



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 46, Number 5

May 2006

## Inside

### Red China on the March

by Steven W. Mosher, Page 5

China is moving in as a political influence in the Carribean. Can the U.S. afford that?



### Venezuela's Hugo

by Stephen Johnson, Page 7

China's communists look to prosperity, but Chavez looks to Castro as a model.



### Dr. Ronald Nash

May 27, 1936-March 10, 2006,

Page 6

Read a tribute to a former editor of The Schwarz Report.

## Justice Tom Parker: Man of the Year

by Wesley Strackbein

And he set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, city by city, and said to the judges, "Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it: for there is no iniquity with the LORD our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts. Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehoshaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the LORD, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem." (2 Chronicles 19:5-8)

Do you remember the last time you heard of a high-ranking elected official invoking the name of Jesus Christ in his inaugural address, explaining that the Lord is the only source of life, law, and liberty?

You have heard of innumerable judges and their rulings which appear to legitimize sin and progressively banish God from the public square; but when was the last time you read of a Supreme Court justice using Scripture in a court opinion to explain and defend the biblical roots of the common law and our constitutional system of government?

And can you think of one high-ranking judge in the entire United States, currently in office, who has risked his "[career], his fortune and his sacred honor" by standing completely alone, taking an unequivocal biblical stand in the defense of women and children?

If you have followed the rise of the Christian jurist, Alabama Supreme Court Justice Tom Parker, then your answer is yes.

For demonstrating unflinching courage in the field of legal and spiritual battle; for modeling a heroic commitment to historic constitutional and Christian principles of justice; for restoring the biblical duty of the judge to defend women and children; for acting without compromise, but with remarkable charity and gentlemanly demeanor; and for restoring hope to a generation of Christians who have, for decades, lived in the shadows of judicial tyranny, Justice Tom Parker is the 2005 Vision Forum George Washington Man of the Year. In our view, he represents the very best example of visionary, righteous, Christian leadership.

A distinguishing characteristic of Justice Tom Parker is his marriage to wife Dottie. Virtually inseparable, the couple's deep love for each other and commitment to serve the Lord as a team is widely recognized. A model southern lady and a devoted student of Scripture, Dottie is usually seen by her husband's side, encouraging him and praying for him. It is clear to everyone that they are not just husband and wife; they are best friends. In a day of leaders with failing marriages

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

and broken covenants, this happy marriage of twenty-three years is an encouragement to many.

Together, the Parkers have been front and center in the battle to preserve righteousness in the land and defend the American family. A graduate of Dartmouth College and Vanderbilt Law School, Justice Parker founded the Alabama Family Alliance (now the Alabama Policy Institute) and Alabama Family Advocates. He served three Alabama Attorney Generals, where he handled death penalty cases, criminal appeals, and constitutional litigation. Throughout his legal career, Parker has fought to defend the unborn, to protect the rights of parents to home educate their children, and to defeat judge-ordered tax increases.

In January 2001, Justice Parker received an appointment that forever changed his life. Judge Roy Moore, newly elected as Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court, hired Tom Parker to serve as his Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts. During the Ten Commandments controversy, Parker served as Legal Adviser to Chief Justice Moore. Through the long fight to keep the Ten Commandments Monument in the judicial building and through Chief Justice Moore's ultimate removal from office by a kangaroo court, Justice Parker stood beside his boss and was immediately fired in the fall of 2003 after Chief Justice Moore was tossed off Alabama's high court.

Yet Tom Parker would live to fight another day. In November 2004, Parker was elected to the Alabama Supreme Court after a hotly disputed primary against Jean Brown, an incumbent Associate Justice who voted to remove the Ten Commandments monument from the Alabama Judicial Building and supported the removal of Chief Justice Roy Moore. Justice Brown and her supporters out-spent Tom Parker six-to-one, but still lost. Then, in the General Election, soon-to-be Justice Parker easily defeated his Democratic opponent.

Justice Parker's victory over Justice Jean Brown set the stage for another day of drama. Once again, both Moore and Parker would stand before the high court and their fellow Alabamians for Justice Parker's investiture. On January 14, 2005, hundreds of Alabamians packed out the Troy State University Davis Theatre for the Performing Arts in Montgomery to witness the swearing-in ceremony of Justice Tom Parker along with two other newly-elected Alabama Supreme Court Justices.

At the appointed time, Tom Parker walked toward the front of the stage to take his oath of office. Behind him, at a long table draped in black, sat the very justices who had supported the removal of Chief Justice Roy Moore and Tom Parker from office!

When he reached center-stage, Parker stood face-to-face with Roy Moore. With Dottie holding the family

Bible, former Chief Justice Moore swore in Justice Tom Parker.

Following the administration of his oath, Justice Parker walked to a podium on the left side of the stage where he addressed the capacity crowd that had gathered for the ceremony. In Parker's opening remarks as a newly-installed Supreme Court Justice, he cut straight to the heart of the raging battle over legal theory with these pointed words:

The defining question for the American people today is this: "By what standard?" By what standard shall we govern ourselves? By what standard shall our courts interpret the Constitution? Who is the ultimate voice of authority? Is it the people? Is it the judges who wear black robes? Are they truly the ultimate voice of authority? Or is there a higher source from which even the legitimacy of constitutions ultimately derive their authority, and to whom the allegiance of every policy maker and judge is due?

In his answer to this probing question, Justice Parker claimed the high ground with this proclamation:

The very God of Holy Scriptures, the Creator, is the source of law, life, and liberty. It is to Him, not evolving standards or arbitrary pronouncements of judges, that the leaders of every nation owe their ultimate allegiance.

Justice Parker concluded his remarks with these solemn words, charging himself and his fellow justices on the high court to acknowledge God in all of their endeavors:

May we [as judges] boldly proclaim that it is God—Jesus Christ—who gives us life and liberty. May we, as justices who have taken oaths to our God, never fear to acknowledge Him. And may the Alabama Supreme Court lead this nation in our gratitude, humility, and deference, to the only true source of law, our Creator.

Perhaps no other inaugural address of a state Supreme Court justice in the last century has been so constitutionally appropriate and so overtly Christ-honoring.

The 2005 murder by starvation of the helpless Terri Schaivo remains one of the great blights on the American political and judicial system. For thirteen days after sustenance was denied her by court order, Terri clung to life through agonizing forced starvation. On March 31, 2005 at 9:05 a.m., she passed into eternity.

Though he lacked direct jurisdiction to rule in the controversy, Justice Parker spoke openly about the legal and ethical meaning of the case. His was a lone voice of

sanity among state supreme court justices across America. Parker explained that the grueling and unnecessary death of Terri could have been avoided if those in authority (state and federal courts and Florida's executive branch) had not refused to intervene. He issued a statement decrying the state-sanctioned killing of Schiavo as a "shameless miscarriage of justice," explaining:

Terri's forced starvation, what one critic called "the longest public execution in American history," directly violates the Constitution of the State of Florida which mandates that "No person shall be deprived of any right because of race, religion, national origin, or physical disability," (Article 1, Section 2). No judicial order can change that.

Justice Parker lowered the boom against those officeholders who blamed Terri's murder on the judicial branch:

Some public officials who refused to act to stop Terri's unjust killing are claiming "the rule of law" kept them from acting. But the rule of law is not whatever a judge says it is; that would be the rule of man. The unpopular truth is that when a judge issues an order contrary to a higher law such as the Constitution, that order is void and should be resisted by the leaders of other branches of government who took their own oaths before God to defend the Constitution. Whether directly involved or not, every branch that refuses to act in such a case becomes culpable too.

Florida's leaders were unwilling to act, and Terri was starved to death. Justice Tom Parker concluded his official statement on the travesty with these probing words:

Ultimately, Terri's unjust death is the result of public officials lacking moral courage and fearing man rather than God. But He sees their deeds and will call them to account: "Woe to those judges who issue unrighteous decrees," the Scripture says in Isaiah 10:1, "and to the magistrates who keep causing unjust and oppressive decisions to be recorded."

The fear of God makes a hero; the fear of man makes a coward." So said World War I marksman Sergeant Alvin C. York. In the midst of the battle for Terri's life, many rulers feared man more than God. Justice Parker feared God, proving that he was more concerned about defending the helpless than receiving the praise of man.

One of the prevailing myths that has led to rampant injustice in our legal system is the doctrine of judicial supremacy—the notion that the judicial branch is the only arm of civil government that can speak with authority on

matters of constitutional interpretation.

Because this false doctrine has been embraced in our day by all but just a few in the legal profession, the courts have assumed nearly unbridled power in shaping the course of legal precedent in our land.

In early 2005, Justice Parker took the opportunity to be a voice of restraint from the bench and to argue that all branches of civil government have a binding duty to interpret and uphold the Constitution. In a concurring opinion involving a dispute over the separation of powers, Parker wrote:

Because each branch of government swears an oath to uphold the Constitution, it is reasonable to conclude that officers of each branch have a duty to constitutional interpretation.

In Justice Parker's lucid opinion, he expounded on the reasoning of *Marbury v. Madison*—the Supreme Court case most often cited in defense of judicial supremacy—seeking to put Chief Justice John Marshall's landmark ruling in proper perspective:

"It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803). In these words, which enshrined the principle of judicial review, Chief Justice John Marshall noted that constitutional interpretation is emphatically the responsibility of the judiciary. [Marshall] did not say that Constitutional interpretation is *exclusively* the responsibility of the judiciary.

By quoting from the balance of *Marbury*, Justice Parker demonstrated that, contrary to now-accepted precedent, Marshall maintained in his 1803 opinion that all branches of civil government are equally bound by the Constitution and that no arm of the law can set itself above it:

Courts have taken one part of Chief Justice Marshall's opinion and ignored another: "[I]t is apparent that the framers of the constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts... [A]nd that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument." *Marbury*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) at 180-181.

In his ruling, Justice Parker resisted judicial tyranny by granting latitude to the Alabama legislature in the case before the court, concluding with this statement: "By deferring, we show proper respect to a coordinate branch of government."

By taking this rare stand in honoring other branches of government as an officer of Alabama's highest court, Justice Parker communicated responsibility as a leader

bound by his constitutional oath. He served as an example of a man who refused to abuse or expand his power as a member of the judiciary, even though such actions are accepted practice among judges.

The Declaration of Independence makes it clear that fundamental rights are granted by God rather than being conferred by civil authorities: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights.”

The jurisdictional right of parents to raise their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, free from state interference, is one such right that may not be abrogated by legislatures or courts. Unfortunately, modern courts have set aside the presumption of parental rights by routinely invoking arbitrary standards (like the “best interest of the child”) to justify invasive actions when the state believes it has a better approach to parenting than the natural parent.

Constitutional scholars and Christian attorneys should take special note of Parker’s opinion in a very difficult child custody case that came before the Alabama Supreme Court. Parker demonstrated how the “best interest of the child” standard is often used to give courts unwarranted authority over children:

The primary cause of the Courts’ varied and often conflicting opinions in this case is disagreement over foundational issues that underlie the more visible custody issues.... Courts must recognize that the state is but one of several spheres of government, each with its distinct jurisdiction and limited authority granted by God.

Parker explained that courts must affirm parental rights in order to maintain our nation’s stability:

Explicit judicial acknowledgment of the source of parental rights is vital to support the vision and reality of the state and society our Forefathers fought and died for....

How should courts handle child-custody cases? Parker explains:

[E]ach time a court considers a child-custody dispute, it should begin by taking judicial notice of the fact that parents possess the right and responsibility to govern and raise their children; that God, not the state, has given parents these rights and responsibilities, and, consequently, that courts should interfere as little as possible with parental decision-making instead deferring to parental authority whenever it has not been fundamentally compromised by substantial neglect, wrongdoing,

or criminal act....

... [T]he law recognizes that parental authority is ordained by God as a governing sphere distinct from that of the state and, consequently, that parents or guardians, not state officials or courts, generally know what is best for, and act in the best interest of, their children.

High praise is due Justice Tom Parker for having the courage to clearly assert that parents’ rights are not privileges conferred by the state, but are a sacred trust established by God.

In one of his gutsiest and most controversial judicial stands of the year, Justice Tom Parker publicly criticized his fellow justices after they invoked the law of foreign nations as precedent to undermine Alabama’s capital punishment laws.

The background for the controversial case is tragic: In 1997, a vicious thug entered the home of a pregnant Alabama woman. He raped and repeatedly stabbed her, then fled, leaving her and her unborn child to die in a house with three other children. Police acted swiftly and caught the attacker, Renaldo Adams, literally red-handed with blood. After a fair trial, Adams was convicted of rape and murder and given the death penalty. It took the jury less than thirty minutes to recommend his execution.

Justice Parker helped prosecute Adams at the time while serving as Assistant Attorney General. Consequently, when Adams’ case came before the Alabama Supreme Court for review, Justice Parker recused himself. His fellow justices proceeded to let Adams off the hook, citing *Roper v. Simmons*, a recent United States Supreme Court decision which invoked the laws of foreign nations as the basis for freeing juvenile murderers from the death penalty (Adams was seventeen when he committed his crime). The ruling—written by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and joined by Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg, David H. Souter, John Paul Stevens and Stephen G. Breyer—held that so-called “evolving standards of decency” had changed, and that because most foreign countries now disapprove of sentencing juveniles to death, America must follow along.

Both the comments of the United States Supreme Court and the ruling of the Alabama Supreme Court demonstrate that the defining presuppositions of the modern courts are driven by the theory of evolution as applied to social theory. Instead of moral law being fixed and transcendent, law evolves to fit changing mores. Because this theory necessarily undermines the doctrine of Original Intent, it is not only unconstitutional, but it is idolatrous—placing unaccountable judges above the very moral standards of God. Both our republican system of government and the women and children of this land are

losers whenever the court embraces evolutionary standards and sets aside their duty to fully prosecute those who rape women and murder children.

In an op-ed published in the *Birmingham News* on January 1, 2006, Justice Parker criticized the actions of his colleagues on the Alabama Supreme Court for capitulating to misguided precedent from our nation's highest court:

I was shocked to learn that the Alabama Supreme Court just freed Adams from death row.... [M]y fellow Alabama justices freed Adams ... not because of any error of our courts, but because they chose to passively accommodate—rather than actively resist—the unconstitutional opinion of five liberal justices on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Reminding his fellow justices of the duty they swore to uphold when they took office, Parker wrote:

[A] judge takes an oath to support the constitution—not to automatically follow activist justices who believe their own devolving standards of decency trump the text of the constitution.... The proper response to such blatant judicial tyranny would have been for the Alabama Supreme Court to decline to follow *Roper* in the Adams case. By keeping Adams on death row, our Supreme Court would have defended both the U.S. Constitution and Alabama law (thereby upholding their judicial oaths of office).

Since publishing this op-ed, Justice Parker has been attacked by his fellow justices as well as by other attorneys and newspaper editors throughout the state who have accused him of harming public confidence of the court by openly criticizing its decisions.

Parker's response:

Exactly the opposite is true. Public confidence in the judiciary will only be restored by many more judges like myself actively resisting rather than passively accommodating judicial activism.

For unflinching courage in defense of women and children, in opposition to evolutionary standards of justice and the usurpation of American law by foreign law regimes, Justice Tom Parker is the 2005 Vision Forum George Washington Man of the Year.

"[I]t does no good to possess conservative credentials if you surrender them before joining the battle." —Tom Parker

It is right that the very first George Washington Man of the Year Award goes to the man who best modeled dignity, perseverance, and unflinching commitment to principle in his role as public servant. In the pattern of our first President, Justice Parker has "raise[d] a Standard to

## Red China on the March

by Steven W. Mosher

In January 2005, Grenada established diplomatic ties with the People's Republic of China, breaking off its longstanding relationship with Taiwan in the process. The sudden move followed a hotly contested election in which the ruling party won by the smallest of margins. The PRC has opened a substantial embassy in the tiny island nation—Ambassador Shen Hongshun and entourage arrived in April—and is rebuilding, at considerable expense, the national soccer stadium that was destroyed by Hurricane Ivan in September 2004. Other aid has been promised, including funds for scholarships in China and the renovation of the main hospital.

China's move into Grenada clones a pattern it has followed elsewhere in the eastern Caribbean. Exactly the same scenario was played out last year in the neighboring island of Dominique, and some years ago in St. Lucia. Each of these island republics now has a full-scale Chinese embassy, a completed or promised national soccer stadium, and is receiving continuing aid. Dominica, for example, is slated to receive a staggering U.S.\$112 million in aid, which works out to \$1,600 for each of the island's 70,000 inhabitants. Some of this aid was cash, ostensibly to ease the government's cash flow problems. Coincidentally, Chinese construction battalions have landed a number of government-funded infrastructural projects in the region, such as a contract to build a storm drainage system in Castries, the capital of St. Lucia.

Chinese immigration to the region is picking up, and a cultural offensive is underway. The relationships between China and the islands' ruling parties are increasingly cozy, with leading politicians regularly being invited to China for all-expenses-paid "familiarization" tours. Those not important enough for the "foreign guest" treatment receive their dose of propaganda in their own homes. Shows touting China's history, culture, and peaceful intentions are broadcast for hours on the islands' state-owned television channels—all paid for by Beijing, of course. Let a hundred flowers boom, one might say.

But Chinese moneybags-diplomacy is not cheap, and Beijing's rulers are not known for their largess—unless, that is, it serves their strategic interests. So what does Beijing hope to gain from its investments?

The immediate target is Taiwan, of course. By causing those few nations which still recognize the

island-democracy to break off ties, Beijing hopes to undermine Taiwan's *de facto* independence and hasten the day of reunification—on its terms. The PRC is fighting the Chinese civil war even in the Caribbean. Look for St. Vincent and the Grenadines to break ties with Taiwan in the next year or two.

But this alone does not explain China's continuing aggressive and expensive efforts to bring these small nations—Grenada has less than 100,000 people—under its sway. With staffs ranging from five to ten people, these embassies are able to hold regular meetings and informal dinners with leading political figures, and to monitor the eastern Caribbean's political and economic environment on a daily basis. By way of contrast, the U.S. doesn't even maintain a single diplomat in any of these countries. Instead, the U.S. ambassador to Barbados is jointly accredited to the other island nations in the Eastern Caribbean and is a complete stranger to most eastern Caribbean figures in the public and private sector.

These islands are right in our backyard (the Caribbean has been called the soft and vulnerable underbelly of the United States), and China's actions in the West Indies are of a piece with their well known activities in Cuba and Panama. While none of these islands have any great military potential for electronic eavesdropping, and none sits aside a maritime choke point, it would be foolish to forget the lessons of the Cuban missile crisis of the early 1960s. Dealing with an expansive China in the Far East will be complicated enough without having a dozen aggressively pro-Chinese nations sitting in and around the Caribbean basin.

For now, however, it seems that China has a different purpose in mind. Recall that each of these independent nations is a member of countless international bodies, chief among them the general assembly of the United Nations and the World Trade Organization. In some of these organizations, their representatives hold considerable rank. The ambassador from St. Lucia to the U.N. actually presided over the general assembly during its 2004 session. If the nations of the Caribbean could be induced to vote consistently with China in either of these bodies, this PRC-led bloc could become a force to be reckoned with.

It would prove especially useful to Beijing in the event of a future confrontation with the U.S. over Taiwan, for instance, or over trade.

China is widely believed to be flaunting WTO rules, in part by keeping its currency significantly undervalued. (The recent 2.1 percent revaluation of the yuan was insignificant.) Suppose that an unfair trade case were brought against China by the U.S. government in the WTO. Such cases are resolved, ultimately, by a vote, with WTO rules requiring a supermajority of 62 percent of the member states. Who knows if the governments of Grenada, Dominica, and St. Lucia, having been the beneficiaries of significant amounts of PRC largess, would vote with the U.S. or with China?

What should we do to counter China's moves in the Caribbean? First, we must stop taking the region for granted, reacting only after the fact, as we did after a communist coup in Grenada in 1983. That crisis, it is well to recall, would have been much worse if other Caribbean nations had not taken a firm stand against the Russian and Cuban-supported coup, and voted in favor of U.S. intervention. Would the new crop of politicians, so assiduously courted by China, come down on our side in the event of a similar problem?

To put it another way, can we allow China, an up-and-coming superpower, to replace the U.S. as the predominant political influence in the region? Opening embassies in each of these states, so that we are in a position to make America's case directly to local government officials, is essential. Thwarting China's efforts to buy friends and influence governments requires not just foreign aid — although this should be increased — but private investment as well. Increasingly, foreign investment is coming from everywhere but the United States. A Free Trade Zone for the West Indies would be a good first step toward fixing this.

China has a long history of establishing tributary relationships between it and lesser states, supporting lo-

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. 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.

# Venezuela's Hugo

by Stephen Johnson

Dictators and strongmen enjoy basking in their own glory. Spain's Generalissimo Francisco Franco waved from balconies to arranged crowds. North Korea's Kim Jong-Il once preferred to be called 'Dear Leader.' Uganda's Idi Amin loved to show off in race cars. Cuba's Fidel Castro turned olive-green fatigues and seven hour speeches into trademarks.

None managed to extend their charisma much beyond their borders. But Venezuela's authoritarian President Hugo Chavez seems to be making waves—not only in South America, but also in the United States, throwing money around from his country's oil industry, which he controls.

Here, his government reportedly pays lobbyists up to \$100,000 a month to conduct publicity campaigns and convince Congress he's a good guy, despite all the epithets he has called U.S. officials since his election in 1998.

His government supports the Venezuela Information Office, a firm employing writers and publicists operating under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Allied pro-Chavez activist groups called 'Bolivarian Circles' have now surfaced in Miami, Chicago and other cities.

This weekend, Venezuela's embassy helped organize a National Solidarity Conference on Venezuela at George Washington University along with the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES), Committee for Indigenous Solidarity-D.C. Zapatistas, and Code Pink-D.C., all a stale wind from the 1980s, when radical groups agitated to build support for Nicaragua's Sandinistas and Salvador's guerrillas.

Last fall, Mr. Chavez negotiated with selected members of Congress to sell small amounts of discount heating oil to poor neighborhoods in Northern U.S. cities, helping these officials gain political clout. Appreciated as it may have been by consumers, it came as a result of overall higher oil prices Mr. Chavez obtained by prodding fellow OPEC members to limit production. (Weeks ago, in a schizophrenic reversal, Mr. Chavez threatened to stop all exports to the United States.)

Closer to home, Mr. Chavez is friendly with the Revo-

lutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) guerrillas and allowed FARC units to camp in Venezuelan territory. His regime granted FARC commander Rodrigo Granda Venezuelan citizenship before he was captured on a bounty and returned to Colombia. His regional satellite TV network, Telesur, bashes Colombia for its relations with the United States, in addition to beaming Marxist propaganda throughout South America.

He has proposed two energy cartels, PetroCaribe and PetroSur, to integrate Latin America's state hydrocarbon industries under his dominion with the idea of slowly choking off regional sales to the United States. And, despite controlling the seventh-largest oil and tenth-largest natural gas reserves in the world, Mr. Chavez announced plans to acquire nuclear technology from Iran, fueling fears he may try to develop a bomb.

Just as worrisome, Mr. Chavez has embarked on an arms buildup to scare Brazil and Colombia. He touts plans to buy more than a million rifles, acquire armored vehicles, new attack helicopters and possibly fighter bombers from Russia. Recently, he called for Britain to leave the Falkland Islands.

Mr. Chavez opposes the planned Free Trade Area of the Americas, while advocating his own Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA)—a vaguely defined aid network financed largely by Venezuelan oil profits. Though the highway to Caracas' international airport is in disrepair, he has reportedly committed more than \$3 billion a year in aid to Latin American neighbors with no accountability to Venezuelan citizens.

He has repressed his own citizens by confiscating property, permitted thousands of Cuban officials to form a secretive shadow regime within his government, and enacted 'social responsibility' laws that make it a jailable offense to criticize public officials.

Mr. Chavez opposes the United States, its prosperity and its definition of representative democracy. Free markets and human rights have no place in his utopia. He believes neighboring democratic and market-oriented nations represent a U.S. empire of sorts, though they are sovereign states. He would create instead a confederacy of populist satraps.

The United States has worked hard to support demo-

## 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.

## Dr. Ronald Nash

### May 27, 1936-March 10, 2006

“Whenever I get mad, I write a book,” Dr. Ron Nash explained as he unloaded box after box of books onto our Summit book table.

I suppose most people would be impressed that he had written 40 books. I was most impressed that he had only gotten mad 40 times! Of course, if it was actually more than that, I’m sure Ron’s gracious wife, Betty Jane, would have concealed the fault.

Those books had a profound influence on our culture, perhaps more of an influence than Ron ever knew. They helped me to rationally apply a biblical worldview to the issues of our age. I now find that I am invited to speak to a lot of people at homeschool conferences, Christian school teacher conferences, and other events. There is not a single one of my lectures that had not been influenced in some fashion by Ron Nash.

Of all of the books Ron wrote, my favorite was called *Closing of the American Heart*. It was Ron’s Christian response to Allan Bloom’s *Closing of the American Mind*, one of the best-selling titles of the late 80s. The very last paragraph of Ron’s book lit a fire in me that burns to this day:

“One final word: we dare not forget the most important person in all of this—the young man or woman who has the potential to become a Christian leader of tomorrow. These young people are the church’s most precious treasure. Whether it is in the church, the home or the school, let us do everything possible to love them, to motivate them, to challenge them, and to *educate* them.”

It was this paragraph that made me wonder whether Dr. Nash might be willing to come speak to our humble little Christian worldview training program. He *did* come and speak, and what a lecturer he was. He had the students in the palm of his hand as he explained complex ideas in such a simple way that we all came away feeling smarter. He made us feel that we could understand what is necessary to make a difference in the world.

Ron spoke the way he wrote—no wasted words, beautifully crafted prose. When he was done, he was done. Never once in 10 years did he go overtime.

Every time Ron came to Dayton (Tenn.) it was my job to take him out to eat at *Bubbas*—our local barbeque establishment. He loved the place. Well, after two years *Bubbas* closed down. Ron had convinced me that the only reason he came to speak in Dayton was because he could eat at *Bubbas*! So it was with fear and trembling that I called him to inform him of the bad news. It all worked out well. On his next visit, Ron brought Betty Jane with him so I chose a nicer place, not one of those “fried fat” places that Ron loved so much. I’ll never forget those memorable discussions—wise counsel and encouragement from someone who was further down the path of life.

At the end of our lives, it’s not about our speeches or our books. It’s about our influence on people. One wise professor was asked to stand up at a banquet and reflect on his accomplishments. He surprised and delighted everyone by pulling out and reading a list of students whose doctoral dissertations he had supervised. They were his legacy.

Dr. Nash left a shelf full of books. But his real legacy is in the lives of the thousands and thousands of students at Summit, at Houghton, at Western Kentucky, at Reformed Seminary, and at Southern Seminary—and in an entire generation of young leaders who now understand better what it means to love God heart, soul, *mind* and strength.

Ron has passed the baton to us. It is now up to *us* to carry it as he, and the others in the great cloud of witnesses, cheers us on. Let us do so in faith and with perseverance that brings glory to our Lord and Savior.

—Dr. Jeff Myers

