



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 51, Number 1

January 2011

Happy New Year!

From China . . . With Love, Part I

by Brig. General USAF Ret. Jimmy L. Cash

Sliding silently under the mud, muck, and fog of national politics, is a current event that makes Bill Clinton's excursion into the world of elderly sex look tame in comparison. This time the nation's national security is truly threatened in my opinion, and it involves not only a weak President with limited problem-solving ability, but leadership at the highest levels in the Pentagon as well. The American people would do well to demand a full investigation by an unbiased group, and let the chips fall where they may. I am referring to the "missile shot" taken off the California coast recently, and the lame response by NORAD, the Pentagon, and the White House itself.

First, in hope of adding some credibility to my assessment of what really happened just off the coast of Los Angeles let me convey a bit of my background, which can be checked easily by going to Google and typing in my name. An Air Force biography will appear.

During the late eighties I was assigned to NORAD, as a Command Director initially and later as the assistant Director of Operations for NORAD. The NORAD operation was located inside the Cheyenne Mountain complex just outside Colorado Springs, Colorado. Twenty four hours a day a team of approximately 150 highly trained individuals, led by a Brigadier General, monitored one of the most sophisticated computer systems in the world. This system was fed data from many different sensors that were able to detect missile shots from any point on the globe. All this data was taken into consideration when making the "assessment" as whether or not North America and/or Canada were threatened by such a launch. If the launch was assessed as a true threat, the President was contacted immediately by NORAD through a military individual always close to the President, who carried what we called "the football," a black brief case with release codes for our nuclear forces. I know the system well, as for near three years I led one of those teams.

In addition, for over 25 years, I flew US Air Force fighters to include the F-106, F-4, F-15, F-16, and commanded an F-15 Squadron and an F-16 Wing. The sole purpose of the F-106 assignment was to maintain an ability to become airborne in minutes to intercept inbound bombers posing a threat to the US mainland. Untold hours were spent studying and being tested on visually identifying an air-to-air threat to include its type and threat potential. I understand the difference between an aircraft contrail and a missile launch contrail.

In my opinion, there is absolutely no doubt that what was captured on video off the coast of California was a missile launch, was clearly observed by NORAD, assessed by a four-star General in minutes, and passed to the President immediately. That is the way the system works, and heads fall if there is a failure. This is one of the most important tenets of National Defense and its sole purpose of protecting the American people. Even the smallest failure in this system gets intense scrutiny at the highest level.

Now, the question that still must be answered is why NORAD's muted response was simply that North America was not threatened, and later our government approved the lame excuse that the picture recorded was simply an aircraft leaving a contrail. This decision was made far above the four-star level, and because the system in place demands it, was made by the President himself.

There are many possible answers to the question why. Normally, when a situation of this nature occurs the decision makers in Washington feel it would create panic among the mere mortals who go to work every day. To avoid shocking the population the truth is shaded, or sometimes just kept quiet in hope it will just go away. I would say to our government officials who disregard the intelligence of the American people, be careful. The people are awakening, and their trust in our government is fading. This level of decision making will hasten that process.

In my opinion, we must question the timing of this shot across our bow. The President was abroad being diplomatic, which means trying to placate China which is becoming overly concerned with our handling a totally out of control deficit in spending. They do not want our debt to them to be paid in cheapened US dollars, and it appears that our current plan is to do just that. China is devoting a major portion of its GDP to defense spending, and what better time to show the US that they can slip a missile-equipped submarine through the South Pacific undetected right up to one of our largest cities, than right now? And, the Chinese have the guts to do it.

Important in my opinion is that once again the leader of this nation chose to disguise the truth and keep the American people in the dark on an issue that constitutes a major threat to the entire population of the United States of America. This is no longer a threat to only our military thousands of miles from the homeland. This is a show of force sending a signal that downtown USA is now capable of being hit by an undetected submarine and at any time. It may very well be the beginning of the real power struggle between the United States and China. If so, I predict the next phase will be China's demand for the US to cease support of Taiwan, and so it goes.

President Obama is getting in over his head once again on this one. Hiding the severity of issues we face with China, to include this possible signal of strength, is a terrible mistake. It is happening at a time when our Secretary of Defense, under the guidance of the President, is literally gutting our military forces. We have seen it already when the F-22 buy was cut from over 600 aircraft to 187, and research and development for follow-on systems severely reduced. This is but one of hundreds of examples of military reductions. I fear that this could be another reason for this cover-up. If the American people fully realized the severity of the threat they might demand restoring our military to face the growing threat from China and Russia, as opposed to the massive domestic spending that we have witnessed over the past two years.

So, where does this leave us? Again, the people must decide and place pressure on the government to insure that our National Security remains intact. Military strength prevents war. Military weakness invites not only war, but also a lack of deterrence for intervention and bullying on many fronts.

If there was ever a time for the people to look closely at the national leadership and demand honesty and integrity, it is now. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. At issue is electing those who have the ability to make proper decisions for our country, and will do so with no regard to their own personal gain. It is time to elect a President and a Congress who will put country above self, and defend this great nation against all enemies, foreign or domestic, and above all, be honest with the people who honored them with election to high office.

—Jimmy L. Cash, Lakeside, Montana

From China . . . With Love, Part II

by Wayne Madsen

China flexed its military muscle Monday evening in the skies west of Los Angeles when a Chinese Navy Jin class ballistic missile nuclear submarine, deployed secretly from its underground home base on the south coast of Hainan Island, launched an intercontinental ballistic missile from international waters off the southern California coast. WMR's [Wayne Madson Report] intelligence sources in Asia, including Japan, say the belief by the military commands in Asia and the intelligence services is that the Chinese decided to demonstrate to the United States its capabilities on the eve of the G-20 Summit in Seoul and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit in Tokyo, where President Obama is scheduled to attend during his ten-day trip to Asia.

The reported Chinese missile test off Los Angeles came as a double blow to Obama. The day after the missile firing, China's leading credit rating agency, Dagong Global Credit Rating, downgraded sovereign debt rating of the United States to A-plus from AA. The missile demonstration, coupled with the downgrading of the United States financial grade, represents a military and financial

show of force by Beijing to Washington.

The Pentagon spin machine, backed by the media reporters who regularly cover the Defense Department, as well as officials of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), and the U.S. Northern Command, is now spinning various conspiracy theories, including describing the missile plume videotaped by KCBS news helicopter cameraman Gil Leyvas at around 5:00 pm Pacific Standard Time, during the height of evening rush hour, as the condensation trail from a jet aircraft. Other Pentagon-inspired cover stories are that the missile was actually an amateur rocket or an optical illusion.

Experts agree that this was a ballistic missile being fired off of Los Angeles. The Pentagon insists it was a jet aircraft or model rocket.

There are no records of a plane in the area having taken off from Los Angeles International Airport or from other airports in the region. The Navy and Air Force have said that they were not conducting any missile tests from submarines, ships, or Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Navy has also ruled out an accidental firing from one of its own submarines.

Missile experts, including those from Jane's in London, say the plume was definitely from a missile, possibly launched from a submarine. WMR has learned that the missile was likely a JL-2 ICBM, which has a range of 7,000 miles, and was fired in a northwesterly direction over the Pacific and away from U.S. territory from a Jin class submarine. The Jin class can carry up to twelve such missiles.

Navy sources have revealed that the missile may have impacted on Chinese territory and that the National Security Agency (NSA) likely possesses intercepts of Chinese telemetry signals during the missile firing and subsequent testing operations.

Japanese and other Asian intelligence agencies believe that a Chinese Jin-class SSBN submarine conducted a missile "show of force" in the skies west of Los Angeles.

Asian intelligence sources believe the submarine transited from its base on Hainan through South Pacific waters, where U.S. anti-submarine warfare detection capabilities are not as effective as they are in the northern and mid-Pacific, and then transited north to waters off of Los Angeles. The Pentagon, which has spent billions on ballistic missile defense systems, a pet project of former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, is clearly embarrassed over the Chinese show of strength.

The White House also wants to downplay the missile

story before President Obama meets with his Chinese counterpart in Seoul and Tokyo. According to Japanese intelligence sources, Beijing has been angry over United States and allied naval exercises in the South China and Yellow Seas, in what China considers its sphere of influence, and the missile firing within the view of people in Southern California was a demonstration that China's navy can also play in waters off the American coast.

For the U.S. Navy, the Chinese show of force is a huge embarrassment, especially for the Navy's Pacific Command in Pearl Harbor, where Japan's December 7, 1941 attack on the fleet at Pearl Harbor remains a sore subject.

—*Wayne Madsen Report*, November 10, 2010

From China . . . With More Love, Part III

by Andrew F. Krepinevich

Throughout the Cold War, the United States sought to maintain a military advantage over the Soviet Union. One reason was that if the military balance shifted in Moscow's favor, America's European allies might conclude that Moscow could not be resisted and would fall under Soviet sway. All of Europe would then share the fate of Finland, which had remained nominally independent after World War II but abided by foreign-policy rules set by the Soviets.

The Soviet Union never successfully "Finlandized" Europe. But the threat has returned—from China, which is now trying to do the same in the Western Pacific.

A country's military strategy offers a window into its intentions, and China is clearly seeking to effect a gradual but decisive shift in the Chinese-U.S. military balance. China's goal is to stop the U.S. from protecting its long-standing interests in the region—and to draw Washington's democratic allies and partners (such as Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan) into its orbit.

China's military buildup centers on a set of capabilities, called "Assassin's Mace" by the Chinese, which is designed to exploit surprise. Its name derives from the

practice of assassins in medieval times, who would hide their mace, or heavy club, in order to obscure their motives.

China's People's Liberation Army (PLA) sees the U.S. military's battle networks—which rely heavily on satellites and the Internet to identify targets, coordinate attacks, guide “smart bombs” and more—as its Achilles' heel. The Chinese successfully tested an antisatellite missile in 2007 and have reportedly used lasers to “dazzle” (or temporarily blind) U.S. satellites. For years the U.S. military has been under increasingly frequent cyber attacks originating in China.

The Chinese buildup also involves developing so-called anti-access/area-denial capabilities to threaten major U.S. bases such as Kadena Air Base on Okinawa and Andersen Air Force Base on Guam. The PLA is developing and fielding large numbers of ballistic and cruise missiles capable of overwhelming U.S. and allied missile defenses and striking these air bases with a high degree of accuracy. The message to the U.S. and its allies is clear: China has the means to threaten the forward bases from which most U.S. strike aircraft operate.

The PLA's area-denial capabilities focus on restricting the U.S. Navy's freedom of action out to the “second island chain,” a line that extends from China's coast as far east as Guam. To stalk American carriers and the surface warships tasked with protecting them, China's navy has launched submarines equipped with advanced torpedoes and high-speed, sea-skimming antiship cruise missiles. To detect and strike American surface warships at progressively greater distances, the PLA is constructing over-the-horizon radars and deploying reconnaissance satellites, as well as aircraft armed with high-speed antiship cruise missiles.

East Asian waters are gradually becoming a “no-man's land” for American warships and forward-based aircraft, while U.S. satellites are becoming sitting ducks and the Pentagon's digital backbone is increasingly endangered.

China's “Assassin's Mace” approach cannot be justified as a counter to any U.S. military buildup. American forces in the Western Pacific are significantly smaller than they were at the end of the Cold War. Moreover, over the past two decades the U.S. has not used its military forces

either to attack China or coerce it. Rather, it has underwritten a stable regional military balance that has enabled a period of unprecedented peace and prosperity—of which China has been the principal beneficiary.

China's buildup, then—its “peaceful rise,” as Beijing calls it—is best explained as a strategy of Finlandization. Such a strategy fits China's outlook, which is epitomized in Sun Tzu's famous observation that “To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill.”

We are beginning to see what a China-dominated Western Pacific would look like. Witness Beijing's recent declaration that its “core interests” now include 1.3 million square miles of the South China Sea, or its refusal to accept North Korea's culpability for sinking a South Korean warship despite the evidence provided by an international investigation. At a recent international summit, Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi bluntly dismissed Singapore's concerns over Beijing's expanding territorial claims, stating that “China is a big country and other countries are small countries, and that's just a fact.”

While Washington's Asian allies look to it for leadership, the Obama administration has (like its predecessor) taken China's professed good intentions at face value. Things have gotten so bad that in the Pentagon some now refer to China as “Voldemort,” the evil wizard from the Harry Potter series who is often referred to as “he who must not be named.”

The “Voldemort Effect” is seen in the Defense Department's recently published Quadrennial Defense Review, which cites the growing threat posed by anti-access and area-denial capabilities. But while Iran, North Korea, and even Hezbollah are mentioned as developing these capabilities, China—the country with the most formidable and threatening forces, by far—is not mentioned at all.

Washington's longstanding allies and friends in the Western Pacific want a stable military balance in the region that will encourage Beijing to pursue its goals according to accepted international norms of behavior. But they realize the U.S. must take the lead to preserve it, and soon. For if the military balance between the U.S. and China continues to deteriorate, they may have no choice but to follow Finland's Cold War example.

—*Wall Street Journal*, September 11, 2010, p. A 13

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.

Communist China's "State Capitalism"

by Jason Dean, Andrew Browne, Shai Oster

BEIJING—Since the end of the Cold War, the world's powers have generally agreed on the wisdom of letting market competition—more than government planning—shape economic outcomes. China's national economic strategy is disrupting that consensus, and a look at the ascent of solar-energy magnate Zhu Gongshan explains why.

A shortage of polycrystalline silicon—the main raw material for solar panels—was threatening China's burgeoning solar-energy industry in 2007. Polysilicon prices soared, hitting \$450 a kilogram in 2008, up tenfold in a year. Foreign companies dominated production and were passing those high costs onto China.

Beijing's response was swift: development of domestic polysilicon supplies was declared a national priority. Money poured in to manufacturers from state-owned companies and banks; local governments expedited approvals for new plants.

In the West, polysilicon plants take years to build, requiring lengthy approvals. Mr. Zhu, an entrepreneur who raised \$1 billion for a plant, started production within 15 months. In just a few years, he created one of the world's biggest polysilicon makers, GCL-Poly Energy Holding Ltd. China's sovereign-wealth fund bought 20% of GCL-Poly for \$710 million. Today, China makes about a quarter of the world's polysilicon and controls roughly half the global market for finished solar-power equipment.

Western anger with China has focused on Beijing's cheap-currency policy; President Obama blasted the practice at the G-20 Summit in Seoul. Mr. Zhu's sprint to the top points to a deeper issue: China's national economic strategy is detailed and multifaceted, and it is challenging the U.S. and other powers on a number of fronts.

China: A Growing Challenge

China's economic approach today is still far more focused on government guidance than the world's other top economies.

Central to China's approach are policies that champion state-owned firms and other so-called national champions, seek aggressively to obtain advanced technology, and manage its exchange rate to benefit exporters. It leverages state control of the financial system to channel low-cost capital to domestic industries—and to resource-rich foreign

nations whose oil and minerals China needs to maintain rapid growth.

China's policies are partly a product of its unique status: a developing country that is also a rising superpower. Its leaders don't assume the market is preeminent. Rather, they see state power as essential to maintaining stability and growth, and thereby ensuring continued Communist Party rule.

It's a model with a track record of getting things done, especially at a time when public faith in the efficacy of markets and the competence of politicians is shaken in much of the West. Already the world's biggest exporter, China is on track to pass Japan this year as the second-biggest economy.

Charlene Barshefsky, who as U.S. trade representative under President Bill Clinton helped negotiate China's 2001 entry into the World Trade Organization, says the rise of powerful state-led economies like China and Russia is undermining the established post-World War II trading system. When these economies decide that "entire new industries should be created by the government," says Ms. Barshefsky, it tilts the playing field against the private sector.

Western critics say China's practices are a form of mercantilism aimed at piling up wealth by manipulating trade. They point to China's \$2.6 trillion in foreign-exchange reserves. The U.S. and the European Union have lodged a series of WTO cases and other trade actions targeting Beijing's policies, and hammer China's refusal to let its currency appreciate more quickly, which they argue fuels global economic imbalances.

Top executives at foreign companies have started griping publicly. In July, Peter Löscher, Siemens AG chief executive, and Jürgen Hambrecht, chairman of chemical company BASF SE, in a public meeting between German industrialists and China's premier, raised concerns about efforts to compel foreign companies to transfer valuable intellectual property in order to gain market access.

Some observers think Beijing's vision is rooted in a desire to avenge China's "century of humiliation" that started with the 19th-century opium wars. Such critics believe that China's focus on "indigenous innovation"—nurturing home-grown technologies—entails appropriating others' technology. China's high-speed trains, for instance, are based on technology introduced to China by German, French, and Japanese makers.

"The Chinese have shown that if they have the ability to kill your model and take your profits, they will," says

Ian Bremmer, president of New York-based consultancy Eurasia Group. His book, *The End of the Free Market*, argues that a rising tide of “state capitalism” led by China threatens to erode the competitive edge of the U.S.

So far, though, multinationals aren’t staying away, because China remains a vital source of growth for companies whose domestic markets are saturated.

China’s strategy echoes the policies Japan employed in its economic rise—policies that also rankled the U.S. But China’s sheer scale—its population is 10 times Japan’s—makes it a more formidable threat. Also, its willingness in recent decades to open some industries to foreign firms makes its market far more important for global business than Japan’s ever was, giving Beijing much greater leverage.

China’s sovereign-wealth fund bought 20% of GCL-Poly Energy Holding for \$710 million. Today, China makes about a quarter of the world’s polysilicon and controls half the global market for finished solar-power equipment. A company handout shows a GCL control room.

Chinese leaders have begun to acknowledge the backlash. At the World Economic Forum in Tianjin in September, Premier Wen Jiabao said that the recent debate about China among foreign investors “is not all due to misunderstanding by foreign companies. It’s also because our policies were not clear enough.”

“China is committed to creating an open and fair environment for foreign-invested enterprises,” Mr. Wen said.

The state has always played a big role in China’s economy, but for most of the reform era that started in the late 1970s, it retreated as state-owned collective farms were dismantled and inefficient state industrial enterprises closed. Accession to the WTO in 2001 represented a big bet by the leadership on liberalizing markets further. The gamble paid off, with growth rocketing much of the past decade.

But the state is again ascendant. Many analysts say the pace of liberalization has slowed, and point to vast swaths of industry still controlled by state companies and tightly restricted for foreigners. The government owns almost all major banks in China, its three major oil companies, its three telecom carriers and its major media firms.

Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao acknowledges a foreign backlash, but says Beijing “is committed to creating an open and fair environment for foreign-invested enterprises.”

According to China’s Ministry of Finance, assets of all state enterprises in 2008 totaled about \$6 trillion, equal to 133% of annual economic output that year. By compari-

son, total assets of the agency that controls government enterprises in France, whose *dirigiste* policies give it one of the biggest state sectors among major Western economies, were €539 billion (\$686 billion) in 2008, about 28% of the size of France’s economy.

The government’s increased involvement in sectors from coal mining to the Internet has spawned the phrase *guojin mintui*, or “the state advances, the private sector retreats,” among market proponents in China. A January report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development said China’s economy had the least competition of 29 surveyed, including Russia’s. Prominent Chinese economist Qian Yingyi has said he worries over what appears to be “a reversal of market-oriented reforms in the last couple of years.”

The state’s huge role in the economy gives it enormous sway to pursue its policy goals, which are often laid out in voluminous five-year (sometimes 15-year) plans. These relics of the Mao-era command economy are central to the corporate fortunes of Western giants like Caterpillar Inc. and Boeing Co. that rely on the country’s market. China is now one of the biggest sources of revenue growth for Caterpillar, and is the biggest buyer of commercial jets outside the U.S., according to Boeing.

One of Beijing’s most important goals: wean China off expensive foreign technology. It is a process that began with the “open door” economic policies launched by Deng Xiaoping in 1978 that brought in waves of foreign technology firms. Companies such as Microsoft Corp. and Motorola Inc. set up R&D facilities and helped train a generation of Chinese scientists, engineers, and managers.

That process is now in overdrive. In 2006, China’s leadership unveiled the “National Medium- and Long-Term Plan for the Development of Science and Technology,” a blueprint for turning China into a tech powerhouse by 2020. The plan calls for nearly doubling the share of gross domestic product devoted to research and development, to 2.5% from 1.3% in 2005.

One area of hot pursuit: green technology. China’s “Torch” program fast-tracks industries, attracting entrepreneurs with offers of cheap land for factories, export tax breaks, and even a free apartment for three years.

Take the case of Deng Xunming, a China-born U.S. citizen who is a pioneer of America’s solar industry and whose innovations light up the first solar-powered billboard on New York’s Times Square.

His company, Xunlight Corp., has been nurtured by U.S. financial aid and embraced by politicians eager for the U.S. to win the race to develop new energy technolo-

gies. Xunlight has pulled in more than \$50 million in state and federal grants, loans, and tax credits, partly aimed at bringing needed jobs to Toledo, Ohio, where the company is based.

But two years ago, Mr. Deng, who left China in 1985 to study at the University of Chicago, set up a Xunlight unit on a giant industrial estate near Shanghai. The company now also makes its thin-film solar panels there and employs 100 workers. The panels are exported back to the U.S.

Mr. Deng says he is trying to keep the Chinese operation “low key.” It isn’t mentioned on Xunlight’s website, and Mr. Deng declined to comment on the China factory in an interview. “China will be a good market for the future,” he said. “But right now, the bigger market is in Europe. We’re putting our attention on the Europe and U.S. market. But meanwhile we’re developing efforts for the China market,” which could eventually be bigger, he said.

While the state seeks new technology, it also uses control of banking to feed cheap credit to industries it wants to foster. The government sets interest rates for China’s bank depositors low relative to rates of growth and inflation. That means Chinese households, through the banks, effectively subsidize the state’s industrial darlings.

Privately held telecommunications equipment maker Huawei Technologies Co. has long had its overseas expansion supported by China Development Bank, which in 2004 extended a five-year, \$10 billion credit line and routinely lends money to foreign buyers to finance their purchases of Huawei products. Revenue has risen more than 200% in the past five years, and it has become one of the top three telecommunications companies, along with Nokia Siemens Networks and Telefon AB LM Ericsson.

Sprint Nextel Corp. recently excluded Huawei and fellow Chinese telecom company ZTE Corp. from a contract worth billions of dollars, prompted by U.S. fears that the companies have ties to China’s military. The Sprint decision was a setback for Huawei in the one major market it has had difficulty penetrating, the U.S., and shows how mounting concerns over China’s policies are starting to exact a cost.

Huawei has also faced complaints in Europe that Chinese government backing gives it an unfair advantage. Both Huawei and ZTE have said their equipment poses no threat to U.S. security, and deny benefiting unfairly from government support.

For China, the biggest risks may be internal. Some attempts to generate high-tech breakthroughs by fiat have fizzled. A drive to produce a home-grown microprocessor took years to replicate features of those from Intel Corp.

and Advanced Micro Devices Inc., whose products had continued to evolve. A Chinese-developed mobile phone technology has yet to gather significant momentum abroad, despite the government forcing China’s largest phone company to adopt it.

Longer term, China faces a host of challenges that threaten growth. They include a population that is aging quickly because the one-child policy limited births in recent decades, and environmental damage resulting from the country’s breakneck pace of industrialization.

For now, that pace has the West on guard. “Our competition has gotten tougher during a period for the U.S. of profound economic weakness that magnifies any perceived threat,” says Ms. Barshefsky, the former U.S. trade representative. There is a “significant and profound—almost theological—question about the rules as they exist.”

—*Wall Street Journal*, November 16, 2010, p. 1

Ruling Elites Wage War on Morality

by Robert Knight

As the nation lurches back toward well-founded suspicion of big government, the ruling elites are putting the pedal to the metal against the moral foundations.

In a matter of months, three liberal federal judges struck down California’s constitutional marriage amendment, the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), and the military’s law barring homosexuality. Why mess around with legislators when federal judges can create havoc with the stroke of a pen?

Sometimes just the threat of a wacko liberal ruling is enough to drive policy. That seems to be the reasoning behind Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates warning Congress to homosexualize the military before the courts do it. He said it would be disruptive if a court acts, so Congress should order up the lavender tanks instead.

I don’t recall a single reporter asking Mr. Gates why, if ending the policy by court order would harm the military, it would be less disruptive if done by the lame-duck Congress. Mr. Gates himself hinted at the answer: Training (i.e. brainwashing) could begin earlier. Think about that. Troops drawn from America’s heartland will be “trained” to appreciate sodomy—or else. Wonder if they’ll break out those little Maoist dunce caps while they’re at it?

The military keeps ducking bullets in the Senate. A procedural vote on the policy failed to overcome a Republican filibuster on Thursday—just barely. But Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada, Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, and Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut seem determined to jam it through in a separate bill.

White House press secretary Robert Gibbs warned before the vote: “Either Congress is going to solve this legislatively, or the courts are going to solve this. The policy is going to come to an end.” Who cares if the Pentagon’s recent survey shows that Army and Marine combat troops overwhelmingly oppose lifting the policy?

Despite the treachery still being hatched in the Senate, most of the dirty work to redefine morality as bigotry has been initiated in the courts.

It was a California federal judge, Virginia A. Philips, who struck down the military’s law in *Log Cabin Republicans v. United States of America*. She then issued a dictum to the entire armed forces here and abroad to make bases homosexual-friendly. Before the 9th Circuit issued a temporary halt to her order, President Obama’s Pentagon suspended the policy, then made it more difficult to enforce.

Meanwhile, on Dec. 6, a three-judge panel of the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals heard arguments in *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, the challenge to California’s Proposition 8 marriage amendment. A ruling is expected within three to 12 months. The case will then go to the full 9th Circuit or directly to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In November 2008, more than 7 million Californians voted for Proposition 8, which amended the state constitution to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman. From the beginning, it was clear that California’s ruling elites were working to destroy marriage. Attorney General Jerry Brown and Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger violated their oaths of office by refusing to defend Proposition 8.

The case mysteriously keeps winding up before left-wing activist judges. Openly gay U.S. District Judge Vaughn R. Walker used it as a platform to promote homosexuality and disparage traditional religious beliefs. He equated biblical morality with prejudice and struck down Proposition 8.

The case then went to the 9th’s three-judge panel, with two Democratic appointees and one Republican. One of

them, Jimmy Carter appointee Stephen Reinhardt, is married to Ramona Ripston, executive director of the Southern California chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. That’s the group that took a lead role in opposing Proposition 8, counseled plaintiffs, and filed an amicus brief.

Addressing this blatant conflict of interest, Judge Reinhardt brushed it aside, saying, “I will be able to rule impartially.” Sure he will, like he did in the 2002 case in which he decided to strike the words “under God” from the Pledge of Allegiance. Judge Reinhardt is the poster boy for loony-left federal jurists.

The ruling elites are, by hook or by crook, trying to make over America in their own corrupt image. The American people should be outraged by this pattern of legal activism, which flouts the U.S. and state constitutions, the will of the people, and basic rules of court conduct.

In his dissent in *Romer v. Evans* (1996), in which the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Colorado’s Amendment 2, a popularly approved law that barred misapplying civil rights status to “sexual orientation,” Justice Antonin Scalia pinpointed the problem:

“This court has no business imposing upon all Americans the resolution favored by the elite class from which the Members of this institution are selected, pronouncing that ‘animosity’ toward homosexuality . . . is evil. I vigorously dissent.”

Later, in his dissent in *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003), in which the court cited international opinion in overturning the Texas sodomy law, Justice Scalia wrote:

“Today’s opinion is the product of a Court, which is the product of a law-profession culture, that has largely signed on to the so-called homosexual agenda, by which I mean the agenda promoted by some homosexual activists directed at eliminating the moral opprobrium that has traditionally attached to homosexual conduct.”

Well, to accomplish that, they’re going to have to burn all the Bibles, suspend the workings of biology, and scrub the history books clean of 5,000 years of the universal understanding that sex belongs between men and women in marriage. And they’re going to have to wipe out the First Amendment while they’re at it.

That’s no small feat, even for Masters of the Universe like Judge Reinhardt, Mr. Obama, and Mr. Gates.

—*The Washington Times*, December 10, 2010

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

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