



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 44, Number 6

June 2004

## Our 51st Year!

### Inside



#### Georgia Tech's Revolutionary Worker

by Britton Alexander, Page 4

Britton Alexander explains the "latest attack against conservative students, officially sanctioned by the School of Public Policy" at Georgia Tech.



#### Mona Charen's Useful Idiots

by William A. Rusher, Page 5

Read William Rusher's review of Mona Charen's new book *Useful Idiots: How Liberals Got It Wrong in the Cold War and Still Blame America First*.



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

## Whence Christianity?

by David Kupelian

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." —Revelation 3:15-16 KJV

Most Americans call themselves Christians.

Twice they chose as their supreme leader Bill Clinton – a sexual predator and pathological liar who regarded the "religious right" as enemies and radical homosexuals as friends, and who by any meaningful and historical measure was a traitor.

After that, millions of Christians came within a hair's breadth of electing Clinton's partner in crime, Al Gore – another pathological liar, a radical environmentalist who reveres "Gaia" but believes the internal-combustion engine should be outlawed (according to his book, *Earth in the Balance*).

Christians have stood on the sidelines during the breathtaking transformation of their once-great Judeo-Christian culture into today's neo-pagan, Sodom-and-Gomorrah-style freak show.

Christians have lost the 30-year war to protect the unborn.

Christians have lost the war for America's schools – which have been scrubbed antiseptically clean of the Christian principles and traditions that once guided those institutions, and are now filled instead with every conceivable form of propaganda and perversion.

Christians have lost their former influence in politics, in the press, in entertainment, in literature – in virtually every major area of life.

And now, Christians are losing the war for their very own institutions – their churches. The clergy sex scandal is the tip of the iceberg. Both the Catholic Church and most of the major Protestant denominations are literally being ripped apart – from within – by double agents who pretend to be "faithful" but actually loathe Christianity's historical precepts and values.

It's a harsh indictment – but hey, the truth hurts.

In his recent book, *Abandonment Theology* [New title—*America...A Call to Greatness*], author John W. Chalfant describes the precipitous decline of Judeo-Christian influence in law, culture and public policy in America, noting the 1947 Supreme Court decision that invented the modern "separation of church and state" and later decisions that outlawed Bible reading and prayer in the nation's public schools. He writes: "Once God was shown the door, America went into chaos. Scholastic Aptitude Test scores plummeted. Violent crime rocketed upward. The abortion mills did an unprec-

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

edented business as they devised ever-more-sadistic ways to kill children before and even during birth. Bill Clinton, elected president of the United States in 1992, aggressively advocated homosexuality, which God calls “abomination.” The Abandonment Clergy and their millions of undiscerning followers stood mute while America’s sudden loss of greatness became obvious even to the world.”

What’s this about an “Abandonment Clergy?” Chalfont explains: “Abandonment Theology is a term devised by the author to describe a faith which deceptively pawns itself off as Christianity by operating in the name of Christ, but which produces fruits destructive to America’s God-given freedoms. It comprises what is left today of the militant, power-filled, full-dimensional Christian faith of America’s Founders after decades of erosion, watering down and trivializing of God’s action mandates by America’s Abandonment Clergy. It is a “feel good” theology that patronizes Jesus Christ and thereby gains legitimacy, while at the same time produces disobedience to the commands of God and desertion of Christian duty.”

Chalfont describes how the “Abandonment Clergy” and their followers have responded to increasingly audacious attacks on Christian America during the past half-century: “Incredibly, this was the ultimate hour for the Abandonment Clergy to see the light of truth. They faced blatant godlessness at every turn. They could have abandoned their own ways and made a comeback to the faith of the Founding Fathers. But what did they do?”

“They observed the horrible, deteriorating conditions in America, determined that she was headed into rubble just like pagan Rome and that we must be living in the prophesied ‘last days’ and ‘end times.’ Therefore, with the end and the ‘rapture of the church’ so apparently near, why fight?”

“‘After all,’ these clergymen said, ‘We’re in this world, not of it, so to heck with it,’ and ‘Compared to eternity we’re here only for an instant.’ They told us that all that really counts is that we ‘lead as many people as possible to salvation and let our corrupted country continue on its death course.’”

Faulty Christian teaching, says Chalfont, is the only way to explain why so many well-meaning Christians are paralyzed into inaction: “The Abandonment Clergy and their followers have been teaching, preaching and saturating the media and their church members with the doctrine of surrender and political non-involvement. They are not teaching us to surrender to Christ through obedience to the commandments of God. Rather, they tell us that America is finished, that the collapse of our heritage and our freedoms has been predeter-

mined within a definable near-future time frame and is therefore beyond our control.”

Chalfont is right. But the problem with contemporary Christianity goes way beyond mere political non-involvement. Do we dare take an honest look?

One reason for the multitude of attacks on Christianity is that evil *always* attacks good – because it *is* good – because good shines a bright and painful light on the works of darkness. Jesus Himself warned His followers to expect to be persecuted, just as He was persecuted. This is the reason, and a profound one, that Christians offer to explain why they, their values and their institutions are always under attack.

However, there is another, and far more decisive, reason for the spectacular decline of Christianity in our modern era: Christianity today is very different from what it once was.

America is full of people who have accepted the idea that Jesus Christ died for their sins, and that this belief guarantees them a place in Heaven.

Some are very sincere. They are truly mortified at their former sins, genuinely contrite before God and those they have offended, and they grieve over their continuing compulsions. They have awakened from their former life of gross sin, and now want nothing more than to do the will of their Creator – whatever that may be, wherever it may lead them, whatever they may suffer. They take seriously the commandments and principles given by their Savior, and make their life revolve around emulating Him, to the best of their ability. They are, quite literally, followers of Christ – that is, Christians.

On the other hand, there are countless “Christians” who believe they have a ticket to Heaven, and nothing else really matters very much to them. Their attitude can only be described as brazen. They live lives of shallowness and selfishness, of petty emotions and jealousies, of distraction and escape, of ego and pride, and sometimes of gross corruption and treachery – remember, Clinton is a churchgoing “Christian.” This version of Christianity, more prevalent than you can imagine, literally justifies and excuses dirty rotten scoundrels. Its adherents, while living it up under the smug delusion that they’re “saved,” drive other people crazy (and away from real Christianity) with their hypocrisy.

And then there are, of course, millions of “lukewarm” Christians in between these two groups. They go to church and sing songs and sometimes read the Bible, and maybe “try to be a good Christian” – but they’re basically clueless. Their marriage is on the rocks and their children are wearing tongue studs. They believe in society’s atheistic “experts” and they’re

addicted to Internet porn.

Some Christians are actually worse off after being “saved” than before. At least before they were “saved,” they had a natural respect for, or fear of, ultimate justice – an inborn sense that somehow we all reap what we sow. After being “saved,” that’s gone for the insincere “Christian.” For him or her, belief in Jesus amounts to a “get-out-of-Hell-free” card, a sort of spiritual “diplomatic immunity.” It’s like the profligate teenage son of an important Arab diplomat who knows he won’t be prosecuted under U.S. law while living here, so he drives recklessly, molests women and generally lives it up with impunity. And because the natural and *necessary* fear of consequences has been unwisely removed from his life, he falls that much more easily to the temptations of his lower nature.

For millions of people, Christianity has become a bumper-sticker religion. Simply by saying, one time, a single phrase – “I accept Jesus Christ as my savior and repent of my sins” – you are guaranteed salvation and eternal life in heaven, no matter how insincere or selfish or shallow your motives for doing so.

Is this the kind of salvation Jesus referred to when He said, “But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” (Matthew 24:13 KJV) *Endure to the end? What’s with that? I thought this salvation thing was all settled by that altar call back in ’89.*

Is this what He meant when He said, “If ye keep My commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept My Father’s commandments, and abide in His love.” (John 15:10) Many Christians don’t bother to pay any attention at all to God’s commandments. *Hey, what the heck difference does it make? I’m already saved!*

Is this what Paul referred to when he said, “I die daily”? (1 Cor. 15:31) The apostle’s poignant and intensely meaningful reference to the duty of man to give up the life of pride in all its forms, to die to the “carnal mind” – considered central to Christians of past eras – is all but absent from most of today’s churches.

Christianity – the deepest, most meaningful and awe-inspiring religion ever, the magnificent driving force behind Western Civilization, and the transcendent hope of mankind’s future – has been dumbed down by these types into a comic-book religion. Turn on your radio and listen to some of the pitches: “Do you want to go to Hell – forever? Well, think about this: What if it really *is* true that Jesus is the Son of God, and that He is the *only* way to eternal life in Heaven? Do you want to miss out on eternal life? Then why not say yes to

Jesus right now, just to make sure? You’ll like it – it’s a natural high.”

Such altar calls are little more than an insurance pitch. “Hey, buy a little extra insurance, then you can go on with your selfish life and be guaranteed a place in Heaven no matter what.”

Just repeat the salvation “formula” – like an Eastern mantra – and you’re saved. Period.

For this type of Christian, there’s no need to do good works, because they’re saved by grace, not works. No need to obey God’s commands, because they’re already saved, so why bother? They don’t need to try to help make it a better world, because they’re gonna be “raptured” soon and the rest of the suckers who are left behind can sort out the mess.

Is it any wonder the West is dying?

What’s missing in all of this, of course, is a love of truth.

“This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoureth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me,” said Jesus. (Matthew 15:8 KJV)

Truth predates the incarnation of Christ, it predates the Bible. It’s the substance of our bond with God. If you have a love of truth, you’re just not ever really satisfied with anything else, and you want to know the truth about everything – especially about yourself. If you’re wrong about something, you want to know it. If you’ve been living a lie, you’re willing to see it – no matter what the cost.

If you don’t have a little bit of this quality, you don’t have squat – even if you call yourself a Christian.

To a truth-seeking soul, the story of Christ – not as told by a plastic minister, but as told by someone, anyone, who’s *real* – has an internal reverberation of truth in the listener’s soul. It has the quality of a wonderful old story you heard long ago, in your childhood, but had forgotten.

At the core of this life-changing religion is the individual believer’s love and appreciation and acceptance and embrace of Christ’s sacrifice – the ultimate demonstration of God’s love for His wayward children.

But the problem with the way Christianity is “taught” today is that it doesn’t require a love of truth. It doesn’t require honest introspection, or courage, or self-denial, or patience. The only ingredient it needs is a guilty person who’s sick of feeling guilty, who wants relief, wants to feel better about himself and doesn’t want to go to Hell. But even the most insincere person wants to feel better about himself, wants relief from guilt, and fears death and what may lie beyond.

So, it’s this compartmentalization and trivialization of

Christianity – into a mantra of belief – but separated from works, from obedience to God’s laws, and even more fundamentally, separated from basic honesty, integrity, love of truth and true repentance, that has ushered in a generation of shallow and ineffectual Christians.

Did you ever wonder why American founders like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin completely rejected institutional Christianity – what some call “Churchianity”? Maybe even back then too many of the churches were just too pale a reflection of Christ’s true message for them to stomach.

The Christian Church in America needs a revival. But it

doesn’t necessarily need ever-bigger tents with tens of thousands of people swaying back and forth, singing songs, giving speeches and getting pumped up – and then going home and watching television.

America’s real revival will happen when those same people go home, go to their room, close the door, take a deep breath – and take a good, long, hard look at themselves in the mirror. And then, quietly and humbly and fervently, they ask the living God for help, for insight, for direction – for salvation.

—*WorldNetDaily.com*, August 9, 2002

## Georgia Tech’s Revolutionary Worker

by Britton Alexander

In the latest front on the war against academic bias in our colleges and universities, the Georgia Association of College Republicans is dismayed to report that the School of Public Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology is formally engaged in distributing a propaganda flyer opposing the Academic Bill of Rights. The flyer is a reprint of an article attacking the Academic Bill of Rights that was published by the *Revolutionary Worker* ([www.rwor.org](http://www.rwor.org)), a self-identified communist organization. It is being distributed through the school’s Public Policy Office and had been posted throughout the building on professor’s personal boards and office doors.

Titled “Beware the Academic Bill of Rights,” the article specifically attacks conservatives and Christians, and originates from an organization that advocates “laying the basis to wage and win (for communism) the future revolutionary civil war whenever the conditions do ripen for such a struggle (in the United States).” College Republicans obtained the flyer from the Public Policy’s office last Wednesday morning and the flyer continued to be officially distributed by that office until last Friday, at which time the practice was stopped. The flyers still remain posted throughout the building and continue to occupy space on professors’ personal boards.

The State of Georgia has recently been thrust into the forefront in the issue of academic freedom. On March 24, the Georgia Senate voted 41-5 in favor of a formal resolution discouraging public colleges and universities from discriminating against students based on their political or religious beliefs. Georgia Tech student Ruth Malhotra was among those to testify at the Senate hearing in favor of such legislation, citing examples of political prejudice. “My professor told the

class, ‘Some of you don’t understand the political structure... You need to understand that Democrats will bend over backwards for you, but Republicans will cut your throats,’” recalled Malhotra.

The Revolutionary Communist Party, USA, identifies itself as, “a political Party that can lead such a struggle, a political Party that speaks and acts for those with nothing to lose but their chains.” Chairman Bob Avakian advocates a revolutionary struggle to replace the current system, stating, “It is completely worthless and no basic change for the better can come about until this system is overthrown.”

Calling the intellectual diversity movement “part of a right-wing pincer move,” the article claims that, “Horowitz and the other reactionary forces involved with this bill aren’t interested in intellectual wrangling and they’re even less interested in truth.” He further states, “they are undertaking a mean-spirited, aggressive and dangerous effort to create a climate hostile to critical analysis and understanding of the world.”

It is imperative that the issues of academic freedom and intellectual diversity are addressed in educational institutions around the country. “My concerns have never been a personal issue, but rather a strong belief that political prejudice often pervades the campus,” Malhotra said. “This is yet another example of the extreme ideology some in authority promote.” This latest attack against conservative students, officially sanctioned by the School of Public Policy, serves as ultimate proof that institutional, leftist bias exists on our campuses today despite the continued denials by university officials.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, April 22, 2004

# Mona Charen's Useful Idiots

by William A. Rusher

The collapse of Europe's Christian monarchies in the aftermath of the Enlightenment resulted in at least three distinct solutions to the problem of how to organize society in a post-Christian world. One, which ultimately won approval in most Western nations, stressed the freedom of the individual, and gave rise to institutions that favored it, both politically (democracy) and economically (the free-market economy, or capitalism). Another, drawing on atavistic impulses allegedly resident in particular societies, and fueled by the Romantic rebellion against Enlightenment rationalism, resulted in the totalitarian regimes we know as "fascist": Mussolini's Italy, Hitler's Germany, and their imitators.

The third, insisting on its strictly scientific origins, professed to have discovered "the laws of history," under which capitalism (defined as the exploitation of workers by those owning the means of production) would be overthrown by the workers and replaced by a state which would itself control the means of production. This "socialist" state would then plan the national economy scientifically, on the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

It would be foolish to underestimate the appeal of this third solution to the modern mind. The Enlightenment's central achievement, after all, had been to replace faith with reason—to make mankind, with the aid of science, the arbiter of its own destiny. Socialism, as described above, seemed to many a 19th- and 20th-century mind nothing more than the application of this technique to the problem of economics on a national scale.

A century on, we have learned better. The challenge posed by the fascist nations was faced and disposed of in the first half of the 20th century. The second half was consumed in a decisive struggle between the heirs of the Enlightenment's two competing traditions: the tradition of freedom, and the tradition of state power, which, it soon transpired, inevitably resulted in the enslavement of the people the state purported to serve.

But it should not be surprising that many people in the Western world have always found it difficult to condemn Communism quite as wholeheartedly as they condemned fascism. Communism, and socialism more generally, at least assertedly appealed to science for their justification. Perhaps (many thought) their totalitarian tendencies were not inevitable but simply the result of circumstances.

Even capitalism had its problems. Capitalism, after all, did not even pretend that its own motivating impulses were

high-minded: It argued only that each individual's desire for his own economic benefit would collectively result in a benefit to society at large. Surely socialism, and even Communism, deserved some credit for at least having a higher motivation than that.

Such, at any rate, was the frame of mind of many Western intellectuals when World War II ended in the decisive defeat of fascism, and left free societies and socialist ones (and more particularly Communism) squarely in contention for the leadership of the world.

In addition, and even worse, a good many intellectuals in the West were simply blind to the negative aspects of Communism. In the 1920s and 1930s they had become convinced that Communism was actually superior to Western societies, and no amount of evidence to the contrary—even eyewitness evidence—could change their minds. World War II, in which Britain and the United States became the military allies of "good old Joe," briefly made this mindset even easier to maintain, and the outbreak of the Cold War between the former allies found these people silently (or in some cases quite vocally) sympathetic to the Communist cause. As a result, the world's free societies were forced to wage the Cold War with far less than the wholehearted support of many liberal and leftist intellectuals. In one way or another, and to one degree or another, they effectively supported the policies and purposes of the Soviet Union.

Lenin reputedly referred to these Western intellectual defenders of Communism as "useful idiots," and this is the sobriquet Mona Charen confers on them in the title of her book chronicling their statements and activities. As a reference source, it will be absolutely invaluable to scholars for generations to come. For the rest of us, it provides a sharp reminder of just how stubbornly many liberals resisted this country's efforts to contain, and ultimately defeat, the deadly threat of international Communism.

\*\*\*

In the interests of full disclosure, I should say that I have known Mona Charen personally since she worked on the editorial staff of *National Review* (of which I was publisher) a couple of decades ago. She left our employ for greener pastures—first as a White House speech-writer for Nancy Reagan, and ultimately as a popular television commentator and syndicated columnist—and I have watched her career with pleasure. She was splendidly suited, by temperament and intellect, to marshal this stunning collection of liberal follies into a deadly indictment of their stupidity (or worse) over forty perilous years.

Her book does not contain, alas, the remarkable statement that constituted my own first introduction to a useful idiot. It blazes in my memory across the 58 years since it was

uttered. It was 1946. The Cold War was just beginning, and I was listening to a radio debate on the subject between Clare Boothe Luce and Rev. Harry F. Ward, former chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union and an ornament of New York's Union Theological Seminary (professor of Christian ethics there, I believe), who was already famous as an apologist for Communism. Mrs. Luce made a scathing reference to the Soviet Union's "concentration camps," to which Dr. Ward promptly responded, "Those are *not* concentration camps. They are *personal rehabilitation camps*, and they have done those people a world of good!" It is testimony to the impact that piece of idiocy had on me that I remember every word, and am prepared to bet money that my quotation of it is practically verbatim.

\*\*\*

Ms. Charen's formula is simple, and devastatingly effective. She simply recounts the history of the Cold War, in chronological order, and quotes what noted liberals of the day were saying about it. In recent years there has been a good deal of revisionist history ground out, the general tendency of which is to leave the impression that America was of one mind and voice on the subject of the Cold War, and specifically on the matter of the evil deeds of the Soviet Union. But Mona Charen will have none of it.

To be sure, it took the liberals a little while to get accustomed to criticizing America's resistance to the aggressive policies of post-war Communism. In a chapter entitled "The Brief Interlude of Unanimity on Communism," Charen allows that up until about 1960 both major parties were fairly uncompromising in their insistence on the need to block Soviet aggression. Probably the fact that the Korean War was embarked upon and largely waged by Harry Truman, a Democratic president, and under the nominal auspices of the United Nations at that, had a lot to do with muffling early liberal impulses to appeasement. And it was in 1960 that John Kennedy, in his inaugural address, so memorably vowed to "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to ensure the survival and the success of liberty."

But in the decade of the sixties, under the pressure of the seemingly endless struggle in Vietnam, and impressed by the explosive growth of the New Left on campuses across the United States, many American liberals turned sharply to the

left, and gradually modified their view of reality to reflect not only opposition to the war but a more generous concept of the purposes and possibilities of the Soviet Union and its satellites. (A minority of veteran liberals, unable to stomach the change, broke with their colleagues altogether and eventually found a new home under the name "neoconservatives.")

But it was not merely a certain sympathy for the Communist cause that began to manifest itself in America during the 1960s. As Charen perceptively remarks, "The profound tremor that went through American society starting in about 1965 was not just about the Vietnam War. Some deep wellsprings of dissatisfaction, petulance, and irritability were tapped by the war. All at once everything about American society—from its 'materialism' to its supposed 'militarism'—was decried and despised." Susan Sontag unerringly identified the true enemy: "During the last years Vietnam has been stationed inside my consciousness as a quintessential image of the suffering and heroism of the 'weak.' But it was really America 'the strong' that obsessed me—the contours of American power, of American cruelty, of American self-righteousness."

An entire book could have been written about the scores of liberals—Ramsey Clark, William Sloan Coffin, Jr., Mary McCarthy, Frances Fitzgerald, Jonathan Schell, Harrison Salisbury, and Noam Chomsky, to name just a few—who shared Sontag's negativism. As the Cold War progressed, domestic resistance to America's efforts to block the advance of Communism continued to reflect this element of hatred for America itself.

Take, for example, Pol Pot's bloodbath in Cambodia. By now the liberal tendency to make excuses for Communist atrocities was well entrenched. *New York Times* correspondent Sydney Schanberg, in a front-page story on April 13, 1975, reassured the paper's readers: "...for the ordinary people of Indochina...it is difficult to imagine how their lives could be anything but better with the Americans gone." Difficult, perhaps, but unfortunately not impossible.

Not surprisingly, de facto support for Communist causes often took the less dangerous form of "anti-anti-Communism." "The problem" Charen explains dryly, in describing this phenomenon, "...was not the existence of a communist threat but our groundless paranoia." What about the 10 new nations that had fallen into Communist hands between

## 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](http://www.schwarzreport.org). This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

1974 and 1980? Resistance to Marxist revolutions was futile. “The fact is,” warned Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, “that we can no more stop change than Canute could still the waters.” And that included Marxist “change.” President Carter himself spoke disapprovingly of our “inordinate fear” of Communism.

\*\*\*

As for the Soviet Union itself, it never lacked for liberal apologists, even in its worst Stalinist moments. George Bernard Shaw, Edmund Wilson, H. G. Wells, Julian Huxley, and Henry Wallace were only a few of the scores of prominent Americans and Britishers who made fools of themselves praising Stalin’s Soviet Union. And three decades after Stalin’s death, Princeton professor Stephen Cohen was still taking in the washing of the Soviet leadership, as in this almost poetic depiction of Yuri Andropov, who briefly took the helm: “Andropov seems to have been the most reform-minded senior member of Brezhnev’s Politburo, an impression he chose to reinforce cautiously in his first policy speech as the new General Secretary. Nor does his 15-year stint as head of the KGB disqualify him as a potential reformer. Soviet police chiefs, who must understand the limits of control, have become advocates of liberalizing change before.” (And, let us hope, since—President Putin, take note.)

Similarly, when Constantin Chernenko succeeded Andropov, the *New York Times*’s John F. Burns was on hand with this bouquet: “Others caution against underestimating Mr. Chernenko, who impressed several Western leaders who met him after [Andropov’s] funeral as a warmer, earthier man than Mr. Andropov, seemingly comfortable in his new role.” As for Mikhail Gorbachev, the enthusiasm of the Western press simply knew no bounds. CNN founder Ted Turner arguably won the prize for uncritical adulation with this effusion: “Gorbachev has probably moved more quickly than any person in the history of the world. Moving faster than Jesus Christ did. America is always lagging six months behind.” (There were those who suspected that Gorbachev “moved” a great deal faster than he had any intention of moving.)

\*\*\*

The American president who confronted all three of these Soviet *nonpareils* was, of course, Ronald Reagan, and it goes without saying that he suffered in comparison with all of them, in the eyes of contemporary liberals. When, in March 1983, he described the Soviet Union as “an evil empire,” their reaction was little short of hysterical. Henry Steele Commager, then a professor of history at Amherst, condemned Reagan’s speech as “the worst presidential speech in American history, and I’ve read them all.” Hendrik Hertzberg, later editor of *The New Republic*, protested that

“words like that frighten the American public and antagonize the Soviets. What good is that?” *Time*’s Strobe Talbott, later President Clinton’s deputy secretary of state, made the same objection: “When a chief of state talks that way, he roils Soviet insecurities.” George W. Ball, undersecretary of state in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, sounded a somber warning: “Mr. President, you have set us on a dark and ominous course. For God’s sake, let us refix our compass before it is too late.”

The idea that Reagan’s willingness to challenge the morality, and hence the fundamental legitimacy, of the Soviet empire would be welcomed where Communism was known the best, and would ultimately contribute to its downfall, never occurred to this bunch of Chicken Littles.

Charen notes that straight through the 1980s liberal Democrats in Congress “found fault with every weapons system for which they were asked to vote. Pointing to some future system that would theoretically work better, many would vote against nearly all military expenditures. In 1984, 194 Democratic members of the House of Representatives voted to bar funding of the MX missile. In 1987, 195 voted to forbid testing on a space-based “kinetic-kill vehicle.” Two-hundred-nineteen Democrats voted to urge the president to maintain the unratified SALT II limits without regard to Soviet compliance. A smaller number, but still a clear majority of Democrats (134 of them), voted against developing the neutron bomb. In 1986, while the Cold War was very much a going concern, 76 Democrats voted for a resolution proposed by Colorado Democrat Patricia Schroeder to cut U.S. troops devoted to NATO by 50% over five years. One hundred forty-five Democrats voted for an amendment to the defense authorization bill proposed by California Democrat Ron Dellums to bar funding for the B-1 bomber. And 146 voted to prevent modification of submarines to carry Trident II missiles.” As Walter Mondale, the Democratic presidential nominee in 1984, saw it, “[F]our years of Ronald Reagan has [sic] made this world more dangerous. Four more will take us closer to the brink.”

No group was more influential in pressing the case for “arms control” than the great majority of America’s main-line churches. In the early 1980s the National Council of Catholic Bishops called on the United States to pledge “no first use” of nuclear weapons—a pledge the Soviet Union had cheerfully made, knowing that its tremendous superiority in conventional weapons would overwhelm Western Europe. The (Protestant) National Council of Churches and the Rabbinical Assembly of America both endorsed a nuclear freeze. Bishop Matthiesen of Amarillo urged loyal Catholics to give up their jobs in nuclear arms plants.

Charen notes that on television, “Phil Donahue probably

earned the title ‘useful idiot’ as much as anyone during the 1980s,” slavishly promoting a Soviet “journalist” named Vladimir Pozner, whom he advertised as Exhibit A for the moral equivalence of the United States and the Soviet Union.

\*\*\*

President Reagan’s proposal of a Strategic Defense Initiative, to intercept Soviet nuclear missiles *en route* to their targets, predictably brought on another spasm of opposition. This time the preferred weapon was ridicule; Senator Kennedy derided the whole idea as “Star Wars,” and insisted that it would never work. A group of 6,500 scientists, including 15 Nobel Prize winners, signed a “pledge of nonparticipation” in SDI research. Democratic presidential candidate Michael Dukakis described SDI as “a fantasy—a technological illusion.” (The Soviets, however, didn’t think so. At Reykjavik, Gorbachev offered to reduce Soviet conventional forces in Europe, eliminate intermediate range missiles from Europe, and reduce the Soviet nuclear arsenal by half if only President Reagan would agree to limit SDI research to the laboratory.)

And so it went, with every development in the Cold War. The Cuban revolution was explained and praised as a different kind of Communism. (In 1981, more than 20 years into that tyranny, a United Methodist Church document described it as “a vision for the future.”) President Reagan’s occupation of Grenada, which had been turned into a Communist base in the Caribbean, was denounced by the *New York Times* as “a reverberating demonstration to the world that America has no more respect for laws and borders, for the codes of civilization, than the Soviet Union.” Determined Communist bids for power in El Salvador and Nicaragua were explained away as peasant revolts deserving, if anything, American sympathy. (Michael Harrington, founder of the Democratic Socialists of America: “The Nicaraguans are a generous people, a poor and often hungry people, who want to make a truly democratic revolution and it is we who work to subvert their decency.”)

Even when the Soviet Union collapsed and the evidence of its evil nature could no longer be concealed, its apologists found cause to regret its passing. On the CBS *Evening News* on April 11, 1990, Bert Quint described southeastern Poland as “a place where the transition from communism to capitalism is making people more miserable every day.” And Connie

Chung told viewers of the same network in late 1991 that “in formerly Communist Bulgaria, the cost of freedom has been virtual economic disaster.” Barbara Walters could hardly bear the comparison: “In the old Soviet Union, you never saw faces like these—the poor, the homeless, and the desperation of the Russian winter. Their numbers are growing. Tonight: Is this what democracy does? A look at the Russia you haven’t seen before...the price of freedom can be painfully high.”

In retrospect, it is clear that American victory in the Cold War was no foregone conclusion. At any one of half a dozen turning-points, events could have moved in directions favorable to Communism, until the cumulative momentum of serial successes overwhelmed the forces opposed to it. Fortunately, if sometimes by the narrowest of margins, the leaders of the West had the skill, the determination, and the luck to prevail. But it is very much worth remembering that their resistance was opposed, tooth and claw, by liberal and radical forces within the Western societies themselves. If those forces had had their way—if their interpretation of events had prevailed—the free world would ultimately have succumbed to its enemies.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that such an outcome would not have been wholly unwelcome to many of these internal foes who worked so diligently to bring it about. For at bottom, as Charen notes in her conclusion, “the rotten kernel of their appeasement and weakness throughout the second half of the Cold War was America-hatred”—the animus against this country that Sontag had frankly admitted early on.

Perhaps every free society nurtures in its bosom similar destructive impulses forever ready to test its vulnerability. Certainly this one did, and we are fortunate that, in the 20th century at least, the United States proved equal to the deadly challenges, both foreign and domestic, that confronted it.

This article appeared originally in the Spring 2004 issue of the *Claremont Review of Books*, published by the Claremont Institute, and is reprinted by permission ([www.claremont.org](http://www.claremont.org)).

—*Claremont Review of Books*, Springs 2004, Claremont Institute

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](http://www.schwarzreport.org).**