quality to Becker’s Communism. For example, in a December 2000 address to the Workers World Party conference in New York, Becker began by discussing issues raised by “comrades” who had recently been to Cuba and then launched into a detailed and impassioned analysis of Marxism and revolution. Becker stressed that the Workers World Party had “supported the Soviet Union against imperialism and domestic counter-revolution.” He praised the Soviets for having “sent invaluable aid to Vietnam, Cuba, the African National Congress in South Africa, and other national-liberation movements.” He railed against “U.S. imperialism.” And he concluded: “We know that the biggest single contribution that we can we make to the final transition to socialism everywhere is to build a truly revolutionary party that can lead the struggle to overthrow imperialism at its center.”

These days, with the Soviet Union long dead, Becker spends much of his time supporting rogue regimes. Last Au-

gust, he traveled to Iraq as part of a delegation led by Ramsey Clark. In an article in *Workers World*, he bitterly condemned the “lawless aggression” of the “imperialist” and “racist” U.S. air patrols enforcing the no-fly zone. In early 2000, Becker traveled to North Korea to help build what he had earlier called “a movement of genuine solidarity” with Pyongyang. Accompanying Becker was a WWP writer, who described the deep impression North Korea made on them. “Where-

ever we went and whomever we spoke with,” she wrote, “what impressed us the most was the unbreakable determination of the North Korean people to defend their socialist society against U.S. imperialism.”

Such statements do not add up to the ideal profile for a leader in an antiwar movement that seeks broad mainstream support. But don’t suggest that to Becker. At a news conference the day before the protest, he grew angry when asked about his association with the WWP. “I want to talk about *you*,” he said. “*National Review* is a racist pro-war magazine.

It’s got a long—many, many generations of racism and militarism. So your so-called interest in the Left is complete bullsh\*\*. You’re just looking to try to divide the antiwar movement. This is a right-wing, racist, militarist magazine. You should be embarrassed to be working for it.” End of conversation.

#### OBNOXIOUS

Becker is not the only WWP activist who played a key role in the January 18 demonstration. Another co-organizer—and M.C.—of the event was a man named Larry Holmes. A member of the Workers World Party secretariat, Holmes has run for president twice on the WWP ticket. At the rally, he used his time to lecture the crowd on the plight of political prisoners in the U.S. He cited two examples, Mumia Abu-Jamal and Jamil Al-Amin (better known as H. Rap Brown), who have both been convicted of murdering police officers and have become *causes célèbres* in radical circles. “There are so many political prisoners,” Holmes told the crowd. “They want peace more than any of us, and they’re in prison for fighting for it.”

Yet another member of the WWP secretariat, a woman named Sara Flounders, also spoke at the rally, denouncing George W. Bush’s “racist arrogance” and “plans for criminal war of colonial conquest.” In addition, the crowd heard from representatives of other groups—the Free Palestine Alliance, Free the Cuban Five, and the Korea Truth Commission—

**“Former”  
Communists  
thrive in the  
new NATO.**

that are apparently front organizations associated with the WWP. By the time the rally was over the audience had heard enough cries of “Butcher Sharon!,” “We don’t want your racist war!,” and “Free Mumia” to last for many months to come.

For outside observers, the effect of it all was to raise questions about the real nature of the peace movement. “The Workers World Party is one of the most obnoxious groups on the far Left,” says Stephen Zunes, an associate professor of politics at the University of San Francisco who studies the antiwar movement. The WWP exercises influence, Zunes explains, by its sheer energy and resourcefulness. “Historically, you have these groups that are just able to out-organize anybody else. One thing you can say about Marxist/Leninist groups is that at least in the organization stage, they are very efficient.” The Workers World Party has simply out-hustled other leftist groups in the work of getting parade permits and organizing big events. According to Zunes, that has created a problem for more moderate antiwar organizations. “It causes division among the nonauthoritarian Left groups. They say, ‘Do we march at a rally organized by a group like this? I don’t feel comfortable with this, but it’s the only game in town.’”

But it is not at all clear that other Left groups are truly distressed by the WWP’s tactics. In interviews with several representatives of peace-movement groups, most declined to condemn the politics of Brian Becker and his associates. “Good for them for having the wherewithal to call the demonstrations,” says Scott Lynch, a spokesman for Peace Action, considered the largest antiwar group in the country. “This is ANSWER’s dance, and they get to call the tune.” Leslie Cagan, a long-time antiwar activist with the group United for Peace, adds, “We are at a point where it is really, really critical that many, many groups come out and voice their opposition to this war. Some in the hard-core Left have taken the lead on that, and I applaud those groups for that.”

But others have their fears. “These groups with the more radical agenda get a lot of media attention,” says Bob Edgar, the general secretary of the National Council of Churches who is helping lead a new, more centrist antiwar group called Win Without War. “I don’t think they discredit the movement, but they turn off some [people] in Middle America.”

If anyone in the crowd on January 18 was turned off, there was little evidence of it. Most people seemed to listen enthusiastically to the WWP speakers. But the WWP has no more than a couple of thousand members in the world, and

there can’t be enough Marxist-Leninists to fill a large portion of the National Mall. So why did they listen?

The answer appeared to be this: Because they hate George W. Bush. Yes, they oppose a war, but the thing that seemed to unite the attendees was an intense hostility toward the president. The signs they carried seethed with rage and condescension. “He Is A Moron ... And A Bully,” said one. Another denounced “Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld: The Real Axis of Evil.”

There were old peaceniks: “We’ve been marching for peace since 1960, and it hasn’t happened yet,” one gray-haired couple said. There were college students doing their best imitations of hippies. And there were the assorted nuts, like the man who stood naked, but for his underwear, in the 24-degree cold, inviting people to use felt-tipped pens to inscribe peace messages on his shivering flesh (he said he wanted to “get people together on my body—literally, everyone signing up for peace”).

Speaker after speaker claimed that the crowd represented the “real America,” the millions who are said to passionately oppose a war to oust Saddam Hussein. And that was the way the rally was covered in the press. One fairly typical report on MSNBC said the demonstration included “a growing number of people [who] are speaking out against a war with Iraq—students, grandparents, businessmen, politicians, teachers, actors, and activists, standing shoulder to shoulder in protest.”

Newspaper reports largely ignored what was said on the stage; the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* failed to mention much of anything that was said by ANSWER’s speakers. The *Times* editorial page said the demonstration “represented what appears to be a large segment of the American public . . . [and was] impressive for the obvious mainstream roots of the marchers.”

Surely the *Times* editorialist did not actually attend the march. And surely he or she has not spent much time listening to Brian Becker and his WWP allies. Many on the left are trying to will themselves to believe that there is a massive, grassroots, centrist opposition to war in Iraq rising in the heartland—and finding its voice in rallies like the one on January 18. Perhaps that sounds plausible to people who weren’t there. But not to anyone who was.

—February 10, 2003, p. 29f., © 2003 by *National Review*, Inc., 215 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10016. Reprinted by permission.

# NATO's Left Turn

by John Laughland

The high point of last November's NATO summit in Prague came when a couple of aging rock stars wearing sunglasses and black leather staggered onto a stage and sang John Lennon's "Power to the People!" to the assembled summitters. Earlier in the evening, the suits had watched an avant-garde ballet, in which films were projected at high speed of dancers in their underwear miming copulation on an enormous bed. If any proof were needed that the Cold War has been won by the Left, such in-your-face postmodern trash was it: as one British NATO cheerleader wrote, "In Prague, NATO became a peace movement."

The cultural program for the Prague summit was a typical choice by the Czech president, Václav Havel. An icon of the 1960s, Havel is known as an advocate of free love, world peace, and the end of the nation state. It is also rumoured that he dabbles in New Age and the occult.

Whatever the truth, the key point about this gigantic jamboree—2,000 delegates, 3,000 journalists, 14,000 police and troops to protect them, and 200,000 Praguers who fled their homes for the week—was that the West extended a warm embrace to some of the most senior henchmen of the Communist tyranny, and thereby proclaimed the Cold War over.

The leaders of the new NATO member states include a former Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Socialist Republic; a former General Secretary of the communist Youth in Romania at the height of that country's bloodiest Stalinism; a senior communist *apparatchik* from Czechoslovakia, whose career blossomed for 20 years after the crushing of the Prague spring and who ended up as a member of the Central Committee; a minister in the very last Communist government of Poland; and a former agent of the Hungarian KGB. They were joined in Prague by the various Oriental despots and thugs who continue to run the former Soviet Central Asian and Caucasian republics, as they did during the Soviet Union, and who have signed various association agreements with the Atlantic alliance.

The West did this because its own ideology is viscerally hostile to anti-communists. The warm welcome extended to Peter Medgyessy, the new prime minister of Hungary who was rumbled as a communist secret agent shortly after his election in the summer, contrasts vividly with the distaste Washington barely hides for his predecessor, Viktor Orbán. That young man, who rose to prominence as a vehement anti-communist at the end of the 1980s, is now dismissed as a "nationalist" in Beltway circles and is repeatedly accused of "having tolerated anti-Semitism." By the same token, U.S.

government agencies intervened illegally in September's elections in Slovakia to do down the conservative Vladimir Meciar, the most popular politician in Slovakia.

One by one, indeed, the West has systematically worked to undermine or eliminate anti-communists: Franjo Tudjman in Croatia, Sali Berisha in Albania, Alexander Luka-shenko in Belarus... the list goes all the way back to the early 1990s, when the West helped topple the anti-Soviet Georgian president, Zviad Gamsakhurdian, preferring instead the long-serving First Secretary of the Communist Party in Soviet Georgia, Edward Shevardnadze.

As Havel's rock concert showed, the victor in the Cold War was therefore not anti-communism, but "reform." I will never forget attending a meeting of bearded Romanian and Hungarian "dissidents" in the summer of 1990, shortly after the "fall of communism": they all remained convinced Marxists. Their goal, and that of their colleagues across the Eastern bloc, had never been to destroy Marxism, but to reform it by encouraging a "convergence" between East and West.

This ultimately Gnostic dream of a world with no divisions was the political creed of all tolerated dissidents from Sakharov to Havel; serious anti-communists like Solzhenitsyn and Zinoviev, in contrast, are no friends of the new world order.

For what the New Left really hated about the communist system was its conservatism. Encouraged by the ideology of the 1960s, the younger generation of Marxists resented the social prudery and patriotism of the post-Stalinist ruling class. The anti-Zionism of the USSR and its allies, which increased after the Six-Day War, also made many communists feel uncomfortable. Consequently, these people reinvigorated the dormant opposition that Trotsky had articulated against Stalin's "socialism in one country": they wanted world revolution. They knew, as Marx and Engels had taught in *The Communist Manifesto*, that the best way of achieving this was through "the bourgeois revolution," i.e., global capitalism, which the New Left liked for its perceived moral nihilism and its terrible revolutionary force.

Like Marx, the New Left understood that global capitalism would destroy all traditional social structures, especially the family and the nation. Just as Marx idolized the worker "who has no country," so Marxists had no difficulty identifying with the internationalist ideals of the new world order. Above all, they recognized that the key Marxist-Leninist goal of the withering away of the state could never be achieved unless the old communist structures were jettisoned in favour of the Western cosmopolitan ideology of global markets and administrative rule by ostensibly apolitical supranational organizations like the UN, the EU, NATO, the IMF, and the WTO.

Consequently, the eminently communist ideology of anti-

fascism has become the West's principal—perhaps only—political value. It is press-ganged into service whenever a state shows any sign of resisting the new world order ideal of statelessness, all of whose enemies are tarred as “right-wing,” “fascist,” or “the new Hitler,” even when they are in fact from the Old Left, like Slobodan Milosevic or Saddam Hussein. One of Havel's advisers even attacked the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia as “extreme Right.”

Just as, under communism, the ideology of statelessness is conjugated with a massive increase in the reality of state power, so anti-fascism is used to justify ever greater restrictions on individual liberty: the first anti-fascist protection barrier, after all, was the Berlin Wall.

These trends are set to increase in the future. In the November/December issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Celeste Wallander of the Center for Strategic and International Studies calls for the imposition of supranational political control by NATO on its own member states. The values she seeks to protect are not the bare essentials of military necessity, but the limitless requirements of political correctness: she cites, as evidence of the

good NATO has already done, that Hungary got rid of its “nationalist” government and that Lithuania has “acknowledged its anti-Semitic past and role in the Holocaust.” Given that such nonsense is U.S. State Department standard issue, there is no reason why Wallander's suggestion that a state should be expelled if its government is “xenophobic, authoritarian or corrupt” should not become official NATO policy.

Marx and Engels never intended Orthodox, backward Russia to be the bearer of the world revolution. They looked instead to the most technologically advanced states of their day, Germany and Britain.

So it is with the U.S. now, which today's market-Leninists see as but a means to an end, and as an instrument to be jettisoned once the goal is achieved. Even if the good sense of the American people prevails, therefore, and the U.S. one day pulls back from its current globalist adventure, the interlude will have done its evil work: if ever the current imperialist tide recedes to Washington, it will leave in place, all over the world, the filthy deposit of real revolution.

—*The American Conservative*, January 13, 2003, p. 18f.

## Radical “Peace” Movement

by David Horowitz

The “Peace” Movement Isn't About Peace...

It's about carrying on the left's war against America. When your country is attacked, when the enemy has targeted every American regardless of race, gender or age for death, there can be no “peace” movement. There can only be a movement that divides Americans and gives aid and comfort to our enemies.

In his speech to Congress after 9/11, the President said: “We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th Century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions, by abandoning every value except the will to power, they follow in the path of fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism.”

The so-called “peace movement” today is led by the same hate-America radicals who supported America's totalitarian enemies during the Cold War. They marched in support of the Vietcong, the Sandinista Marxists and the Communist guerrillas in El Salvador. Before that they marched in behalf of Stalin and Mao. They still support Castro and the nuclear lunatic in North Korea, Kim Jong-Il. They are the friends in deed of Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein.

What prompts American radicals to make common cause with such monsters? The answer is obvious: They share a common view of America as the “Great Satan.” They believe that it is America – not tyrants like Saddam Hussein – that

inflicts misery and suffering on the world. The targets of the 9/11 terrorists were Wall Street and the Pentagon. These were the targets of American radicals long before.

In the perverse minds of the so-called “peace” radicals, America is the “root cause” of all the root causes that inspire the terrorists to attack us. “America is to blame for what is wrong in the world. The enemy is us.”

Today, as we battle the Axis of Evil, which threatens us with weapons of mass destruction, these familiar mantras are rising on college campuses from coast to coast. Just as they did in the Cold War past.

During the Cold War, the radical “peace” movement bullied right-thinking Americans into silence. Our government lost the ability to stay the course in the anti-Communist war. The result was the Communist slaughter of two-and-a-half million peasants in Indo-China after the divisions at home forced America to leave.

Once again, the hate America left is attempting to silence right-thinking citizens. It is attempting to divide the home front in the face of the enemy. Even as we go to war. It is stabbing our young men and women in the back even as they step into harm's way to defend us. It is attempting to paralyze our government again and prevent it from securing the peace.

We can't afford to let this happen. The time has come for those who love freedom and who appreciate the great bounties of this nation to stand up and be counted.

—*www.FrontPagemagazine.com*, January 21, 2003

# An Open Letter to Student Anti-War Protesters

By Brian Sayre

On Wednesday, March 5th, a few hundred of you at Stanford University participated in a “National Student Strike” against an attack on Saddam Hussein’s murderous regime. This mass hooky was sponsored nation-wide by an organization calling itself the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition; locally, it was purportedly organized by a collection of Stanford student organizations called the Coalition of Students Against War, closely affiliated with the Stanford Community for Peace and Justice. Others have already shown the links between the national front groups and shadowy Stalinist organizations like the Worker’s World Party. The same sort of thing is true locally. To find out who really ran the show at Stanford, one simply has to go to the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition’s website, and search the list of participating campuses. There, the Stanford organizers are plainly listed as the Stanford Labor Action Coalition and the Young Communist League—the youth branch of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The president of the Stanford Young Communist League, a Clara Webb, is the contact person for both organizations.

That the anti-war demonstrations are led by communists, while underreported in the mainstream media, is not exactly breaking news. However, the reports from the protest indicate that a new stage of radical quislingism is about to begin. Desperate to prevent President Bush and the American military from liberating the Iraqi people, the Communists have begun openly recruiting college students like you to participate in illegal acts, designed to disrupt the lives and empty the pocketbooks of ordinary Americans. All of this took place last Wednesday with the tacit approval of many Stanford professors—a full two dozen cancelled their classes in support of the demonstration, and, according to the protest organizers, a full sixty pledged their support.

I simply cannot be silent about this. In fact, I have a moral responsibility to speak up, for once, not so long ago, I was the one organizing. I was the one manipulating others. You see, I was once a Communist.

I began my career as a communist radical in Toronto in 1996, when I joined an organization called the Communist League of Canada. The Communist League was oriented towards factory workers; when I decided to go back to university in 1998, I left it and joined a mostly student Communist organization called the New Socialists. Both of these groups were split-offs of split-offs, tracing their lineage back through the 1960s Left to the heyday of American Communism. Although small in numbers, thanks to their activity they

and other groups like them had a great deal of influence over the broader left. While in these groups, I helped organize and participated in many protests—demonstrations against “globalization,” demonstrations against war, and demonstrations against the government. As a communist, I used people as simply means to an end. I discarded people as they ceased to be useful, and came to my senses only long after I was discarded in turn. Now, doing graduate work at Stanford, I try to avoid politics. I don’t know Clara Webb. I don’t know any of the radical leftists at Stanford, and I hope I never do. But I do know the system of front groups, the “non-violent direct action,” and the system of “affinity groups,” all too well. This is a system that controls the individual protestor almost perfectly while giving the illusion of freedom; this is the system being used by anti-war protestors in America today.

What is an “affinity group”? In theory, it’s a small group of people, maybe ten to twenty, who decide to work together by consensus for a political action. In practice, it’s a ruthlessly effective way of manipulating the less extreme into greater acts of extremism, all coordinated by the group’s leaders, who invariably belong to the shadowy communist organizations who run things behind the scenes. These groups are nothing more than the translation of communist leader Che Guevara’s armed “military focus” to the American city, as popularized by the French radical Regis Debray. In America, they work on the same “dictatorship of the most radical” principle as most leftist front organizations, which consist of two groups—a small core clique of fanatics, and a slightly broader group of willing stooges, with varying degrees of commitment to the cause. The fanatics obtain and control their flock through the force of their personalities—they are admired for their experience, commitment, and knowledge of authoritative-sounding leftist dogma, and generally adopt a hip, trendy, and friendly demeanor. While the communist organization of the fanatics is run by majority vote, the front organizations and affinity groups are run by consensus. No action is taken unless all within the group concur.

On the surface, consensus sounds very open and democratic, but fans of the system fail to take into account the admiration the flock has for the fanatics, who pose as their friends. These elite members of the organization meet beforehand, in a secret and unpublicized gathering, where they make the actual decisions. They are then presented to the group as “ideas” or “suggestions”—suggestions that quickly find seconders. People are asked if they concur, and they almost always do, for the social consequences of dissent are great. To dissent is to issue a “block,” which prevents the group from acting until the action is resolved. It positions the odd man out in opposition to the entire group, which is often that person’s entire social network. A stubborn blocker condemns the meeting to a long, dry contest of wills, with them the twelfth man on the jury. And so the

dissenter keeps quiet—or dissenters, since for every decision there are usually several people with misgivings, all unknown to each other. And therefore a radical proposition that would have been rejected by a large majority in a secret ballot will be accepted unanimously in a “consensus.”

If the fear of being the lone dissenter shapes organizational meetings in a student lounge, how much more does it shape the decisions made by an affinity group on the city streets, while a protest is underway? Pumped up by their simple slogans and the press of other bodies, these groups of radicals make their decisions relatively quickly. Here there is little debate, no time for debate—the group looks to its leader, the person with the most experience, who will offer a “suggestion” that, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, will be accepted immediately. Reservations get swept aside as the flock fears holding the radicals back, of appearing cowardly, of letting them down.

While appearing chaotic, the mash of affinity groups is always under tight control. Large numbers of people are managed efficiently through a convened central body, the “spokescouncil,” consisting of one or two members from each group—the ultra-radical “leaders” admired by the rest. Here they regularly sell out the desires of their adoring charges. On the one occasion I witnessed where several affinity groups rebelled against their masters, refusing to rush a barrier separating them from a meeting of the Organization of American States, the members of the spokescouncil decided to tell each and every group that they were the only dissenting group—causing each and every group to change their mind (which wound up getting some of them pepper-sprayed). The spokescouncil, of course, has its own leaders, prominent radicals and communists, who either direct the protest on site or from a distance, using cell phones. The average person, suckered into this mess, believes and is told he has complete freedom over a non-hierarchical process where everyone is equal. And in fact, they are equal, in theory—as equal as every Republic was in the Soviet Union, as equal as every party was in the Communist International.

That is how an affinity group operates. That is how a mass of students in Toronto ended up spending a night huddled miserably on the floor of the lobby of a major bank in the middle of winter, without food or water, urinating in a garbage container barely shielded by a pair of plastic plants, surrounded by riot police—when they thought, starting out, that they’d be going on a simple march. Of course, the organizers, having planned everything in advance, had brought their own supplies. That is how, should war on Iraq begin, the college students being recruited at Stanford today will become useful idiots, finding themselves in jail for committing criminal acts. Unless you are willing to bolt and run, to leave the group, to let down all your friends gathered around you, you will do

exactly what your communist controllers want you to do—controllers several steps up on the radical hierarchy, controllers you probably don’t even know by name.

My advice to potential protestors: bolt and run. Friends you can replace; your freedom you cannot. You are being wooed into crime, something easily visible from the website of the Stanford Coalition for Peace and Justice. Underneath the call for recruitment to affinity groups, is one for more information about these groups, which leads to the web site Direct Action to Stop the War (DASW). And beneath that, a notification: that “neither DASW nor any of the AG [Affinity Group]-formation is connected with SCPJ [Stanford Coalition for Peace and Justice] in any formal capacity.”

Apparently, the mobilization of all of its membership to fill these “affinity groups” with naïve young bodies is not sufficiently “formal” for the Stanford Coalition for Peace and Justice. But why the disclaimer, right underneath a call for recruitment? No doubt the genteel professors that take part in the Stanford Coalition for Peace and Justice feel the need for a little behind-covering, for the cause they’re sending you to is openly seditious. The goal of Direct Action to Stop the War is to “impose real economic, social and political costs and stop business as usual until the war stops;” their “Action Menu” contains a list of almost three dozen key intersections and places of employment in San Francisco that they want shut down. In plain English, sabotage. This attempt to damage the American economy in a time of crisis will hurt the largely immigrant, hard-working service staff of San Francisco hardest, as you, students of one of the wealthiest, most-privileged universities in America prevent them from getting to their jobs and supporting their families, but the tolerance of such treason will indirectly hurt us all. It shames this great nation in a time of crisis; it demoralizes the troops in their time of greatest need. It runs absolutely counter to the proper role of the university.

Those of you who wind up being used as pawns are responsible for your actions; when you are arrested, you will deserve what you get. However, the administration and professorate of Stanford University must share the blame—in particular, those twenty-six Stanford professors who refused to teach this last Wednesday. They have allowed an America-hating fringe to transform you, their students, into communist dupes. The administration weakly tolerates their machinations. Parents, alumni, and ordinary Americans should not, and, above all, you should not. Right now, protestors, your radical leaders are scheming to control you. I know, because I’ve seen it for myself, done it for myself. For yourself, your future, and for your country—don’t be fooled.

Don’t be their dupes.

—*www.FrontPagemagazine.com*, March 11, 2003

# The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

- *Beating the Unbeatable Foe*, Fred C. Schwarz.....\$25.00
- *You Can Trust the Communists... to be Communists*,  
Fred C. Schwarz.....\$5.00
- *Mind Seige: The Battle for Truth in the New Millenium*, Tim  
LaHaye and David Noebel.....\$15.00
- *Understanding The Times: The Religious Worldviews of Our Day  
and the Search for Truth*, David A. Noebel.....\$25.00
- *Understanding The Times* (abridged), David A. Noebel ... \$14.95
- *America's 30 Years War*, Balint Vazsonyi ..... \$24.95
- *Another Gospel: A Confrontation with Liberation Theology*,  
Paul C. McGlasson. .... \$7.99
- \* *Architects of Victory: Six Heroes of the Cold War*,  
Joseph Shattan.....
- *Baker Encyclo. of Christian Apologetics*, N. L. Geisler .....\$49.95
- *Beyond Liberation Theology*, Ronald H. Nash..... \$12.95
- *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*,  
Stephane Courtois, ed..... \$37.50
- *Body and Soul*, James Porter Moreland, Scott B. Rae. ....\$22.99
- *China: Debates the Future Security Environment*, Michael  
Pillsbury.....\$25.00
- *The China Threat: How the People's Republic Targets America*,  
Bill Gertz.....\$27.95
- *Chinese Views of Future Warfare*, Michael Pillsbury.....\$25.00
- *The Creed*, Michael Bauman.....\$9.99
- *A Christian Manifesto*, Francis A. Schaeffer.....\$9.95
- *Cloning of the American Mind*, B.K. Eakman.....\$22.00
- *Commies: A Journey Through the Old Left, the New Left and the  
Leftover Left*, Ron Radosh (hardcover).....\$24.95
- *Communism, the Cold War, and the FBI Connection*,  
Herman Bly .....\$12.95
- *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael J. Behe (hardcover).....\$25.00
- *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael J. Behe (paperback).....\$13.00
- *Dictatorship of Virtue*, Richard Bernstein..... \$12.95
- *God and Man: Perspectives on Christianity in the 20th  
Century*, Michael Bauman, ed. .... \$9.95
- \* *The Gulag Archipelago Vols. I, II and III*, Alexsandr I.  
Solzhenitsyn, .....
- \* *The Harvest of Sorrow*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *Hollywood Party: How Communism Seduced the American Film  
Industry in the 1930s and 1940s*, Kenneth Lloyd Billingsley.....
- *Is the Comminern Coming Back?*, Wallace H. Spaulding....\$38.00
- *Joseph McCarthy: Re-examining the Life and Legacy of America's  
Most Hated Senator*, Herman Arthur.....\$26.00
- \* *Koba [Joseph Stalin] The Dread: Laughter and the Twenty Mil-  
lion*, Martin Amis.....
- \* *Kolyma: The Arctic Death Camps*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *The Long War Against God*, Henry M. Morris.....
- *Morality and the Marketplace*, Michael Bauman, ed. .... \$9.95
- *The Noblest Triumph*, Tom Bethell..... \$29.95
- *None Dare Call It Education*, John Stormer.....\$21.00
- *Postmodern Times*, Gene Edward Veith, Jr.....\$14.95
- *A Program For Conservatives*, Russell Kirk .....\$3.00
- \* *The Quest for Cosmic Justice*, Thomas Sowell.....
- *Radical Son*, David Horowitz.....\$27.50
- *Red Cocaine: The Drugging of America*, Joseph D. Douglas....\$14.95
- *The Redhunter: A Novel Based on the Life and Times of Senator  
Joe McCarthy*, William F. Buckley .....\$25.00
- \* *Reflections on a Ravaged Century*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *The Russian Revolution*, Richard Pipes.....
- *The Secret World of American Communism*, Harvey Kiehr,  
John Earl Haynes, Fridrikh Firsov.....\$24.95
- *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Richard Milton.....\$24.95
- \* *Stalin: The Breaker of Nations*, Robert Conquest.....
- *Tenured Radicals*, Roger Kimball.....\$18.95
- *Troublemaker: One Man's Crusade Against China's Cruelty*,  
Harry Wu ..... \$25.00
- \* *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*,  
John Earl Haynes, Harvey Klehr.....
- \* *The Venona Secrets: Exposing Soviet Espionage and America's  
Traitors*, Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel.....
- *Warranted Christian Belief*, Alvin Plantinga..... \$24.95
- *Why the Left is Not Right*, Ronald H. Nash.....\$10.99
- *Workers' Paradise Lost*, Eugene Lyons.....\$9.95
- *Year of the Rat*, Edward Timperlake, William C. Triplett II....\$24.95
- Video, *Clergy in the Classroom*.....\$19.95
- Video, *The Marxist/Leninist Worldview*.....\$19.95

\* Not available from CACC. Check your favorite book-seller for purchase or your local library.

"An authentic section of the Berlin Wall, donated in April 1990 to President Reagan for his unwavering dedication to humanitarianism and freedom over communism throughout his presidency." Reagan Library and Museum, Simi Valley, California

You may order these materials for your own Schwarz Report Bookshelf by calling (719) 685-9043, or by writing the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. **Payment must accompany your order. For shipping, please add \$5.00 or 12 percent of total order, whichever is greater.** Allow 3-4 weeks for delivery.