



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 44, Number 5

May 2004

Our 51st Year!

Inside

Tatiana Menaker and San Francisco State University, Part I

by Lee Kaplan, Page 2

Tatiana Menaker, an immigrant from Russia, likens her treatment as a student at SFSU to the days of the old Soviet Communist regime.



Tatiana Menaker and San Francisco State University, Part II

by Lee Kaplan, Page 4

Read the latest information on the case of Tatiana Menaker, who appealed the school discipline.



“Social Justice:” Code for Communism

by Barry Loberfeld, Page 5

Mr. Loberfeld traces the roots of so-called social justice.

Communist China...At It Again

by Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.

The televised hearings convened last week by the September 11 Commission proved to be one of the most interesting and valuable civics lessons of all time. In particular, they made a point Americans cannot hear too often: The world is generally a dangerous place for the United States, its people and its interests — whether we think so or not, and most especially when we don't. After all, at such times, we frequently squander opportunities to bring to bear the leadership and popular attention, military might and other national resources that could nip in the bud problems that will prove very costly to address later.

In particular, the hearings illuminated that the international situation bequeathed by Bill Clinton to George Bush was considerably more threatening than was widely perceived at the time. Understandably, given the mandate of the commission, its members and their witnesses focused on one of those threats — the Islamist al Qaeda organization — and how it flourished largely unchecked during the eight years of the Clinton presidency and the eight months Mr. Bush was in office prior to September 11, despite this network's repeated, murderous acts of terror.

Unfortunately, there is another danger that grew inexorably over the pre-September 11 years: a Communist China bent on becoming not just the dominant nation in Asia, but a superpower and “peer competitor” to the United States.

If the Bush 43 team was, as Richard Clarke contends, giving too little attention to Osama bin Laden and his followers, one reason might have been it was reckoning — both before and after Beijing's April 1, 2001, take-down of an unarmed American EP-3 reconnaissance aircraft — with the near- and longer-term strategic implications of an increasingly formidable and aggressive China. All that changed after September 11, when China was supposedly transformed into an ally on terror and North Korea.

Yet, such critical thinking is, if anything, even more warranted today in light of the following:

- China is crushing freedom in Hong Kong. Ever since Britain surrendered the Crown Colony to the PRC in 1997, Beijing has, like a boa constrictor, inexorably tightened its grip on the people of Hong Kong. After briefly backing away from antidemocratic legislation in the face of massive public protests, the communists are now shredding what remains of the assurances it gave the United Kingdom about respecting liberty. Party organs are brazenly trying to intimidate courageous, freely elected legislators like Martin Lee and their followers by branding them “traitors.”

On Monday, the *Wall Street Journal* quoted Liu Kin-ming, who runs the editorial page of Hong Kong's pro-democracy *Apple Daily*: “[At the time of the Chinese take-over], some said the city would be a ‘freedom virus’ that would infect the rest of China. Nearly seven years later, that thesis is tough to support, Mr. Liu says. Also increasingly

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

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

tough to support is speculation that Chinese President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao, who took power more than a year ago, would promote substantive political change in China. ‘If Hong Kong isn’t going to have democracy, then forget about the rest of China,’ Mr. Liu says.”

- Communist China is no less actively threatening and otherwise trying to stifle the other Chinese experiment in democracy: Taiwan. In the wake of still-contested Taiwanese presidential polling that Beijing sought to influence — through intimidation (some 500 PRC ballistic missiles are now aimed at the Taiwanese people), pressure on the island’s businessmen who are investing in or trading with the mainland and perhaps other, more covert means — the communists have declared: “We will not sit back and look on unconcerned should the postelection situation in Taiwan get out of control, leading to social turmoil, endangering the lives and property of Taiwan compatriots and affecting stability across the Taiwan Strait.”

- The missiles pointed at Taiwan are not the only manifestation of China’s interest in being able to project power decisively in its region and emerge as the arbiter of Asian affairs. Center for Security Policy Asia Fellow Richard Fisher has noted that, with considerable help from the former Soviet military-industrial complex and cash supplied by Western consumers, the People’s Liberation Army could have by the end of this decade as many as three new nuclear submarines, 27 new Kilo-class conventional subs plus about 18 older, but still potentially lethal, diesel submarines. Such an underwater force could, particularly when taken together with comparable improvements in its missile-equipped surface fleet and aviation arms, present a serious challenge to American efforts

to defend Taiwan or other U.S. interests in the Western Pacific.

- Communist China is taking other steps with worrisome strategic implications. Testimony Dr. Peter Leitner and I presented before Sen. James Inhofe’s Environment and Public Works Committee last week noted Beijing’s use of the controversial Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST):

(a) To install fortified bastions on reefs, allowing it to lay claim to ever greater swathes of the South China Sea, and

(b) To try to thwart President Bush’s new Proliferation Security Initiative. The latter is essential to U.S. efforts to prevent the transfer of weapons of mass destruction-related materials on the high seas. Were the United States unwisely to become party to this misbegotten treaty, it is a safe bet the Chinese will also try to employ LOST as a precedent for no-less-cynical efforts in the future to advance its determination to make military use of space, while constraining this country’s ability to do so.

The good news is that the Communist Chinese threat is being subjected to intense, if less publicized, scrutiny by another congressionally mandated, bipartisan panel: the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, ably chaired by my colleague, Roger Robinson.

Given the stakes — and the current, virtually complete lack of official and public attention to the menace posed by the PRC today and in the future — the critical policy review provided by the China Commission may prove, if anything, even more needed than the findings of its more celebrated September 11 counterpart.

—*The Washington Times*, March 31, 2004

Tatiana Menaker and San Francisco State University, Part I

by Lee Kaplan

Tatiana Menaker is a Russian émigré who knows firsthand about persecution and indoctrination. She was a journalist in her native Russia, and she came to America in 1986, a divorcee with two small children and only \$90 in her pocket. A Jewish refusenik against the old Soviet Communist regime, she continued as a journalist writing for the Russian-Jewish community. Later, she bought a small tour van and began giving tours of San Francisco to supplement her income. Three years ago she enrolled at San Francisco State University to better her English. To her dismay, she found the same anti-

Semitism and Marxist dogmas prevalent in her previous homeland right here in the U.S.A. at San Francisco State. She frequently found herself arguing with professors who extolled the glories of Marxism and she spoke out frequently at anti-Semitic rallies on campus. One night her tour van was torched which crippled her business. While she could not prove it, she suspected it was those same people with whom she had had heated debates on the Bay Area campus many times.

San Francisco State University is the stomping grounds of the General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS). The GUPS

are extremely organized on campus. For the last fifteen years, they have been the only student group, out of 206 clubs, to have a permanently assigned office in the Student Union building that boasts a bigger-than-life PLO flag painted onto and covering the entire door. Other campus groups may rotate in or out of offices designated for student activities, but not the GUPS. Many of the Palestinian leadership, such as Saeb Erekat, Yasser Arafat's chief negotiator, are graduates of SFSU.

Tatiana has written some articles here at *FrontPageMag.com* about the Marxist and anti-U.S. indoctrination in classes as well as the anti-Semitism she has experienced at SF State. One of her experiences was taking a class in English as a second language with many international students visiting the campus from around the world and having a professor who required every assignment to be written about how U.S. imperialism and terrorism were responsible for the attacks on 9/11. Tatiana once relayed to me how foreign exchange students received a daily barrage of how horrible America is and how it is the cause of all the problems in the world. And her grades suffered as her assignments went against the grain and praised American freedom.

Tatiana has also told me about posters on campus with a picture of a dead baby and the words "Palestinian baby meat canned by the USA and Israel" being hung all over campus, and of Palestinian and Muslim students openly exhorting to kill Jews during demonstrations.

Being from Russia and knowing what it is to live in a real totalitarian state, Tatiana has no qualms about supporting the United States and Israel in a place where to do so can make many other students fearful to speak out. Last year, when some of the Jewish students on campus sought to stage a peaceful pro-Israel rally advocating peace in the Middle East, the GUPS and their Marxist allies on campus counter-demonstrated, many of whom screamed out statements like "Kill the Jews" and "Hitler should have finished the job." The situation was so bad that the former Professor of Jewish Studies on campus described it as being like Germany in the 1930s. The administration actually had to call in 25 San Francisco city police officers to escort the Jewish students off campus when the campus police could not protect them from the mob.

And it was at this event that Tatiana's problems first started. Being a tough cookie, she hurled some vituperation back at them, urging some to have sexual relations with a camel. She admits now that her response was a bit unnecessary, but nowhere near the threats of genocide and murder she heard from the other side.

After the demonstrations, Tatiana learned how things operate at SF State: she was ordered in for a "disciplinary hearing" by Donna Cunningham, the Officer of Judicial Student Affairs at SF State. She was told she could not bring an

attorney and was to appear for judgment and punishment if found she had broken university rules. Ms. Cunningham, who is black, and a friend, Leila Qutami, one of the student leaders of the GUPS, claimed that Ms. Qutami and others had accused Tatiana of calling Palestinian students "sand n—s," using a variation of the "n" word.

Subsequent tape recordings and videos of the event revealed that Tatiana uttered no such slur. Her accuser did not even attend the hearing claiming she was "too afraid" to attend even though a campus police officer was present at the hearing and Tatiana is a 53 year-old mother of three children who hardly poses a threat to anyone. Also present at the hearing were a Black Muslim advisor to the Muslim groups on campus and other members of the GUPS. Some might call this a stacked deck.

After 8 hours, the "hearing" was concluded with Tatiana being told she must do 40 hours of "community service" with the stipulation that none of those hours could be to aid or contribute to any "Jewish, Israeli or Russian groups." That this was anti-Semitic and discriminatory to please the GUPS made no difference to Ms. Cunningham or the administration at SF State.

Not one to take things lying down, Tatiana began writing about her experiences of facing the same Marxism and anti-Semitism at San Francisco State that she had in the former Soviet Union.

She wrote one article about a Palestinian film festival where the film "Jenin, Jenin" and other propaganda films were shown to the student body further denigrating Jews, Israel and the United States. And she wrote about a professor who had disrupted the festival, a social studies professor at SF State named Deborah Gerson, who is a member of a front group for the Palestinians claiming to be made up of Jews in the Bay Area called Jewish Voice For Peace. The activities and writings of this group have in the past even claimed it doubtful that Jews ever lived in the Holy Land at all in biblical times. In short, Professor Gerson identifies herself as a "Jewish Marxist." She and Jewish Voice For Peace frequently demonstrate on the SF State campus where calls to dismantle Israel are standard fare.

Tatiana described how this professor refers to her colleagues as "comrade" in the old Soviet style and how she educates students on the glories of the Communist system of government that Tatiana as a Soviet Jew risked her life to escape.

Tatiana continued to write about the political climate at SF State. Her articles were good and appeared in the campus newspaper and on *FrontPageMag.com*. Then she made her next mistake.

She approached Professor Gerson and asked her for an

interview so she could inquire why Gerson, as a professor of Jewish heritage, supported those who sought the murder of Jews. Professor Gerson was very curt and rude and said she didn't wish to talk to Tatiana, who then responded that she had been through real persecution as a Jew in Russia and told Gerson: "If you think that when they start to kill the Jews, they will spare you, you will still be killed as any other Jew two hours later."

Tatiana immediately received yet another letter calling her into a disciplinary meeting with Ms. Cunningham. She was accused of making death threats! The meeting was scheduled for February 5th but then postponed to the 23rd. During the meantime, Tatiana published two more revealing articles about the Marxist and anti-U.S. indoctrination on the SF State campus. And on the 23rd, her best work yet appeared about a poetry class she had attended where the central theme was damning the United States. The same day that article broke she met with Ms. Cunningham, who handed her a form to sign saying she would waive all her rights allowing Ms. Cunningham to mete out any punishment she saw fit to carry out. Tatiana refused and, when she did, Cunningham informed her she was expelled from the University until the year 2009 and had her escorted off campus by a uniformed police officer. The officer informed her that, if she steps foot on campus, she will be arrested for trespassing.

Tatiana maintains that Cunningham and Leila Qutami are close friends. She also maintains the administration, to keep peace with the GUPS and to avoid negative publicity about the political climate at SF State, simply wanted to get rid of her because she is outspoken in favor of the U.S. and democracy and because she is a Jew who isn't afraid to speak out against anti-Semitism on campus.

And in that regard she is not alone. The SFSU campus chapter of Students For Academic Freedom, the Jewish Anti-defamation League, the Jewish Community Relations Council, DAFKA, and other civil rights groups along with the Russian Jewish community have all stepped up to support Tatiana in her time of need by providing her written support as well as free legal services. All of these groups understand how important it is to back her up in her fight against political indoctrination and anti-Semitism on a campus where leftist ideological groups turn their opponents into outlaws in order to subjugate and silence them.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, February 26, 2004

Tatiana Menaker and San Francisco State University, Part II

by Lee Kaplan

Tatiana Menaker, the former Russian refusenik and student who was facing a 5-year expulsion from San Francisco State University, has been informed she may continue her studies and attendance there in order to graduate the same as any other student. The settlement included two weeks suspension from school that have been considered already served as a part of the time spent while her case was being negotiated. The "punishment" is more of a face-saving move by the University since the settlement basically drops charges against her.

Tatiana was expelled earlier by the University's Judicial Affairs Officer, Donna Cunningham, for allegedly arguing with pro-Palestinian and pro-Marxist leaders on school grounds. In one instance she responded to calls that "Hitler should have finished the job" and "Jews go back to Russia" with an explosive. However, police reports revealed she made no physical or verbal threats to anyone, did not disrupt any school functions, and her case was based more on her politics on the Bay Area campus than anything else. Tatiana had written several articles critical of SFSU for *FrontPageMagazine* prior to the threats of expulsion.

Students For Academic Freedom and the local Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC) in the San Francisco Bay Area rose to Tatiana's defense after she was escorted off campus by three uniformed campus police officers because she dared to raise her voice to Ms. Cunningham. The Judicial Affairs Officer had tried to get Tatiana to sign an agreement to waive her rights and agree to the expulsion. Subsequent readings of the police reports surrounding the case showed a pattern of campus police working with pro-Palestinian groups on campus to silence her. (One of the police reports actually referred to Palestine as being "occupied by Israel," an odd political statement to be found in a police report.) In addition, the campus police had sought to have felony charges brought against Tatiana with the local District Attorney, who instead stated in writing that Tatiana had committed no crimes but was merely speaking her mind.

Ephraim Margolin, Tatiana's attorney, stated, "Everybody won a victory. The State (University) has to explain

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman with the assistance of Dr. Ronald H. Nash. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given. **Check out our updated website at www.schwarzreport.org.**

why they dropped this.” Margolin, who handled the case *pro bono* for the JCRC, also said it marked a watershed for how Jewish students are treated on the Bay Area campus. “The Jewish community was very heavily involved in trying to make sure that the atmosphere at the university does not go back to what it was a year-and-a-half ago.” During that time, conditions for Jewish students on campus became so bad that city police were called in to escort them off campus due to threats from pro-Palestinian demonstrators. “The Jewish community pulled together to show we are not only interested in Jewish study on campus, but the life of the students, as well,” he said. Margolin, who is a Yale graduate and teaches law at Hastings University, is one of the most distinguished lawyers in America.

As soon as Students For Academic Freedom became involved with the case, a Tatiana Menaker Defense Committee was set up and thousands of e-mails and letters of support from around the world were sent to Tatiana. In addition, many of her supporters sent correspondence to SFSU President Robert Corrigan calling for her immediate reinstatement.

San Francisco State University has been in controversy before with the Jewish community. Last year, pro-Palestinian demonstrators plastered the campus with flyers of a dead baby on the face of a can that read “Palestinian Baby Meat, Packaged Under U.S. and Israeli License.” The student union building once had a mural displaying a Star of David dripping with blood and covered in swastikas. The General Union of Palestinian Students, unlike many other campus groups, has a private office on the taxpayer-supported campus. The office has a door adorned with a PLO flag and has been used by the pro-PLO group on campus for 16 years, a courtesy denied most other campus organizations. (Jewish student organizations have been turned down for office space in the same building and elsewhere on campus.)

Some Marxist professors actually greet their students in class by calling them “comrades,” and many classes and professors devote time to bashing the United States and extolling the virtues of Marxism over capitalism.

Tatiana has written extensively about life at SFSU and described how the political attitudes and indoctrination found there mimic those of the Soviet Union. Her expulsion for five years was announced the same day her third article critical of SFSU appeared on *FrontPageMagazine*.

Many of her supporters have expressed their delight and consider her vindication proof of the need for an Academic Bill of Rights. With the creation of Students For Academic Freedom, people like Tatiana now have a venue to turn to when abuses in the academic process occur. Combining this with the Academic Bill of Rights, such protection for all students nationwide will be soon available.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, March 25, 2004

“Social Justice:” Code for Communism

by Barry Loberfeld

The signature of modern leftist rhetoric is the deployment of terminology that simply cannot fail to command assent. As Orwell himself recognized, even slavery could be sold if labeled “freedom.” In this vein, who could ever conscientiously oppose the pursuit of “social justice,” — i.e., a just society?

To understand “social justice,” we must contrast it with the earlier view of justice against which it was conceived — one that arose as a revolt against political absolutism. With a government (e.g., a monarchy) that is granted absolute power, it is impossible to speak of any injustice on its part. If it can do anything, it can’t do anything “wrong.” Justice as a political/legal term can begin only when limitations are placed upon the sovereign, i.e., when men define what is unjust for government to do. The historical realization traces from the Roman senate to Magna Carta to the U.S. Constitution to the 19th century. It was now a matter of “justice” that government not arrest citizens arbitrarily, sanction their bondage by others, persecute them for their religion or speech, seize their property, or prevent their travel.

This culmination of centuries of ideas and struggles became known as liberalism. And it was precisely in opposition to this liberalism—not feudalism or theocracy or the ancient régime, much less 20th century fascism—that Karl Marx formed and detailed the popular concept of “social justice,” (which has become a kind of “new and improved” substitute for a storeful of other terms—Marxism, socialism, collectivism—that, in the wake of Communism’s history and collapse, are now unsellable).

“The history of all existing society,” he and Engels declared, “is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf ... oppressor and oppressed, stood in sharp opposition to each other.” They were quite right to note the political castes and resulting clashes of the pre-liberal era. The expositors of liberalism (Spencer, Maine) saw their ethic, by establishing the political equality of all (e.g., the abolition of slavery, serfdom, and inequality of rights), as moving mankind from a “society of status” to a “society of contract.” Alas, Marx the Prophet could not accept that the classless millenium had arrived before he did. Thus, he revealed to a benighted humanity that liberalism was in fact merely another stage of History’s class struggle — “capitalism” — with its own combatants: the “proletariat” and the “bourgeoisie.” The former were manual laborers, the lat-

ter professionals and business owners. Marx's "classes" were not political castes but occupations.

Today the terms have broadened to mean essentially income brackets. If Smith can make a nice living from his writing, he's a bourgeois; if Jones is reciting poetry for coins in a subway terminal, he's a proletarian. But the freedoms of speech and enterprise that they share equally are "nothing but lies and falsehoods so long as" their differences in affluence and influence persist (Luxemburg). The unbroken line from *The Communist Manifesto* to its contemporary adherents is that economic inequality is the monstrous injustice of the capitalist system, which must be replaced by an ideal of "social justice" — a "classless" society created by the elimination of all differences in wealth and "power."

Give Marx his due: He was absolutely correct in identifying the political freedom of liberalism — the right of each man to do as he wishes with his own resources — as the origin of income disparity under capitalism. If Smith is now earning a fortune while Jones is still stuck in that subway, it's not because of the "class" into which each was born, to say nothing of royal patronage. They are where they are because of how the common man spends his money. That's why some writers sell books in the millions, some sell them in the thousands, and still others can't even get published. It is the choices of the masses ("the market") that create the inequalities of fortune and fame — and the only way to correct those "injustices" is to control those choices.

Every policy item on the leftist agenda is merely a deduction from this fundamental premise. Private property and the free market of exchange are the most obvious hindrances to the implementation of that agenda, but hardly the only. Also verboten is the choice to emigrate, which removes one and one's wealth from the pool of resources to be redirected by the demands of "social justice" and its enforcers. And crucial to the justification of a "classless" society is the undermining of any notion that individuals are responsible for their behavior and its consequences. To maintain the illusion that classes still exist under capitalism, it cannot be conceded that the "haves" are responsible for what they have or that the "have nots" are responsible for what they have not. Therefore, people are what they are because of where they were born into the social order — as if this were early 17th century France.

Men of achievement are pointedly referred to as "the privileged" — as if they were given everything and earned

nothing. Their seeming accomplishments are, at best, really nothing more than the results of the sheer luck of a beneficial social environment (or even — in the allowance of one egalitarian, John Rawls — "natural endowment"). Consequently, the "haves" do not deserve what they have. The flip side of this is the insistence that the "have nots" are, in fact, "the underprivileged," who have been denied their due by an unjust society. If some men wind up behind bars, they are (to borrow from Broadway) deprived only because they are "deprived." Environmental determinism, once an almost sacred doctrine of official Soviet academe, thrives as the "social constructionist" orthodoxy of today's anti-capitalist left. The theory of "behavioral scientists" and their boxed rats serviceably parallels the practice of a Central Planning Board and its closed society.

The imperative of economic equality also generates a striking opposition between "social justice" and its liberal rival. The equality of the latter, we've noted, is the equality of all individuals in the eyes of the law — the protection of the political rights of each man, irrespective of "class" (or any assigned collective identity, hence the blindfold of Justice personified). However, this political equality, also noted, spawns the difference in "class" between Smith and Jones. All this echoes Nobel laureate F.A. Hayek's observation that if "we treat them equally [politically], the result must be inequality in their actual [i.e., economic] position." The irresistible conclusion is that "the only way to place them in an equal [economic] position would be to treat them differently [politically]" — precisely the conclusion that the advocates of "social justice" themselves have always reached.

In the nations that had instituted this resolution throughout their legal systems, "different" political treatment came to subsume the extermination or imprisonment of millions because of their "class" origins. In our own American "mixed economy," which mixes differing systems of justice as much as economics, "social justice" finds expression in such policies and propositions as progressive taxation and income redistribution; affirmative action and even "reparations," its logical implication; and selective censorship in the name of "substantive equality," i.e., economic equality disingenuously reconfigured as a Fourteenth Amendment right and touted as the moral superior to "formal equality," the equality of political freedom actually guaranteed by the amendment. This last is the project of a growing number of leftist legal theorists that

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at www.schwarzreport.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

includes Cass Sunstein and Catherine MacKinnon, the latter opining that the “law of [substantive] equality and the law of freedom of expression [for all] are on a collision course in this country.” Interestingly, Hayek had continued, “Equality before the law and material equality are, therefore, not only different, but in conflict with each other” — a pronouncement that evidently draws no dissent.

Hayek emphasized another conflict between the two conceptions of justice, one we can begin examining simply by asking who the subject of liberal justice is. The answer: a person — a flesh-and-blood person, who is held accountable for only those actions that constitute specifically defined crimes of violence (robbery, rape, murder) against other citizens. Conversely, who is the subject of “social justice” — society? Indeed yes, but is society really a “who”? When we speak of “social psychology” (the standard example), no one believes that there is a “social psyche” whose thoughts can be analyzed. And yet the very notion of “social justice” presupposes a volitional Society whose actions can (and must) be held accountable. This jarring bit of Platonism traces all the way back to Marx himself, who, “despite all his anti-Idealistic and anti-Hegelian rhetoric, is really an Idealist and Hegelian ... asserting, at root, that [Society] precedes and determines the characteristics of those who are [its] members” (R.A. Childs, Jr.). Behold leftism’s alternative to liberalism’s “atomistic individualism:” reifying collectivism, what Hayek called “anthropomorphism or personification.”

Too obviously, it is not liberalism that atomizes an entity (a concrete), but “social justice” that reifies an aggregate (an abstraction). And exactly what injustice is Society responsible for? Of course: the economic inequality between Smith and Jones — and Johnson and Brown and all others. But there is no personified Society who planned and perpetrated this alleged inequity, only a society of persons acting upon the many choices made by their individual minds. Eventually, though, everyone recognizes that this Ideal of Society doesn’t exist in the real world — leaving two options. One is to cease holding society accountable as a legal entity, a moral agent. The other is to conclude that the only practicable way to hold society accountable for “its” actions is to police the every action of every individual.

The apologists for applied “social justice” have always explained away its relationship to totalitarianism as nothing more than what we may call (after Orwell’s *Animal Farm*) the “Napoleon scenario:” the subversion of earnest revolutions by demented individuals (e.g., Stalin, Mao — to name just two among too many). What can never be admitted is that authoritarian brutality is the not-merely-possible-but-inevitable realization of the nature of “social justice” itself.

What is “social justice”? The theory that implies and

justifies the practice of socialism. And what is “socialism”? Domination by the State. What is “socialized” is state-controlled. So what is “totalitarian” socialism other than total socialism, i.e., state control of everything? And what is that but the absence of a free market in anything, be it goods or ideas? Those who contend that a socialist government need not be totalitarian, that it can allow a free market — independent choice, the very source of “inequality”! — in some things (ideas) and not in others (goods — as if, say, books were one or the other), are saying only that the socialist ethic shouldn’t be applied consistently.

This is nothing less than a confession of moral cowardice. It is the explanation for why, from Moscow to Managua, all the rivalries within the different socialist revolutions have been won by, not the “democratic” or “libertarian” socialists, but the totalitarians, i.e., those who don’t qualify their socialism with antonyms. “Totalitarian socialism” is not a variation but a redundancy, which is why half-capitalist hypocrites will always lose out to those who have the courage of their socialist convictions. (Likewise, someone whose idea of “social justice” is a moderate welfare state is someone who’s willing to tolerate far more “social injustice” than he’s willing to eliminate.)

What is “social justice”? The abolition of privacy. Its repudiation of property rights, far from being a fundamental, is merely one derivation of this basic principle. Socialism, declared Marx, advocates “the positive abolition of private property [in order to effect] the return of man himself as a social, i.e., really human, being.” It is the private status of property — meaning: the privacy, not the property — that stands in opposition to the social (i.e., “socialized,” and thus “really human”) nature of man. Observe that the premise holds even when we substitute *x* for property. If private anything denies man’s social nature, then so does private everything. And it is the negation of anything and everything private — from work to worship to even family life — that has been the social affirmation of the socialist state.

What is “social justice”? The opposite of capitalism. And what is “capitalism”? It is Marx’s coinage (minted by his materialist dispensation) for the Western liberalism that diminished state power from absolutism to limited government; that, from John Locke to the American Founders, held that each individual has an inviolable right to his own life, liberty, and property, which government exists solely to secure. Now what would the reverse of this be but a resurrection of Oriental despotism, the reactionary increase of state power from limited government to absolutism, i.e., “totalitarianism,” the absolute control of absolutely everything? And what is the opposite — the violation — of securing the life, liberty, and property of all men other than mass murder, mass tyranny,

and mass plunder? And what is that but the point at which theory ends and history begins?

And yet even before that point — before the 20th century, before publication of the Manifesto itself — there were those who did indeed make the connection between what Marxism inherently meant on paper and what it would inevitably mean in practice. In 1844, Arnold Ruge presented the abstract: “a police and slave state.” And in 1872, Michael Bakunin provided the specifics:

[T]he People’s State of Marx ... will not content itself with administering and governing the masses politically, as all governments do today. It will also administer the masses economically, concentrating in the hands of the State the production and division of wealth, the cultivation of land, the establishment and development of factories, the organization and direction of commerce, and finally the application of capital to production by the only banker — the State. All that will demand an immense knowledge and many heads “overflowing with brains” in this government. It will be the reign of scientific intelligence, the most aristocratic, despotic, arrogant, and elitist of all regimes. There will be a new class, a new hierarchy of real and counterfeit scientists and scholars, and the world will be divided into a minority ruling in the name of knowledge, and an immense ignorant majority. And then, woe unto the mass of ignorant ones!

It is precisely this “new class” that reflects the defining contradiction of modern leftist reality: The goal of complete economic equality logically enjoins the means of complete state control, yet this means has never practically achieved that end.

Yes, Smith and Jones, once “socialized,” are equally poor and equally oppressed, but now above them looms an oligarchy of not-to-be-equalized equalizers. The inescapable rise of this “new class” — privileged economically as well as politically, never quite ready to “wither away” — forever destroys the possibility of a “classless” society. Here the lesson of socialism teaches what should have been learned from the lesson of pre-liberal despotism — that state coercion is a means to no end but its own. Far from expanding equality from the political to the economic realm, the pursuit of “social justice” serves only to contract it within both. There will never be any kind of equality — or real justice — as long as a socialist elite stands behind the trigger while the rest of us kneel before the barrel.

Further Reading

The contemporary left remains possessed by the spirit of Marx, present even where he’s not, and the best overview of his ideology remains Thomas Sowell’s *Marxism: Philosophy and Economics*, which is complemented perfectly by the most accessible refutation of that ideology, David Conway’s *A Farewell to Marx*. Hayek’s majestic *The Mirage of Social Justice* is a challenging yet rewarding effort, while his *The Road to Serfdom* provides an unparalleled exposition of how freedom falls to tyranny. Moving from theory to practice, *Communism: A History*, Richard Pipes’ slim survey, ably says all that is needed.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, February 27, 2004

Thank you!

Once again I want to thank the hundreds of Crusade friends for their continuing support of this ministry. Thank you for meeting our monthly bills. Thank you for not giving up the fight for theism, the gospel of Jesus Christ, freedom, truth, morality, and beauty as over against the forces of darkness, irrationalism, relativism, atheism, agnosticism, socialism, and communism.

For your information, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade is a tax-exempt organization and is so recognized by the Internal Revenue Service. The Crusade continues to accept wills, trusts, stocks, estates, and foundation help. In fact, because of such support from time to time, we can offer *The Schwarz Report* free of charge throughout the country. If any Crusade member wishes information regarding wills or trusts please contact us at 719-685-9043. To place the Crusade in your will or trust you need only call your attorney and let him or her complete the necessary paper work. Our legal name is Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and our address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. If you have questions regarding gifts of stock, please contact us for our account number at Quick and Reilly in Colorado Springs.

I wish to thank the estate of Elizabeth Lippitt for her recent gift to the Crusade. Thank you, Elizabeth, for remembering us in such a timely and meaningful way.

Again, thanks to Crusade supporters for making this ministry such a success. Please continue to pray for us every day as we seek to remain faithful to the vision that our Lord gave Fred and Lillian Schwarz a half century ago. I know I can say with complete confidence that Fred and Lillian, though enjoying their retirement, think of their many friends daily and wish the best for you and yours.

David A. Noebel, editor