



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 45, Number 9

September 2005

## Our 51st Year!

### Inside

#### **Yalta: A Great Wrong of History**

by Arnold Beichman, Page 2

FDR's failure at Yalta is not forgotten.

#### **Socialism: A Path to Tyranny**

by Stephen Moore, Page 3

Is the U.S. in slow motion to Socialism?

#### **The American Left is a Communist Left**

by Phil Brennan, Page 5

Mr. Brennan examines how Marxism dominates the Left.

#### **The Shanghai Cooperation Organization**

by Chris Brown, Page 7

Chris Brown suggests new diplomatic boundaries for Russia towards China.

## **Yalta: Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt**

by Phyllis Schlafly

Thank you, President Bush, for correcting history and making a long overdue apology for one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's tragic mistakes. Speaking in Latvia on May 7, Bush repudiated "the agreement at Yalta" by which powerful governments negotiated away the freedom of small nations.

Bush accurately blamed Yalta for "the captivity of millions in Central and Eastern Europe" and said it "will be remembered as one of the greatest wrongs of history." This admission has been 50 years coming, and Bush's words assure that "the legacy of Yalta was finally buried, once and for all."

It was at Yalta, a filthy Russian port on the Black Sea, where our dying President in February 1945 made a secret agreement with Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin to surrender millions of people to Communist oppression behind what Churchill a year later labeled the Iron Curtain. No treaty was submitted to the U.S. Senate. Indeed, the record of what went on at Yalta was not released until 10 years later.

The Soviets demanded, and Roosevelt acquiesced, that the conference be held on Soviet soil (where they could plant listening devices). Churchill said, "If we had spent 10 years on research we could not have found a worse place in the world than Yalta... It is good for typhus and deadly lice which thrive in those parts."

Roosevelt came home from Yalta and made a false report to Congress. Calling it "a personal report to you and to the people of the country." He asserted, "This conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war."

#### **Roosevelt's Concessions**

Here is a list of the European and Asian concessions he made to Stalin, which were confirmed by the Yalta documents released on March 16, 1955:

- Poland was turned over to the Soviet Union. The United States and Britain agreed to recognize Communist stooges as the new Polish government and to withdraw recognition from the legitimate anti-Communist government of Mikolajczyk.
- Germany was to be dismembered, its "national wealth" removed within two years, and several million Germans were to be sent to the Soviet Union to work as slave laborers. The record quotes Roosevelt as saying, "I hope Marshal Stalin would again propose a toast to the Execution of 50,000 officers of the German army."
- All Russian citizens who had fled to Germany from communism were to be forcibly returned to the Soviet Union (i.e., the gulag).
- The Soviet Union was allowed to keep control of Outer Mongolia, which the Soviets had seized from China. The southern part of Sakhalin and all the adjacent islands were given outright to the Soviets.

*continued on next page*

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*

· The Kurile Islands were given outright to the Soviets, and Port Arthur was given to the Soviets for use as a naval base. The Soviets were given effective control of the commercial port of Dairen, the Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South-Manchurian Railroad, using the subterfuge of assuring that the Soviet Union's "preeminent" interests would be "safeguarded."

· The Soviet Union was given three votes in the United Nations, while all other nations got only one.

Roosevelt's defenders have tried to claim that his concessions were necessary to bribe Stalin to enter the war against Japan. The Yalta papers prove that was false: Three-and-a-half months before the Yalta meeting, Ambassador Averell Harriman had relayed to Roosevelt a "full agreement from Stalin not only to participate in the Pacific war, but to enter the war with full effort."

Russia wasn't needed in the Pacific war, and letting Russia in simply opened the way for a Communist empire in China and North Korea. This set the stage for the Korean War in the 1950s and for the son of the original North Korean Communist dictator to threaten us with nuclear weapons today.

While Republicans and honest writers such as David Lawrence and John T. Flynn denounced the Yalta betrayal, the pro-Roosevelt media praised it. But truth finally overtakes lies and cover-ups. Bush set the record straight when he repudiated Yalta as part of the "unjust tradition" of Munich and the Hitler-Stalin pact that carved up Europe and left millions in oppression.

—*Human Events*, May 16, 2005

## Yalta: A Great Wrong of History

by Arnold Beichman

Last week Vladimir Putin celebrated in Moscow the end of World War II and glorified—yes, glorified—the memory of Josef Stalin, one of the great mass murderers of all time. So much for Putin and what he calls his "managed democracy."

President Bush, on the other hand, celebrated the historic date differently. He had the courage to speak truth to power in a once-captive nation, Latvia, which along with Estonia and Lithuania, had suffered for half a century under a Soviet dictatorship.

Bush told the truth about the closing conference of World War II held at Yalta, a conference that turned Eastern and Central Europe into an annex of the Soviet Gulag. He described the results of Yalta as "one of the greatest wrongs of history." He could have added that Yalta represents one of the most depressing chapters, one of the lowest points, in the history of American diplomacy.

Bush never mentioned the name of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. But it was FDR who accepted the Soviet dictated partition of the European continent and thus legitimized the enslavement of the peoples of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania. In agreeing to Stalin's Bolshevik imperialism, FDR told William C. Bullitt, a confidante: "I think that if I give him [Stalin] everything I possibly can without demanding anything in return then, *noblesse oblige*, he will not attempt to annex anything and will work to build a peaceful and democratic world."

*Noblesse oblige*, indeed! FDR, by a process of self-corruption, blinded himself to the realities of Stalin's Great Terror. He ignored written, documented warnings from State Department Soviet experts such as Loy W. Henderson, a longtime career diplomat and one of the principal architects of 20<sup>th</sup>-Century U.S. diplomacy. He preferred the lying reportage of Walter Duranty, the *New York Times* correspondent in Moscow, and the scandalous pro-Soviet reports from his ambassador in Moscow, Joseph E. Davies. This is the Davies, a wealthy corporation lawyer, who in 1946 actually preached treason, to wit: "Russia in self-defense has every moral right to seek atomic-bomb secrets through military espionage if excluded from such information by her former fighting allies." ("Davies Says Soviet Has Right to Spy," the *New York Times*, Feb. 19, 1946, Page 2).

Roosevelt was as determined to recognize the USSR as he was to ignore the openly avowed purposes of the Communist International. As late as 1953, George Kennan wrote that the United States "should never have established de jure relations with the Soviet government." Yet FDR, with willful ignorance, embarked on a recognition policy without seeking an enforceable quid pro quo. By the time FDR realized he had failed at Yalta, it was too late to do anything about it.

On March 23, 1945, 19 days before he died, Roosevelt confided to Anna Rosenberg: "Averell [Harriman] is right. We can't do business with Stalin. He has broken every one of the promises he made at Yalta." In other words, FDR had

actually believed that Stalin would keep his promises and treaty engagements.

Watching what was going on during and after the war, Kennan deplored “the inexcusable ignorance about the nature of Russian communism, about the history of its diplomacy.” He wrote in 1960: “I mean by that FDR’s well-known conviction that, although Stalin was a rather difficult character, he was at bottom a man like everyone else; that the only reason why it had been difficult to get on with him in the past was because there was no one with the right personality, with enough imagination and trust to deal with him properly; that the arrogant conservatives in the western capitals had always bluntly rejected him, and that his ideological prejudices would melt away and Russian cooperation with the West could eas-

ily be obtained, if only Stalin was exposed to the charm of a personality of FDR’s caliber.”

Roosevelt’s last year was a tragedy for the country and for the post-war world. He was, as a book title had it, a dying President. Roosevelt failed the American people. *The Dying President* by Robert H. Ferrell contains sensational revelations about FDR’s health, all hidden from the American people. A dying President came to Yalta and helped condemn millions of Europeans to death or imprisonment at the hands of the Soviet secret police.

“When powerful governments negotiated,” said Bush, “the freedom of small nations was somehow expendable.”

Never again.

—*Human Events*, May 16, 2005

## Socialism: A Path to Tyranny

by Stephen Moore

Last week the House and Senate agreed on a \$2.6-trillion budget for fiscal year 2006. There was much chest-thumping about the fiscal restraint imbedded in this budget blueprint—which was mystifying since federal outlays will grow by well over \$100 billion in 2006 when the cost of the War in Iraq is added to the equation.

Just the increase in the budget this year is equal to what it cost for NASA to put a man on the moon. Republicans in Congress have become so enamored with big government that they now celebrate a budget with a \$100-billion increase as a sign of progress.

### Fiscal Niagara Falls

But our real budget crisis—and what Newt Gingrich aptly calls the “crisis in conservatism”—is the worrisome longer-term trend line in federal spending, as calculated by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), if we stay on the course we’re on today. To put it bluntly, Uncle Sam is in a canoe, without paddles, swirling around in foamy waters, headed toward Niagara Falls.

Here are the depressing numbers in brief: Today, we spend about 20% of our total economic output on the federal government. That percentage will rise to a record 25% of output in 2025 and then to 34% in 2040.

These numbers do not include what state and local governments spend. Today states and cities swallow up roughly another 12% of our paychecks.

Even if we assume unrealistically that the state and local component of national output remains constant, what the new CBO numbers tell us is that America is on a path toward government’s taking 46% of all output. America will be half

private ownership and control and half government ownership.

Let’s not mince words: This is a path toward socialism—albeit we are taking it in slow motion. Walter Williams, the brilliant economist from George Mason University (whose columns appear in *Human Events* and who is a frequent guest-host for Rush Limbaugh), has a special talent for putting these foggy numbers in terms we can all easily understand. He says that if slavery was someone else’s owning *all* of a man’s output, then government’s taking ownership of 50% of GDP means all Americans are half slaves and half free. Depressing but true.

The economic impact of this spending path is not hard to envision. We know what happens when a nation becomes half Socialist. It begins to look like Old Europe—France, Germany, Italy. These nations with their obese welfare states, confiscatory tax systems, government ownership of industry, and stifling regulations, are economically catatonic. They are not growing. They are not creating jobs. They are rusting. They have twice the rate of unemployment we have in the U.S. today.

The latest budget forecasts have hardly caused a peep of concern from our political class. Some budget hawks—such as Rep. Jeff Flake (R.-Ariz.) and Sen. Tom Coburn (R.-Okla.)—have taken up pitch forks and are raising Cain. But they’re about as popular with their colleagues as the bartender at a bachelor’s party who announces last call.

Too many Republicans, says Coburn, have made their separate peace with big government and have no intention of cutting it down to a more manageable size. And, of course,

the Democrats, behind their new philosophical torchbearer, Hillary Clinton, want health-care, child-care, pension, transportation and energy-policy socialism accelerated.

Where is the growth of government going to come from? Almost all the future explosion of government spending and debt comes from Social Security and Medicare, with Medicare being the primary future borrower.

The prescription drug benefit bill from last year alone added more than \$10 trillion in government outlays with one stroke of the pen. I recently asked Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin what the total unfunded liability is for the long term with respect to the prescription drug bill. His answer: "It is infinite." Too big to be counted or calculated. This Republican bill may have been the most financially irresponsible legislation of the last 30 years.

Treasury Secretary John Snow recently announced that the total unfunded liabilities of the United States government total \$80 trillion. Ouch! That's a debt load equivalent to about six times our current GDP. It is almost twice as much as the value of all goods and services produced everywhere in the world last year. And it is more money than has been earned by every American cumulatively since the *Mayflower* landed here 500 years ago.

What is speeding us toward this fiscal collapse is the hyperinflation in health costs. Since we turned our health care system largely over to government, medical inflation has outpaced inflation of everything else we buy by 142%.

These numbers should frighten even welfare-state liberals. John Goodman, president of the National Center for Policy Analysis, finds that, if we don't slam on the brakes of big government, within 25 years all of our federal revenues will go to pay for hospitals, doctors, and retirement checks to senior citizens. There will be no federal money left for roads, for military weapons, for our soldiers, for schools, for the courts, the FBI, or the air traffic control system, let alone pork items such as the Cowgirl Hall of Fame, honey-bee subsidies, and the Grammys.

The Republican budget, in short, is on an unsustainable and economically reckless course. The bond raters at Standard & Poors recently declared that if we don't change our fiscal eating habits in Washington, one day during our children's working lives, Uncle Sam's credit rating will be junk bond

grade—which is where Argentina is today.

President Bush has taken one enormous step toward fiscal sanity by trying to fix the Social Security long-term crisis. Democrats are floating around on the planet Pluto when they say "there is no crisis" to fix. President Bush's plan would lower the long-term liabilities of Social Security by half—and that's a very good first step in fixing the leakages in our ship of state.

The next logical step is one that President Bush won't be so enthusiastic about, but it must be done. The financially catastrophic Medicare prescription drug bill must be repealed immediately before seniors get hooked like opium on this new feature of American-style socialism. Once they do, there's no taking the benefits away.

### **Reagan Republicans Needed**

Next we need to radically overhaul Medicare. David M. Walker, director of the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently told Congress that the unfunded liabilities are so gigantic that "there is no way we are going to deliver all of Medicare's promises. No way!" The Bush Administration's cost-containment strategies—such as health savings accounts, co-payments, and medical liability reforms—are a promising start to slowing the stampede of medical costs. But a whole new philosophical shift must occur in health care so that today's workers understand that they themselves will be primarily responsible for paying their own health care costs, not their children and grandchildren.

The slow road to socialism is a path to tyranny and economic decline, as F.A. Hayek warned us 50 years ago. That is why Newt Gingrich is right that the conservative movement has arrived at a crossroads. For 25 years the strategy of conservatives has been to elect Republicans to rein in big government. But the beast has escaped and is now back on a rampage—and this has occurred on the GOP's watch.

We need a new generation of Ronald Reagan Republicans who, instead of making a separate peace with big government, will fight a containment policy that concedes not another inch of territory to the Socialist agenda. Where such leaders are right now is anyone's guess—but it's doubtful they will be found in Washington.

—*Human Events*, May 9, 2005

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.

# The American Left is a Communist Left

by Phil Brennan

Communism is alive and well, says *The End of Time* author David Horowitz.

And he should know. The son of Communist parents and a former Communist himself, he has crusaded against the Marxist left on college campuses and written books exposing the influence of the left on America's political culture.

In an exclusive interview with NewsMax.com, Horowitz spoke about his new book and the Marxist domination of today's Democratic party.

In his book, Horowitz writes about his views on life and death, and explains his belief in the destructive nature of Utopia-driven ideologies, noting: "The desire for more than is possible is the cause of greater human misery than any other."

He places Communism in that category, and recalls how his father devoted his life to the pursuit of "more than is possible." Horowitz explains how since leaving the party he has devoted his life to fighting Marxism in all its forms, not as a conservative ideologue, but as a seeker after truth and the meaning of life.

"*The End of Time* is not a political book," Horowitz told NewsMax.com. "It's a philosophical book and while it talks about political themes, it does so from a very foundational point of view. It's not a book for people who want to know what I think about the judicial nominations."

In our interview, as he did in *The End of Time*, he stressed his belief that far from being a threat in the past, Communism is a real force in American politics today.

**NM: In your book you write about Communism and its appeal. Is communism still alive today?**

DH: Communism is alive and well.

**NM: Is it alive and well in the Democratic Party?**

DH: The Democratic party is very close to being the [Communist-controlled Progressive] party of Henry Wallace.

**NM: In other words, a Marxist Party?**

DH: In my book *Unholy Alliance* I laid out what I called the mind of the left and showed the absolute continuity of the critique of capitalism in America between 1940 and 2003. Today's left sees the world pretty much in the same terms as the Stalinists did.

What has happened is that it has lost its faith in the working class, so its agenda is entirely negative. They've dropped the dictatorship of the proletariat and they all say they're democrats, but so did Lenin.

The vast bulk of the American left is a Communist left and

they've introduced some fascist ideas like "identity politics," which is straight out of Mussolini. They don't talk about the working class, they talk about women and race. There's not much that they've learned from the history of the 20th century.

**NM: In Whittaker Chambers' book *Witness* he saw this struggle as being either the great social wars of the 20th century, or the wars of faith.**

DH: Chambers was a believer and I'm an agnostic with a great respect for believers. But the Islamic radicals are believers and it's not a secular belief, it's a religious belief.

There are believers who come both in secular and religious forms and they think they can take the work of salvation into their own hands.

These are all liberation theologians whether they are on the left or the right, and they are extraordinarily dangerous people precisely because they think they are in some ways talking to God or doing his work, and if you are doing God's work, it would justify anything.

I think you have to do what's right but without proposing to yourself that you can save the world.

**NM: But don't we have some responsibility for doing what we believe is right?**

DH: Yes. There's a passage in the book where I deal with my wife April talking about my "mission." My mission is a personal mission – to undo what I did as a leftist, to witness to the truth that I learned and to try to save even if it's only one or two individuals. That's what I do.

There are things that are beyond me. You have to think of Mohammed Atta or Timothy McVeigh – I wouldn't go blowing up federal buildings even for an end that I thought was good. They thought that what they were doing was noble.

One has to fight the good fight but one shouldn't delude oneself into thinking of oneself as a redeemer. Leftists—they call themselves "progressives"—are the arch reactionaries. When they get into arguments they are rude, they step on you, they kick you in the groin and they would kill you if they had the opportunity—you can see it in their passions. That's the sign of people who are intoxicated with their own self-righteousness. You don't really see that with conservatives.

**NM: Is that what we are seeing now in the battles on Capitol Hill? It seems to be sheer hatred on the part of the left.**

DH: That's because they think they are saving the world from the devil, which is us.

**NM: Are the young being indoctrinated into Marxism?**

DH: There's an unbelievable number of people on the campuses indoctrinating kids in the worst prejudices of the left. There are a lot of people of faith on campuses, but they are blacklisted from being on the faculty.

**NM: How deep has this indoctrination gone?**

DH: The Democratic party has never been such a left wing party and I think that comes directly out of the campuses. The whole Howard Dean campaign is what shifted the Democratic party to the far left. You had three Democratic front-runners - Kerry, Edwards and Gephardt - who were all supporters of the war until the Deaniacs came along. And who were the Deaniacs? They were the campus Communists.

The reason you have a blacklist and the reason you have indoctrination, which you've never had before on such a scale, is that you have the generation of the 1960s radicals who to avoid the draft and keep organizing against the war stayed in school and got student deferments and went on to become professors.

They are not academics, they're political activists. Do you think the woman who invited Susan Rosenberg, a convicted bomber, to be a visiting professor at Hamilton and followed that by inviting Ward Churchill - the closest thing to a campus terrorist guerilla - is an academic? Do you think she's a scholar? She's actually the daughter of a Communist lawyer, Victor Rabinowitz, whose closest friend is Leonard Boudin, another Communist whose daughter Cathy was a Weather Underground terrorist.

These people have infiltrated the academic world and converted it and largely captured the Democratic party in the process.

**NM: The Democrats' objections to certain judges nominated to the federal bench are the result of their being pushed very hard by their prime supporters, which is the abortion industry and the gay lobby, and in many ways don't they seem to have been captive to that as much as they are captive to a leftist agenda?**

DH: I don't see the abortion or gay lobbies as special interest groups. I see them as just part of the left. The gay lobby is not interested in gay people - they care about their radical agenda. The same thing with the abortionists.

Take another group, the feminist lobby. When Bill Clinton started abusing women you didn't hear a peep out of them because their agenda isn't women - their agenda is getting their people into power. Because what they are about is changing the world.

In SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) they used to say, "The issue is never the issue, the revolution is the issue." That's the way I look at this. This is a power struggle. It's not about judges, it's not about abortion - it's to stop the Bush agenda.

Here's Janice Rogers Brown, a black female, daughter of a sharecropper. Everything in their overt agenda should lead them to say, "This is great! We care about the equality of women. Half the country is Republican. We have a Republi-

can black woman. Now those racist Republicans will have to respect a black woman."

But that's not what their agenda is. The way they see it is, "My God, if the party of Satan gets a black woman in there, they will fool people into thinking they are not the party of Satan." So the cause is what it's about. The issue is never the issue, the issue is always the revolution.

**NM: How would you define the Bush agenda?**

DH: From the standpoint of the left? They are psychotic these days. They are living in an alternate reality. They make no sense whatever when they are talking about Bush.

As a conservative, I think the man has risen to the hour in terms of the war on terror. He's very Churchillian in that. This is what he'll be remembered for. He saved us an enormous amount of grief and he's done it against unbelievable odds and in the face of the most horrific attacks on a sitting president in history.

If we hadn't gone to war when we did, Saddam's weapons laboratories would be booming; he would be funding terrorists and arming them all over the world; Gadhafi would still have his chemical weapons lab, the largest in the third world, and he'd have his nuclear weapons lab; there wouldn't be a democracy movement in the Middle East; it's very possible that Pakistan would now be an Islamic nuclear state; and the United States would have been so weakened it would have incited much challenge to its power. It's hard to imagine what would have happened.

The reality is that we haven't been attacked since 2001. There's not a living human being who would have bet on September 12, 2001 that we would not be attacked again on our own soil in four years. All of that is due to George Bush and his aggressive war on terror. He's one of the great figures of recent times.

**NM: Your wife April is apparently a believer. She made the statement that when she gets to the afterlife she wants you to be there, and she's afraid that if you don't believe you won't be there. Has she had any impact on you in that respect?**

DH: You can't make somebody a believer. She wanted me to open my heart, so yes, she has had an impact - I will keep my heart open.

**NM: Is *The End of Time* your last will and testament?**

DH: "Hopefully that's premature. When you reach your 60s as I did when I began this, you can see the horizon coming. I have a passage in the book where I talk about how 20 years is like a lifetime. Well, 80 is pretty old even these days. It's time to think about those things. It's a book for people who have reached a certain age."

—*Newsmax.com*, June 1, 2005

# The Shanghai Cooperation Organization

by Chris Brown

Putin's recent lament about the fall of the tyrannical-Soviet system as "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century" received only passing notice within the general press. This misguided view is not only tragic but also potentially dangerous for the millions in Russia whose freedoms are under attack daily, in addition to hundreds of millions of others around the world whose futures are at risk because of Putin's policies. If one is to understand the implications of Putin's statements for the future, one must look to history in addition to events unfolding outside of Russia.

To understand Putin, including his view of government and the role of State, one must remember the situation present in Russia at the beginning of his professional life. Following the removal of Khrushchev in the sixties, Brezhnev allowed the diffusion of control away from the position of Secretary General of the Soviet Union to the "power ministries." At the time in the 1970s when Putin joined the KGB, which was under the leadership of Andropov, these ministries and, in some respects, the Soviet Union itself was at the height of power. From this pinnacle Putin was witness to the decline and fall of the Soviet system that many of his generation blame on the liberalization within the Soviet Union. With this came the accompanying loss of the privileges enjoyed by the elite, of which Putin was a member, and the loss of power on the world stage. This power was based on the amoral application of fear, oppression, and violence, which the Soviet leadership misunderstood to be respect.

With this history in mind, it is easy to see why Putin would be nostalgic for a time when he and his fellow elites were veritable masters of their world. It also explains why Putin has been systematically dismantling many of the freedoms that were won by the Russian people because he likely blames these liberties for the decline of Russia's strength and its position of 'respect' in the world. Putin seems to believe that by looking back he can move Russia forward. Unfortunately, not only do these domestic policies, which include curtailing basic liberties while centralizing more control in the Kremlin, have grave

repercussions for the Russian populace, but the evolving foreign policy portion of the Putin worldview presents dangerous challenges to the U.S., its allies, and even Russia itself.

The most obvious, but apparently ignored, challenge to the U.S. from this neo-Soviet policy is a growing cooperation between China and Russia. This cooperation has included the signing of the treaty creating the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, or SCO, in June 2001 followed a month later by the bilateral "treaty of good neighborliness and friendly cooperation."

Comprised of almost every nation from the former Soviet Union in Central Asia together with China, Russia, and Mongolia, the SCO is perhaps the most dangerous organization that the American people have never heard of. Although the SCO does not currently possess the same nature as the Warsaw Pact, it is not, as its apologists claim, purely an economic organization with limited military characteristics. By its own post-September 11<sup>th</sup> definition its purpose is to fight the "three evils" of separatism, extremism, and terrorism. However, considering the nature of some of the member states the actual definition of those "three evils" is extraordinarily loose. This includes the Chinese leaderships policies in Tibet, Xinjian, Hong Kong, and Macao, as well as the obsessive desire to extinguish the freedom, democracy, and sovereignty of Taiwan whose existence the PRC view as examples of extremism, separatism, and continuously labels any attempt by Taiwan to defend itself as terrorism. In one ironic yet fitting twist the regional anti-terrorism center of the SCO in Uzbekistan is known by the acronym RATS.

Under the formal structure of the SCO, the senior leaders from all the ministries of the member countries, including the heads of state/government, meet at least once a year to increase cooperation and coordination. An additional concern for the U.S. and our allies is the potential future inclusion of Iran in this organization, particularly since one of the programs of the SCO is the linking of the road systems in the region, which would ease the transportation of all manner of dangerous goods between the world's leading state sponsors of terrorism and the communist regime of China, which views the proliferation of WMD and ballistic missile technology as an extension of diplomacy. These road systems could potentially place such shipments out of the reach of the U.S. under the existing efforts of the Proliferation Security Initiative.

## 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.

More worrisome than the SCO, however, is the bilateral treaty between Russia and China. Although this is often dismissed by those who either can't or don't wish to deal with the implications of a growing Sino-Russian relationship, the July 2001 treaty has some strong language that cannot be denied. Article nine of the treaty reads as follows:

When a situation arises in which one of the contracting parties deems that peace is being threatened and undermined or its security interests are involved or when it is confronted with the threat of aggression, the contracting parties shall immediately hold contacts and consultations in order to eliminate such threats.

Perhaps the most chilling portion is the last words of that provision, particularly if one compares it to the second paragraph of article three from the Warsaw Pact which is analogous to Article 5 of the NATO treaty:

They [the contracting parties] shall immediately consult with one another whenever, in the opinion of any one of them a threat of armed attack on one or more of the Parties to the Treaty has arisen in order to ensure joint defense and the maintenance of peace and security.

This language from the Warsaw Pact was the basis of

nightmares during the Cold War, and yet it is civil when compared to the bold assertion that China and Russia will, when they deem it appropriate to their definitions of peace and security, hold "consultations in order to eliminate such threats."

It appears that Putin somehow believes that the post-Cold War U.S.-Russian relationship is governed by the same zero-sum paradigm as it was during the Cold War. This, together with Russia's apparent nihilistic approach to the current global position of the United States, has led Russia to become China's arsenal of tyranny.

If Putin and the Kremlin leadership cannot see the dangerous path that they are on, after all this time Moscow would be in the subservient position to Beijing, it will continue in the direction of creating an extremely dangerous situation for Russia, the United States, and the world. Perhaps it is time for the U.S. to clearly explain to Russia that if it continues to undermine the very domestic institutions and freedoms that provide the only potential for raising Russia up, while at the same time arming and strengthen the Chinese, Russia may one day awake to find its Far East and its natural resources have become the sovereign territory of China while whatever remains of Russia is nothing more than a client to China forced to follow orders from Beijing.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, May 27, 2005

## Thank You for *The Schwarz Report!*

Dear Dr. Noebel,

I have received *The Schwarz Report* for 5 years or more. It is one of a dozen such newsletters I get monthly. In the past I had just leafed through *The Schwarz Report* and threw it in the trash. But that has all changed.

I'm 56 years old and have recently begun to go through some kind of a spiritual crisis, a good one I believe. I have awakened to what is really important in life. Within the past few months I have read *The Schwarz Report* as if for the first time. I am more than fascinated, as if I'm realizing the first true document about a world more dangerous and different than I remember a mere year ago. I was taken aback to learn about the many *Christian Scientists* in your April 2005 issue. In your June issue I have begun to read every word, starting with the "Myths of Yalta." What a history lesson that was.

I am writing you now to beg you to forgive my neglect of the past. *The Schwarz Report* now has an important file at my desk and I await each issue to learn the truth about the world the Lord warns us to come out of.

I'm sending my first donation to assure you that I have a new appreciation, especially for the history, and nuts and bolts of how our world really works in the past and now. . . [Please] do not stop the production of this eye opening, real view of history. I now see *The Schwarz Report* as one of the most important pieces of material I get. Thank you for not forgetting me and for your years of tireless work.

Sincerely,  
E. M.  
Selma, OR