



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 50, Number 2

February 2010

## The United Socialist States of America

by Cal Thomas

Not all revolutions begin in the streets with tanks and guns. Some advance slowly, almost imperceptibly, until a nation is transformed and the public realizes too late that their freedoms are gone.

Such is the revolution now taking place in America. The '60s crowd has emerged from the ideological grave and is about to impose on this country a declaration of dependence in the form of government-run health insurance and treatment. It matters not what facts are known about this "coup," because to those from the '60s—whether they lived in that decade or were born later and adopted its ideology—only feelings and intentions matter, not truth and results.

Why would anyone trust government—which has a difficult enough time winning wars—to properly administer health care? What track record does government have in living up to its economic forecasts and competence in running anything?

But this is about none of that.

This is about liberal Democrats realizing their decades-old dream of complete control of our lives. Every move you make, every breath you take, they'll be watching you. Except, of course, when it comes to terrorists who want to destroy America faster than the liberals do. A different standard is applied to them.

Nowhere in the debate over health care "reform" have we heard a single word from liberal Democrats about personal responsibility, self-reliance, and freedom. In fact, the message has come through quite clearly that government will penalize anyone who demonstrates such beliefs, as it attempts to spread your wealth around.

This is how I see health care reform working: If you are a doctor who has spent a lot of money and time becoming a responsible and caring physician, the government will tell you how much to charge your patients and, in fact, whether you will be allowed to treat them at all.

Bureaucrats, having given themselves the power of God, will decide whether a patient is worth the cost of treatment, thereby deciding who lives and who dies. Despite the Stupak-Pitts amendment, somewhere down the line taxpayers will be forced to underwrite abortions in violation of the consciences and faith of the majority.

This is the triumph of the humanistic, atheistic worldview. We are all to be regarded as products of evolution in which the fit and the powerful will decide our survival and worth.

When Republicans were in the majority, deficits mattered to Democrats. Now we see that expressed concern was a

**Editor's Note:** Due to the increase costs of printing, handling, and postage relative to the publishing of *The Schwarz Report* the next few issues could be your last unless we hear otherwise. Please let us know that you want to keep receiving our unique newsletter as the collision of worldviews becomes more intense and the quest for world government could indeed be closer than most of us wish to contemplate. While there is a general feeling that the Marxist/Leninist worldview is history, only the historically blinded could accept such a conclusion. The truth is there are six "evangelistic" worldviews vying for the world and Marxism is a major player. In these days of spiritual, political, and economic turmoil, all Christians need to be fully informed and motivated to "keep the faith." Your response to this note will be appreciated as we seek to place our house in order. *The Schwarz Report* is also available online at [www.schwarzreport.org](http://www.schwarzreport.org). If you prefer that option, let us know, and we will discontinue sending the publication by mail.

sham, because if deficits meant something when they were relatively small, they ought to mean something more when we are in hock up to the necks of our Chinese-made clothes.

We've only just begun with this. The new breast and cervical cancer screening guidelines may soon become mandatory as health care rationing kicks in. The unwanted, the inconvenient, and the "burdensome" could soon be dispatched with a pill, or through neglect.

Great horrors don't begin in gas chambers, killing fields, or forced famines. They begin when there is a philosophical shift in a nation's leadership about the value of human life. Novelist Walker Percy examined the underlying philosophy that led to the Holocaust and wrote: "In a word, certain consequences, perhaps unforeseen, follow upon the acceptance of the principle of the destruction of human life for what may appear to be the most admirable social reasons."

In our day, the consequences of government seizure of one-sixth of our economy and government's ability to decide how we run our lives (it won't stop with health care) are foreseen. They are just being ignored in our continued pursuit of personal peace, affluence, and political power.

Opinion polls show a majority of Americans reject this health care "reform" bill. They think haste may waste them in the end. It doesn't matter. Like members of a cult, whatever the leader says, goes. The facts be damned. The crowd from the '60s will "seize the time," in the words of Black Panther radical Bobby Seale, thus sealing our doom as a unique and wonderful nation.

Welcome to the U.S.S.A., the United Socialist States of America.

—*The Washington Times*, November 24, 2009, A19

## What's so Great About America?

by Ben Stein

I am writing this in mid-November. This means that in about 12 days, I will be 65. That makes me officially a senior citizen. I don't get Social Security, but I do have Medicare now. It is just a thin little paper card, not even plastic, but it makes me feel old. I don't like it.

But as I look back on my 65 years, as all of us old people do, I see how unbelievably blessed I have been. BEYOND WORDS, beyond all imagining.

I got to spend my life in the United States of America. This country is a true paradise on earth. I often think back to what my ancestors in some miserable shtetl in Russia would think if they saw the way I get to live in America: full legal equality with the majority population, full economic opportunity to do anything my little heart desires and that I am capable of, totally complete freedom of speech.

I don't know where my ancestors came from exactly in Russia, although my father once mentioned some town called Bilsk. But my understanding is that they lived extremely modestly, in little ramshackle houses, in terror of the Cossacks and the pogroms. They were probably close to broke all of the time and certainly lacked any kind of luxury I take for granted. Naturally, they could not vote or choose the people who governed them: That was the tsar, whose voice was law and who seemed all powerful but was a puppy dog compared with the murder-machine Bolsheviks who followed the tsars.

What would my ancestors from the 15th century, probably one day away from starvation each day, have thought about their descendant living in a home with palm trees and a swimming pool and another with a view of the Pacific Ocean? What would they have thought of me being able to appear on a little lighted box so millions of people could see me at once? What would they have thought of the fact that my father, also their descendant, closely advised presidents of a land they never knew of, but that would become the most powerful, most glorious place in the history of man?

I even think of my grandfather, my father's father, who came here as a fatherless boy, and served for many years as a U.S. Army cavalryman. Not in a plane or on a tank, but on a horse. . . what would he think of the fact that his little boy, my father, who helped out with the bills by delivering newspapers in Detroit and Schenectady, would have the ear of world leaders?

What would he, who was unemployed during most of the Great Depression, think of me swimming endlessly in my pool under starry skies as my dogs slumber on the lounges?

I think of the specific luck of Ben Stein to be in America, but I also think of the luck of every American just to be in America. Long ago, I said to my pop, "Dad, we live better than any Jews in history have ever lived." My father, a truly brilliant man, said, "Benjy, the whole point of America is that we all live better than we did anywhere else: the blacks, the Asians, The Irish, the Germans. . . it's better for all of us here than anywhere else."

I wonder just how much today's leaders of this great country realize the exceptionalism of this nation. In the Marxist history departments of today's universities, they don't teach that we are exceptional. We are just another racist, money-grubbing country. We are just war mongers and exploiters like everyone else, say these people with their tenure and their hybrid cars.

Nonsense, say I. There is only one America where a man like Barack Obama, out of nowhere, with no family background of connections or power, could come to be president. There is no other country that takes in the wretched of the earth and in two generations—in one generation—raises them to the ranks of the mighty. If America is murdered by the Muslim terrorists and the environmentalist dictators and the atheists who want to take God out of our lives, there is no other place for freedom to have its citadel. There will be just unending darkness across the earth.

I hope Mr. Obama knows this. I hope Nancy Pelosi knows this. I hope you know this. We are in a fight now to save America, and winning this fight is more important than political correctness or trying to forecast the weather a hundred years from now. We are in a fight to save the America that has given so many of us lives we could not have imagined.

—*Newsmax*, January 2010, P. 23

---

## A Kinder, Gentler Marxism

by Gene Edward Veith

Barack Obama is not a socialist, explained Eric Etheredge of *The New York Times*. He is a “social democrat.” The administration's attempt to control private companies and the free market should not alarm us, according to Etheredge and other pundits. European nations do this all the time. It is simply an application of the European political and economic theory known as “social democracy.”

If social democracy is America's new governmental principle, we should know a little about it. To avoid biased spins and inflammatory rhetoric, let us consult basic, objective sources such as dictionaries and encyclopedias.

Here is the definition of “social democracy” from *Merriam-Webster's* online dictionary: “1 : a political movement advocating a gradual and peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism by democratic means; 2 : a democratic welfare state that incorporates both capitalist

and socialist practices.”

So this political and economic system either moves from capitalism to socialism or incorporates both capitalism and socialism at the same time, so as to form a welfare state.

We need to know more. Here is the first paragraph of the entry for “social democracy” in *The Encyclopedia Britannica*: “A political ideology that advocates a peaceful, evolutionary transition of society from capitalism to socialism using established political processes. Based on 19th-century socialism and the tenets of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, social democracy shares common ideological roots with communism but eschews its militancy and totalitarianism. Social democracy was originally known as revisionism because it represented a change in basic Marxist doctrine, primarily in the former's repudiation of the use of revolution to establish a socialist society.”

The article goes on to chronicle the development of this theory, which was crystallized by the German Marxist Eduard Bernstein in an 1899 essay titled “Evolutionary Socialism.” He noted that the horrible conditions for workers that characterized the early stages of the industrial revolution had, in fact, improved greatly. “Whereas Marx had declared that the subjugation of the working class would inevitably culminate in socialist revolution,” says the article, “Bernstein argued that success for socialism depended not on the continued and intensifying misery of the working class but rather on eliminating that misery. He further noted that social conditions were improving and that with universal suffrage the working class could establish socialism by electing socialist representatives.”

After World War II, social democratic political parties arose throughout Europe, including Great Britain's Labour Party, after forming governments in Germany and becoming dominant in Scandinavia. “In addition to abandoning violence and revolution as tools of social change,” continues the encyclopedia, “social democracy took a stand in opposition to totalitarianism. The Marxist view of democracy as a ‘bourgeois’ façade for class rule was abandoned, and democracy was proclaimed essential for socialist ideals. Increasingly, social democracy adopted the goal of state regulation, but not state ownership, of business and industry as sufficient to further economic growth and equitable income.”

So “social democracy” is a variety of Marxism that rejects revolution in favor of democracy and that preserves certain elements of capitalism, though under strict state control.

Social democrats are not communists, but their Marxism is evident in their belief in class struggle. Thus the vilification of “the rich” over against “working Americans.” Also Marxist is the project of redistributing wealth, the use of state power to seize control of private property, and the overarching secularism that rejects the past in favor of a materialistic progress.

When Americans cast their votes for Barack Obama and a Democratic Congress, did they also intend their country to adopt this kinder and gentler form of Marxism?

If we are going to change our entire economic system and our entire philosophy of government, shouldn't we at least think this through? This would surely be a good topic for a congressional hearing. If we are going to throw out the traditional American model of a limited government in favor of social democracy, we should hold a constitutional convention to come up with a different founding document.

Instead, we are embracing social democracy without questioning the Marxist worldview and without even realizing what we are doing.

—*World* magazine, April 27, 2009

---

## The Toilet Paper Revolution

by IBD editors

If you ever wonder why we so resist socialism, consider the latest news out of that collectivist island paradise known as Cuba.

Central planners announced this week that they were fresh out of money to buy toilet paper—yes, toilet paper—for the island's 9 million citizens. But not to worry. A nameless official for state-run monopoly Cimex and quoted by Reuters assured that “the corporation has taken all the steps so that at the end of the year there will be an important importation of toilet paper.”

The predicament would be funny if it wasn't so pathetic. But toilet tissue is hardly the only item Cuba is lacking. Food itself is in short supply, with red bean and chickpea rations cut by a third, according to the *Miami Herald*. Special hard-currency-only stores for the elites have mysteriously failed to open after last week's “inven-

tory,” with no explanation given.

There's no gas, either. The Associated Press this week reported that state planners have decreed that oxen—yes, oxen—would replace tractors in the fields, a bid to conserve fuel. This, despite the fact that Cuba gets 100,000 barrels of oil a day from Hugo Chavez's Venezuela—effectively free, because Cuba never pays its bills.

But again, not to worry: Cuban socialists say the ox represents progress because it's so eco-friendly.

As these examples of Cuban progress roll in, CNN is presenting Cuba's socialized health care system as “a model for health care reform in the United States,” according to a report on the cable network last week. The report credits low cost and universal coverage.

“How does Cuba do it?” gushed the CNN anchor. “First of all, the government dictates salaries. Doctors earn less than \$30 per month—very little compared to doctors elsewhere. And priority is given to avoiding expensive procedures, says Gail Reed (a contributor to the Cuban communist party propaganda organ *Granma*), who's lived and worked in Cuba for decades.”

But instead of pluses, these features are at the root of why the Cuban system is not a model. Government-dictated salaries—like Medicare payments here—reduce incentives for doctors to provide quality care. And when cheap procedures are a priority—as they are, say, in the U.K.—teeth get pulled instead of filled. But the basic problem with socialism is that there's literally nothing there.

CNN gives little attention to the fact that hospitals in Cuba have no Band-Aids and are short on aspirin and actual medicine. Photos from *TheRealCuba.com* show hospitals strewn with filthy mattresses, infested with cockroaches and full of bony patients nursing ugly bedsores. The only plenty within Cuba's universal coverage system is one of want.

The scary thing is that if you copy that system, the same shortages appear. Take Venezuela, which is following the socialist model and now suffers shortages of milk, meat, steel, gasoline, and tires. (Yes, it too had a run on toilet paper a few years back.)

This week, the country crossed its first milestone for socialist street cred. It was forced for the first time in its history to import a crop it has grown exquisitely well since 1730: coffee.

The problem with the telltale shortages in Cuba isn't a few incompetents at a state-owned toilet-paper company or some hurricane that's wiped out its crops. Nor is it the U.S. trade embargo of which the country constantly complains.

“The system itself is dysfunctional,” explains Brian Latell, a leading expert on Cuba at the University of Miami. “Workers have scarcely any incentive to be productive. The distribution and transportation systems have broken down.”

Even with slight improvements from the newer Raul Castro administration, “it’s a centrally planned economy and still highly centralized. There’s little private enterprise and initiative.”

The shortages are a natural byproduct of central planning, price-fixing, and a system that disregards human nature.

Yes, four hurricanes did damage estimated at \$10 billion last year, Latell acknowledges. But Cuba has also been a bad credit risk for nearly 50 years, he adds, limiting its own access to credit out of loathing for capitalism. That has cut into the nation’s productive capacity, which was once one of Latin America’s highest.

Now, “they’re not producing anything to speak of to earn hard currency, they’re not exporting to earn, and the economy is in a terrible state,” Latell says.

An economic system that can’t supply its people with commodities as basic as toilet paper is no model for anyone.

—*Investor’s Business Daily*, August 11, 2009

---

## The Great American Debt Scandal

by Vasko Kohlmayer

How long can America keep its head above water in this ocean of debt?

Speaking about foreign holders of American treasuries, the noted financial expert Peter Schiff said this in a speech at the Ludwig von Mises Institute:

“We’re not going to pay the Chinese back their money. It’s impossible. We can’t. We can’t possibly.”

Schiff’s point was that America is not good for its debts. Sadly, he is right. Having incurred more than \$65 trillion in obligations of various kinds, the federal government finds itself in an insurmountable fiscal hole. To give a sense of size, this amount is more than the annual economic output of the whole world and four times America’s Gross Domestic Product. It would be impossible to manage this even if our leaders suddenly came

to their senses and began to behave responsibly. There is little chance of that, however. The larger our debt, the more eager they are to spend more.

Despite our leaders’ efforts to conceal the level of indebtedness, its reality cannot be evaded. The steady weakening of the dollar is one evidence of that. In recent months financial experts have even been discussing the unthinkable: The possibility that the American government may default. The well-known writer Niall Ferguson suggested this possibility in an interview with *Vanity Fair* in January 2009. Around the same time *The Washington Post* ran an article under the headline *We’re Borrowing Like Mad. Can the U.S. Pay It Back?* This was at the time when the notion of a trillion dollar budget deficit seemed insane. Needless to say, the deficit will end up being close to \$2 trillion at the end of this fiscal year.

In March, *Market Watch* reported that the spreads on credit-default swaps for U.S. government debt were growing at a rapid pace. What this means is that the markets are growing increasingly concerned about the possibility of the United States failing to meet its obligations.

The question is how did America get into this position. What brought this country—once a citadel of financial stability—to such dire straits? The answer will become apparent when we look at the composition of America’s debt burden.

The federal government’s obligations consist of two main components. The smaller of the two is the one that is reported on more often. It is referred to as “public debt,” or “national debt,” or “sovereign debt.” This is the debt that the government has incurred as a consequence of its budget deficits over the years. It currently stands at \$11.6 trillion, which is about 85 percent of GDP.

The public debt, however, only represents a relatively small portion of the government’s total debt. The rest is primarily made up of obligation connected with three large entitlement programs—Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid. It is estimated that together their combined claims amount to roughly \$55 trillion more than what the government will collect in designated taxes.

At this point Medicare and Social Security do not yet represent a net budgetary expense, because revenues (FICA taxes) exceed what is being paid out in benefits. To put it differently, these programs are currently running surpluses; this situation, however, will not last indefinitely. The social security surplus will end around 2018. The negative gap will then widen rapidly with each successive year.

Contrary to what many people believe, the surpluses have not been kept in some special vaults in Washington.

The money has been “invested” in government bonds and the government then promptly spent the cash. In other words, the so-called Social Security Trust Fund basically contains treasury IOUs. The \$55 trillion question is: How will the government raise the cash once the surpluses come to an end?

There are two ways in which this can be done: by raising taxes or by borrowing. Neither seems like a good option under the circumstances. Taxes are already perceived to be high; bringing them much higher would be politically unpopular if not impossible. Furthermore, raising taxes would hamper growth, which would in turn decrease the tax base and thus defeat the purpose of the increase in the first place. As far as borrowing is concerned, it is almost certain that investors would refuse to finance additional debt given their concerns about its present levels. With no place to go, it is likely the federal government will do what governments usually do when caught in this situation: it will “meet” its obligations by printing money.

This, of course, is an easy way out, but it debases the currency and produces inflation. And since America’s huge debt load is far beyond the government’s ability to pay off with honest money, the level of inflation is likely going to be very high. It would actually appear that the government has already embarked on this path. There are even those who fear that the United States may eventually experience hyperinflation. Discussing the Federal Reserve’s recent purchasing spree of government bonds, Joshua Zumbrun wrote this in *Forbes*:

“That purchase of government debt looked particularly ominous. Creating new money to buy government debt is the sort of strategy that’s known to destroy economies—just ask Zimbabwe, which suffered so much hyperinflation that it destroyed its currency.”

Whatever its exact level, high inflation will likely arrive before the end of the entitlements surplus era. Concerned about the government’s over-indebtedness and its ability to meet its obligations, bond investors will start pulling out well before social security surpluses turn into deficits. Unwilling and unable to control spending, the government will have no choice but to print. The soaring inflation that will follow will have a devastating effect on the already fragile financial system and will inevitably lead to economic breakdown. This will in turn set off

centrifugal forces in a troubled and divided society.

America’s impending travails are thus ultimately tied to fiscal mismanagement, particularly in the area of entitlements. It is as ironic as it is instructive that entitlements seek to confer the kinds of benefits the Founding Fathers thought the federal government should have no business of pursuing. It was with this in mind that they drafted a constitution that sought to prevent the federal government from getting involved in those areas. They made it very clear that federal functions were to be few and limited, confined primarily to protecting the life, liberty, and property of Americans. Ensuring people’s well-being through the provision of retirement income, healthcare, and other such goods was not to be the government’s job.

It is to our detriment that we have betrayed both our founding principles and the Constitution. We have done this because we have fallen for that greatest of lies, which is that government is capable of providing for citizens’ material and social needs. Attractive as this idea may sound, it is impossible to accomplish in practice.

To many this will come as a surprise. Brainwashed by years of public education, many believe that ensuring the population’s material welfare is precisely what good government is all about. But no government has ever been able to pull this off. We only need to look at what happened when it tried to do it in America. Take Social Security, for instance. In late 2006, the incoming House Speaker Nancy Pelosi proudly proclaimed:

“We will guarantee a dignified retirement, and we will begin by fighting any attempt to privatize Social Security.”

Those naive enough to rely on the government’s “guarantee” of a “dignified” retirement are bound to be bitterly disappointed. When an aspiring reporter wants to file yet another tale of a cat-food eating retiree, he can always find someone by searching among those for whom Social Security is the only source of income. With many receiving less than \$8,000 per year, it usually does not take long to find a protagonist for the sad story.

But if the only thing the government did was to fail to deliver on its promises, the situation would not be so dire. Unfortunately, it also did something else in the process—it has bankrupted this nation by saddling it with debts and obligations we cannot fulfill. This outcome is unsurprising. The

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009), 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.

old maxim is as valid now as it has always been. Government does not solve problems; it only makes them worse. Given the ambitious scope of entitlements, it was only to be expected that federal involvement would eventually create difficulties on an insurmountable scale.

The Founding Fathers knew of what they spoke. We have disregarded their advice and trampled on that prescient document they left behind as the law of this land. For that, there will be a steep price to pay.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, August 24, 2009

---

## The Religious Left and Welfare State

by Mark D. Tooley

For the Religious Left, socialized medicine has long been almost the moral equivalent of the Second Coming. So increasing political turbulence for Obamacare is creating panic and fear among the true believers. Must we wait still longer? they now imploringly wonder, with sadness and rage.

Emphasize the rage. *Sojourners'* activist Jim Wallis has issued a virtual public imprecatory prayer for Sarah Palin's political destruction after her comments on Obamacare's "death panels." And a United Methodist lobbyist is denouncing Obamacare's opponents as racists. Meanwhile, the President himself appeared on an August 19 Religious Left conference call, to rally true believers to our "core ethical and moral obligation."

After Palin speculated that Obamacare could degenerate into "death panels" deciding who merits further medical exertion, Wallis responded with outrage and a very specific plea for Palin's political demise. "Please don't invoke your 'Christian faith' anymore and embarrass the people of God even further," he fumed. "May your efforts to scare Americans during this important debate fail. May your political future also fail, and may your star fall as fast as it rose just a few months ago — because we now know who you really are."

A righteous Psalmist of the Old Testament could not have inveighed against Palin with any greater fury or precision. Wallis is often likened by his Religious Left admirers to a prophet. But prophets and Psalmists called their audiences back to worship of God, not worship of Big Government. Palin's sin, in Wallis' eyes, is that she will not bend the knee to the altar of The Welfare State,

which has been the object of Wallis' fervor for over 40 years.

For good measure, and in supposed prophetic tradition, Wallis further denounced Palin as a "demagogue in the worst tradition of those who knowingly distort and deceive for their own political purposes" and who "prey" upon the weak and vulnerable. "Politics for people like you is really all about you, your fame and power, and your taste of it during the last election has revealed what kind of politician you truly are."

In partial vindication for Palin, a U.S. Senate version of Obamacare apparently will delete any reference to providing end-of-life counseling that critics worried could become coercive, especially with elderly patients. But the "death panels" concern seemed to apply to a broader apprehension about government run health care, when government bureaucrats, with finite resources and infinite authority, inevitably would have to decide who merits further care and who does not.

For the statist mindset to which Wallis and the Religious Left passionately subscribe, government is simply a cornucopia of gifts and services, benignly bestowed, as an extension of, or even substitute for, God's grace. But governments, unlike the private sector against whose "greed" the Religious Left perpetually warns, have coercive powers through taxation and law enforcement.

The corruptions and compulsions of a private insurance company, or medical practice, can be magnified ten thousand times by the federal government. Competing private firms could hardly orchestrate "death panels." But can a national government? History, of course, declares that governments have often done far worse.

Understanding the moral limits of state power is foreign to the Religious Left, which imagines that expanding government welfare is always moral, and its critics, always sinister. In the conference call for Religious Left activists that Wallis convened for the President, Obama warned of "some folks out there bearing false witness," of "divisive and deceptive attacks," of "extraordinary lies," and "fabrications."

Accelerating the angry rhetoric about Obamacare's critics was chief United Methodist lobbyist Jim Winkler, whose United Methodist Board of Church and Society is part of the Religious Left coalition for Obamacare. With typical perception, Winkler discerned that "Racism and fear is at the core of the anger" against government health care. Winkler helpfully recalled that after Obama's election America suffered a "spate" of racial outrages, including "cross burnings, black figures hanged from nooses, schoolchildren chanting 'assassinate Obama,' and racial epithets scrawled on homes and cars."

In Winkler's mind, the U.S. is a stewing cauldron that, at best, resembles the Mississippi Delta post-Reconstruction. "Numerous assassination threats have been issued against members of Congress," Winkler darkly revealed. "Gun-toting people have shown up at town hall meetings. There is talk of armed revolution in the air." As to the opponents of Obamacare, the United Methodist lobbyist surmised that the "consistent, inaccurate use of 'socialism' to describe health-care reform is a code word for racism." Generously, Winkler admitted that racism was not the only explanation for opposition to Obamacare: "Incredibly rich insurance companies are wary of any changes that might affect their bottom lines."

Describing the reaction to his support for Obamacare from his own purported church constituency, Winkler complained of a constant stream of "virulent, nasty" and "incredibly sinful, ignorant statements from persons who claim to be United Methodists." He denounced the "ugly rage demonstrated by many in our denomination and at town hall meetings" as "preposterous." From dealing with recalcitrant, sputtering, and ungrammatical United Methodists who do not share Winkler's agenda, he knows "what it's like to face people who have worked themselves up into a frenzy, who cannot control their emotions, who have lost all reason and sense of proportion."

Resorting to Wallis' imprecatory tone against Palin, Winkler quoted Isaiah about the unrepentant: "But if you refuse and rebel, you shall be devoured by the sword; for the mouth of the Lord has spoken." Wow, that's violent language coming from a virtual pacifist. But evidently the vial of God's judgment will be poured down upon all them with the temerity to question government run health care. For those, like Wallis and Winkler, who equate God's Kingdom with Big Government, the punishment evidently cannot be soon enough.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, August 24, 2009

The most recent study on the international Communist movements by The Maldon Institute has been released under the titles: *International Communism and Related Articles* and *Problems of the Revolution in Latin America*. *The Schwarz Report* has obtained 20 copies of the reports written by Wallace H. Spaulding. These two highly professional studies are on a first come, first serve basis. Make your check for \$20 to *The Schwarz Report*, PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829.

## American Minute

by Bill Federer

"The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

This famous quote was from British statesman Edmund Burke, who was born January 12, 1729.

Considered the most influential orator in the House of Commons, Burke stands out in history, for, as a member of the British Parliament, he defended the rights of the American colonies and strongly opposed the slave trade.

In "A Letter to a Member of the National Assembly," 1791, Edmund Burke wrote: "What is liberty without wisdom and without virtue? It is the greatest of all possible evils; for it is folly, vice, and madness, without restraint.

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as they are disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good in preference to the flattery of knaves."

Edmund Burke continued:

"Society cannot exist, unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without.

"It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free.

"Their passions forge their fetters."

—*American Minute*, January 12, 2010

### Because we are called to think like Christ

Are your loved ones developing a Christian understanding of the world? Help ground them in the faith by sending them to Summit Ministries Worldview Leadership training. Summit's two week program designed for young people will challenge, strengthen, and encourage. Summit also has a one week course available for adults. Visit Summit's website at [www.summit.org](http://www.summit.org) to find dates (throughout the summer) and locations (Colorado, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Virginia) to fit your needs.

While at the website, purchase a copy of *Understanding the Times* by David Noebel for yourself and a friend. This book is a must-have tool to recognize and deal with the conflict of worldviews.