



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 51, Number 3



Dr. David Noebel

March 2011

Radicalizing the USA

by Robert Knight

The evidence is overwhelming. The media interest is zero. The UFO strategy is in force.

Let me explain.

I'm talking about the unsolved Weather Underground murder of San Francisco Police Officer Brian V. McDonnell. A bomb placed on Feb. 16, 1970 outside the Golden Gate Park police station ripped through Sgt. McDonnell, who died two days later. His killers never paid a price.

Apart from simple justice, here's why this open case still matters. According to testimony by undercover FBI agent Larry Grathwohl, William Ayers was almost certainly involved. Ayers helped launch Obama's political career in 1995 at his home in Chicago and served on two boards with him. Ayers told Grathwohl that Ayers' wife, Bernardine Dohrn, planted the bomb. In 1971, the FBI found Ayers' fingerprints and those of other Weather Underground terrorists in an apartment that had been a bomb-making factory.

Because of prosecutorial errors, Ayers went free, boasting, "Guilty as hell, free as a bird." Dohrn remained underground until 1980, spent jail time for lesser charges, and then went on, like Ayers, to be a professor at a major college. Ayers was at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Dohrn is at Northwestern University.

On Oct. 21, Larry Grathwohl told his story at a seminar at the National Press Club sponsored by America's Survival, Inc. Moderator Cliff Kincaid, who recently obtained a 601-page FBI file of Barack Obama's communist mentor Frank Marshall Davis, unveiled a raft of speakers and evidence pointing to manipulation of American liberals by actual communist revolutionaries.

Among the speakers was New Zealand blogger and investigative reporter Trevor Loudon, who uncovered former "green jobs czar" Van Jones' communist background, which led to Jones' resignation in 2009. Jones is now back at the George Soros-funded Center for American Progress.

I spoke as well, reporting on the FBI file on Harry Hay, a Communist Party member off and on from 1934 to 1948 and a founder of the Mattachine Society, an early homosexual activist group. Hay also co-founded the Radical Faeries and championed the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). Hay was cited as an "inspiration" by longtime homosexual activist Kevin Jennings, whom Obama appointed as the nation's "safe schools czar" at the U.S. Department of Education.

Another speaker was Paul Kengor, best-selling author of a new book, *Dupes: How America's Adversaries Have Manipulated Progressives for a Century*. Dr. Kengor has the goods on numerous leftists, including the Hollywood Ten, who became famous during the McCarthy era. Four of them, according to FBI files, actually had Communist Party cards with membership numbers. It might be good to recall this the next time you see the media describe them as the "famed Hollywood Ten."

The evidence is so obvious that communists infiltrated many liberal causes and unions and that the liberal media have looked away while crying "McCarthyism." I call this the UFO strategy. Even if you actually saw a UFO, you'd be considered, uh, crazy. What's different here is that the communist influence on America's Left is no delusion. It is thoroughly documented.

On Oct. 23, Kincaid, with a video camera, confronted both Ayers and Dohrn at an environmentalist event in Washington, D.C.

Kincaid: "Why did your husband tell [undercover FBI agent] Larry Grathwohl that you planted the bomb?"

Dohrn: “That is so stupid.” She went on to deny involvement.

Kincaid then asked Ayers about the dedication to radicals in the 1974 manifesto *Prairie Fire: The Politics of Revolutionary Anti-Imperialism* that included Sirhan Sirhan, the assassin of Robert F. Kennedy. Signed by Ayers, Dohrn, Jeff Jones, and Celia Sojourn, the manifesto says, “We are communist men and women, underground in the United States for more than four years. . . . The only path to the final defeat of imperialism and the building of socialism is revolutionary war. . . . Without armed struggle there can be no victory.”

Kincaid: “Mr. Ayers, if you’re anti-war, why did you dedicate your book to the assassin of the leading anti-war candidate in the country?”

Ayers: “You’re delusional.” He walked away while others blocked the camera.

In an onstage presentation, Dohrn addressed the charges in a pamphlet that Kincaid had circulated. She said, “We live in a time of greater polarization, of hate speech and hate talk. . . . We were never terrorists. It’s all crap.” That flatly contradicts a *New York Times* interview published on Sept. 11, 2001, in which an unrepentant Ayers said, “I don’t regret setting bombs” and “I feel we didn’t do enough.”

Dohrn also misrepresented what she and Ayers were doing in the 1970s—aiding and abetting communism: “We were trying to stop the murderous assault that for 10 years killed three million people in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos and U.S. service people. It was the right thing to do.”

In his Oct. 21 presentation, former FBI agent Grathwohl noted that no anti-war literature was found in the Weather Underground bomb factory, just communist booklets urging violent revolution.

In any event, the anti-war movement was instrumental in the U.S. pullout in 1975, leaving Cambodia at the mercy of Khmer Rouge dictator Pol Pot, who killed more than two million of his countrymen. For Dohrn to claim that she and Ayers were merely peaceniks when they were in fact agitating for a communist victory is a lie worthy of the Ministry of Truth in George Orwell’s novel *1984*.

This all should be very hot stuff, given Ayers’ and Dohrn’s long association with Barack Obama and their continuing activism, which includes, according to Kincaid, recent visits to Hugo Chávez’s Venezuela and with radicals in Gaza. But the press is silent. They have spent far more time, personnel, and treasure searching Sarah Palin’s garbage cans.

On May 22, 2008, Kincaid held a seminar unveiling

evidence about Frank Marshall Davis and his eight years influencing a young Barack Obama in Hawaii. Among the speakers was Herb Romerstein, the dean of researchers on communism, whose work has spanned six decades. The Big Media skipped it, except for the *Washington Post*’s Dana Milbank, who ignored the facts and viciously ridiculed the gathering, calling Romerstein “a living relic.” Milbank likened the event to a “UFO convention.”

The UFO strategy. It’s very handy against a mountain of inconvenient facts. But facts are stubborn things.

—Robert Knight, Senior Fellow, American Civil Rights Union, December 15, 2010

Stalin’s Cousins: EPA, FCC, HHS

by Robert Knight

Over the past year, it has become obvious that what leftists cannot win at the ballot box, they will accomplish via bureaucratic dictate. After the U.S. Senate in 2009 rejected the massive cap-and-tax scheme on carbon credits, the Obama administration rode to the rescue of global-warming fanatics. On Dec. 7, 2009, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Lisa P. Jackson issued a ruling that the EPA would begin regulating five “anthropogenic” (man-made) greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, the air we exhale. The EPA based its finding on research from the now discredited U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and rejected at least 10 petitions for reconsideration.

So the EPA is now preparing to hound power plants and refineries by drafting carbon-emissions limits by July 2011, with a final rule due by May 2012. Never mind the faltering U.S. economy and China’s growing economic power. The greenhouse gods must be appeased.

Not to be outdone, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in December began regulating the Internet. Ignoring a recent court decision and Congress’ pointed refusal to grant the FCC this power, the Democrat-dominated body simply voted 3–2 on Dec. 21 (the darkest day of the year) to adopt “net neutrality” rules.

They stopped just short of redefining the Internet as a telecommunication carrier, much like telephone services. But the FCC’s move puts the federal government in a position to begin meddling with content, something the left has salivated over ever since President Obama began

stacking the FCC staff with veterans of Marxist Robert McChesney's Free Press think tank and the far-left Center for American Progress.

Finally, the dreaded "death panels" are back. Recall that on Christmas Eve 2009, Nevada Democratic Sen. Harry Reid's U.S. Senate rammed through the national health care system takeover. They ignored public opposition and mocked the idea that federal bureaucrats would institute end-of-life counseling. But, in deference to the public's growing alarm, they took out Section 1233.

It was a bait-and-switch. A year later, on Christmas Day 2010, the *New York Times* broke the story that Donald Berwick, Mr. Obama's unvetted czar who heads the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, issued a rule to pay doctors for end-of-life counseling. That was the essence of Section 1233. The *Times* acknowledged that the counseling "may include advance directives to forgo aggressive life-sustaining treatment." Exactly.

This is the same *New York Times* that devoted a lengthy article in 2009 disparaging *The Washington Times* editorial board, the *American Spectator*, Sarah Palin, and health-policy expert Betsy McCaughey for sounding the alarm on death panels.

This time around, *New York Times* reporter Robert Pear, acting like an actual reporter for a reputable news service, related that supporters of the policy fear the public will find out what they've done. Rep. Earl Blumenauer, Oregon Democrat, and Sen. John D. Rockefeller IV, West Virginia Democrat, had urged the adoption of the policy under the Medicare wellness benefit.

As Mr. Pear reports: "After learning of the administration's decision, Mr. Blumenauer's office celebrated 'a quiet victory,' but urged supporters not to crow about it."

"While we are happy with the result, we won't be shouting it from the rooftops," Mr. Blumenauer's office said in a November e-mail. "We would ask that you not broadcast this accomplishment out to any of your lists, even if they are 'supporters' . . . Thus far, it seems that no press or blogs have discovered it, but we will be keeping a close watch and may be calling on you if we need a rapid, targeted response. The longer this goes unnoticed, the better our chances of keeping it."

With such allies, the "most transparent administration in history" is seizing ever more power by bureaucratic fiat and scheming to keep it from the public.

In the *American Spectator*, Phil Klein reported that the 2,700-page health care bill includes more than 1,000 power-granting references to the Health and Human

Services (HHS) secretary. Here's the breakdown: The secretary "shall" (700 references); the secretary "may" (200) and the secretary "determines" (139).

This gives HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, who issued threatening letters to insurance companies during the health care debate, enormous unilateral power to set policy.

No wonder Mr. Blumenauer's office doesn't want to let the cat out of the bag on the death panels. No wonder the FCC kept the discussion of their Internet takeover behind closed doors. No wonder Mr. Reid and Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi's Congress cheered on the EPA's massive power grab.

The incoming Congress has several ways to deal with these usurpations. They can defund any of the rogue agencies or portions of their budgets that fuel the policies. The 1996 Congressional Review Act also gives Congress the authority to veto bureaucratic rulemaking that exceeds authorized powers.

The new House should propose legislation and hold hearings as soon as possible, before the sticky web of bureaucratic tendrils gets too dense to penetrate. Knowing they're on a shorter leash, bureaucrats at the EPA, HHS, and FCC and countless other agencies are busy concocting ever more rules as the new year dawns. Tyranny by decree is so much easier than having to persuade the people.

—*The Washington Times*, January 3, 2011

The Communist Drug Connection

by Matt Gurney

Despite the season, there hasn't been a lot of occasion for good cheer in Venezuela recently. President Hugo Chavez has side-stepped recent Congressional gains by the opposition by asking for, and receiving, emergency powers to rule by decree for 12 months. He claims he needs the powers to respond to devastating floods that have left over 140,000 homeless, but few observers believe this. Chavez will claim to be responding to the emergency, but his real goal will be strengthening his control over the economy and redistributing yet more wealth from the country's upper classes to its masses of poor. There is also concern amongst observers that Chavez might attempt to clamp down on the opposition and hostile media outlets. In other words, the news out of Latin America's oil giant

is, as usual, depressing. Even the recent news that Venezuela has been cooperating with the United States in an increasingly successful anti-drug campaign serves only to draw attention to the bleak reality that Hugo Chavez's regime plays a large and growing role in the international distribution of illegal drugs.

During the just-concluded 2010 calendar year, Venezuela arrested more than 12,000 for offenses relating to narcotics trafficking. This represents a major spike over prior years. Venezuela has even extradited several major crime figures to the United States to face prosecution. While not particularly eager to publicize its cooperation with America, the government has certainly not hesitated to boast of its recent successes in the war on drugs; the state news agency, AVN, has boasted that the arrests show that Venezuela's military is playing an important part in battling a global scourge.

That's true, as far as it goes—any progress in combating the smuggling of drugs, which destroy lives in North America and fund various violent causes abroad, is to be welcomed. But while acknowledging Venezuela's recent successes, it is important to note the irony of Hugo Chavez's government touting its victories in the war on drugs. Venezuela's active role in the smuggling of drugs out of Latin America into the Western world has long been a known secret. Any recent claims that Chavez's government is taking a hard line against the narcotics trade must be carefully scrutinized—and Chavez's record does not fare well under that kind of attention. The amount of cocaine being moved through Venezuela has increased at least 500% since 2004, and by some estimates, fully half the cocaine reaching European markets was shipped from Venezuelan ports.

Some of the country's involvement is indirect, or at least unintentional. Venezuela's role as a transit point for the smuggling of drugs has exploded during the last five years, according to Caribbean security issues expert Anthony Maingot, because the country ended all collaborative anti-narcotics efforts with the United States, allowing drug gangs to proliferate and causing a dramatic spike in the quantity of cocaine moving through Venezuela. Further, if elements within the military's upper echelons choose to enrich themselves by dabbling in the drug trade on the side, Chavez might prefer to turn a blind eye and preserve the military's loyalty rather than risk eroding his support amongst the commanders by asking too many questions about their burgeoning bank accounts.

Neglect, however, is not the only explanation for the country's increasing role in the international drug trade. Venezuela has provided direct military support and safe

havens to FARC, the Marxist guerrilla group that controls the cocaine supply in U.S. ally, and Venezuelan neighbor, Colombia. Over the last several years, as Colombia's U.S.-backed war effort against the FARC narco-terrorists has paid dividends, FARC has not only received advanced weapons from Venezuela, but has also relocated some of its leadership to camps just inside Venezuelan territory.

In 2009, Colombia sent troops into Venezuela to raid FARC camps and captured several high-value FARC targets. Venezuela responded by mobilizing troops and threatening regional war if its territory was violated again. The Chavez regime has also been linked to assassination plots against the Colombian president, whose successes against the drug trade and close relationship with America are a constant irritant to Venezuela. Clearly, no matter how many drug smugglers Venezuela might deport to face trial in America, it cannot seriously claim to be a force for law and order so long as it continues to support FARC, one of the world's largest drug-smuggling organizations and a recognized terrorist entity.

Alas, Chavez, while happy to boast of his country's contributions to the war on drugs, would no doubt object to the term "terrorist" being applied to his FARC allies—and "allies" is not too strong a term. In a fascinating piece published by the British newspaper *The Guardian* in 2008, a former FARC fighter, who had defected to the Colombian government, described his experiences inside Venezuela, as a FARC soldier, in great detail (though under his new, assumed identity, of course). The former member of FARC described how the Venezuelan military offered FARC protection, weapons, and training, but also how members of the Chavez administration gave them travel documents, ID cards, and even issued high-ranking FARC leaders clean Venezuelan passports.

Many of the accounts given were confirmed by diplomats, speaking off the record so as to avoid provoking an incident with Chavez, who is notoriously touchy about international criticism. Chavez and FARC, both driven by socialist ideology and a loathing for American influence in Latin America, are natural allies, concluded the former FARC fighter, and few experts seem inclined to disagree. So while Venezuela's recent cooperation and successes against drug smuggling operations taking place on their soil are to be commended, their self-congratulatory praise should be taken with a grain of salt. Venezuela cannot serve both the law enforcement needs of the international community and its FARC allies at once. Given Chavez's enhanced powers and anti-American agenda, it's doubtful that he will choose correctly.

—FrontPageMagazine, January 4, 2011

Why Latin America Turned Red

by Caroline Glick

Israelis can be excused for wondering why Brazil and Argentina unexpectedly announced they recognize an independent Palestinian state with its capital city in Israel's capital city. Israelis can be forgiven for being taken by surprise by their move and by the prospect that Uruguay, and perhaps Paraguay, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, and El Salvador, will be following in their footsteps because the Israeli media have failed to report on developing trends in Latin America.

And this is not surprising. The media fail to report on almost all the developing trends impacting the world. For instance, when the Turkish government sent Hamas supporters to challenge the IDF's maritime blockade of the Hamas-controlled Gaza coastline, the media were surprised that Israel's ally Turkey had suddenly become Hamas's ally and Israel's enemy.

Their failure to report on Turkey's gradual transformation into an Islamic supremacist state caused the media to treat what was a culmination of a trend as a shocking new development.

The same is now happening with Latin America.

Whereas in Turkey, the media failed only to report on the significance of the singular trend of Islamization of Turkish society, the media have consistently ignored the importance for Israel of three trends that made Latin America's embrace of the Palestinians against Israel eminently predictable.

Those trends are the rise of Hugo Chavez, the regional influence of the Venezuela-Iran alliance, and the cravenness of US foreign policy towards Latin America and the Middle East. When viewed as a whole they explain why Latin American states are lining up to support the Palestinians. More importantly, they tell us something about how Israel should be acting.

Over the past decade Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez has inherited Fidel Castro's mantle as the head of the Latin American anti-American club. He has used Venezuela's oil wealth, drug money, and other illicit fortunes to draw neighboring states into his orbit and away from the US. Chavez's circle of influence now includes Cuba and Nicaragua, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Ecuador as well as Brazil, Paraguay, Argentina, and Peru. Democracies like Colombia and Chile are also taking steps in Chavez's anti-American direction.

Chavez's choice of Iran is no fluke, although it seemed like one to some when the alliance first arose around 2004. Iran's footprint in Latin America has grown gradually. Beginning in the 1980s, Iran started using Latin America as a forward base of operations against the US and the West. It deployed Hezbollah and Revolutionary Guard operatives and other intelligence and terror assets along the largely ungoverned tri-border area between Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil. That staging ground in turn enabled Iran to bomb Israeli and Jewish targets in Buenos Aires in the early 1990s.

Iran's presence on the continent allowed it to take advantage of Chavez's consolidation of power. Since taking office in 2005, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has developed strategic alliances with Venezuela and Nicaragua.

With Chavez's assistance, Tehran is expanding its web of alliances throughout Latin America at the expense of the US and Israel.

On the face of it, Chavez and Ahmadinejad seem like an odd couple. One is a Marxist and the other is a messianic jihadist. But on closer inspection it makes perfect sense. They share the same obsessions with hating the US and loving power.

Chavez has demonstrated his commitment to maintaining power by crushing his opponents, taking control over the judiciary and media, amending the constitution, and repeatedly stealing elections.

Meanwhile, the WikiLeaks sabotage campaign against the US gave us a first person account of the magnitude of Ahmadinejad's electoral fraud.

In a cable from the US Embassy in Turkmenistan dated 15 June 2009, or three days after Ahmadinejad stole the Iranian presidential elections, the embassy reported a conversation with an Iranian source regarding the true election results. The Iranian source referred to the poll as a "coup d'etat."

The regime declared Ahmadinejad the winner with 63% of the vote. According to the Iranian source, he received less than a fifth of that amount. As the cable put it, "based on calculations from [opponent Mir Hossain] Mousavi's campaign observer, who were present at polling stations around the country and who witnessed the vote counts, Mousavi received approximately 26 million (or 61%) of the 42 million votes cast in Friday's election, followed by Mehdi Karroubi (10-12 million). . . . Ahmadinejad received 'a maximum of 4-5 million votes,' with the remainder going to Mohsen Rezai."

There is no fence-sitting along the Iran-Israel divide.

Latin American countries that embrace Iran always do so to the detriment of their ties with Israel. Bolivia and Venezuela cut their diplomatic ties with Israel in January 2009 after siding with Hamas in Operation Cast Lead. In comments reported on the Hudson New York website, Ricardo Udler, the president of the small Bolivian Jewish community, said there is a direct correlation between Bolivia's growing ties with Iran and its animosity towards Israel. In his words, "Each time an Iranian official arrives in Bolivia there are negative comments against the State of Israel and soon after, the Bolivian authorities issue a communiqué against the Jewish state."

Udler also warned that, "there is information from international agencies that indicate that uranium from Bolivia and Venezuela is being shipped to Iran."

That was in October. With Iran it appears that if you're in for an inch you're in for a mile. This month we learned that Venezuela and Iran are jointly deploying intermediate range ballistic missiles in Venezuela that will be capable of targeting US cities.

There is no doubt that the Venezuelan-Iranian alliance and its growing force in Latin America go a long way towards explaining South America's sudden urge to recognize "Palestine." But there is more to the story.

The final trend that the media in Israel have failed to notice is the impact that US foreign policy in South America and the Middle East alike has had on the positions of nations like Brazil and Argentina towards Israel. During the Bush administration, US Latin America policy was an incoherent bundle of contradictions. On the one hand, the US failed to assist Chavez's opponents overthrow him when they had a chance in 2004. The US similarly failed to support Nicaraguan democrats in their electoral fight against Sandinista leader Daniel Ortega in the 2007 elections. On the other hand, the US did foster strong alliances with Colombia and Chile.

Under the Obama administration, US Latin American policy has become more straightforward. The US has turned its back on its allies and is willing to humiliate itself in pursuit of its adversaries.

In April 2009, US President Barack Obama sat through a 50-minute anti-American rant by Ortega at the Summit

of the Americas. He then sought out Chavez for a photo-op. In his own address Obama distanced himself from US history, saying, "We have at times been disengaged, and at times we sought to dictate our terms. But I pledge to you that we seek an equal partnership. There is no senior partner and junior partner in our relations."

Unfortunately, Obama's attempted appeasement hasn't done any good. Nicaragua invaded neighboring Costa Rica last month along the San Juan River. Ortega's forces are dredging the river as part of an Iranian-sponsored project to build a canal along the Isthmus of Nicaragua that will rival the Panama Canal.

Even Obama's ambassador in Managua admits that Ortega remains deeply hostile to the US. In a cable from February, illicitly published by WikiLeaks, Ambassador Robert Callahan argued that Ortega's charm offensive towards the US was "unlikely to portend a new, friendly Ortega with whom we can work in the long-term."

It is not simply the US's refusal to defend itself against the likes of Chavez that provokes the likes of Brazil's President Luiz Ignacio Lula da Silva and Argentina's President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner to embrace Chavez and Iran.

They are also responding to the US's signals towards Iran and Israel.

Obama's policy of engaging and sanctioning Iran has no chance of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. And just like the Arabs and the Europeans, the South Americans know it. There is no doubt that at least part of Lula's reason for signing onto a nuclear deal with Ahmadinejad and Turkey's Reccip Erdogan last spring was his certainty that the US has no intention of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear arms.

From Lula's perspective, there is no reason to participate in the US charade of preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear power. He might as well be on the winning side. And since Obama doesn't mind Iran winning, Iran will win.

The same rules apply for Israel. Like the Europeans, the Arabs, the Asians, and everyone else, the Latin Americans have clearly noted that Obama's only consistent foreign policy goal is his aim of forcing Israel to accept a

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.

hostile Palestinian state and surrender all the land it took control over in 1967 to the likes of PLO chief Mahmoud Abbas and Syrian dictator Bashar Assad. They see that Obama has refused to rule out the possibility of recognizing a Palestinian state even if that state is declared without a peace treaty with Israel. That is, Obama is unwilling to commit himself to not recognizing a Palestinian state that will be in a de facto state of war with Israel.

The impression that Obama is completely committed to the Palestinian cause was reinforced rather than weakened this week with the cancellation of the Netanyahu-Clinton deal regarding the banning of Jewish construction in Judea, Samaria, and Jerusalem. The deal was to see Israel banning Jewish construction for an additional 90 days, in exchange for a US pledge not to ask for any further bans; to support Israel at the UN Security Council for a limited time against a Palestinian push to declare independence without peace; and to sell Israel an additional 20 F-35 fighter jets sometime in the future.

It came apart because Obama was unwilling to put Clinton's commitments—meager as they were—in writing. That is, the deal fell through because Obama wouldn't make even a minimal pledge to maintain the US's alliance with Israel.

This policy signals to the likes of Brazil and Argentina and Uruguay that they might as well go with Chavez and Iran and turn their backs on Israel. No one will thank them if they lag behind the US in their pro-Iran, anti-Israel policies. And by moving ahead of the US, they get the credit due to those who stick their fingers in Washington's eye.

When we understand the trends that led to Latin America's hostile act against Israel, we realize two things. First, while Israel might have come up with a way to delay the action, it probably couldn't have prevented it. And second, given the US policy trajectory, it is again obvious that the only one Israel can rely on to defend its interests—against Iran and the Palestinians alike—is Israel.

—CarolineGlick.com, December 10, 2020



Paint the Pentagon Lavender

by Robert Maginnis

The outgoing Democrat Senate majority failed twice to repeal the military's homosexual exclusion law while the House passed a stand-alone repeal bill (250-175). Whether the 111th Congress eventually acts on the measure, the new Republican-controlled House and the larger Republican Senate minority should take up the issue in 2011.

Should the Democrats succeed in repealing the gay exclusion law (10 U.S. Code, Section 654, which is often confused with the Pentagon's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" implementing regulations), the new Congress could block implementation by not funding or specifically prohibiting funding in the fiscal year 2011 Department of Defense Appropriations Act and maintaining current legal sanctions.

Alternatively, Congress could oversee the integration of homosexuals to protect our all-volunteer force and their combat effectiveness by making the process consistent with federal statutes and policies (e.g., Defense of Marriage Act—DOMA) but only after conducting studies that may require additional stipulations and caveats.

Keep in mind the Pentagon's post-repeal implementation plan is based on questionable assessments and flawed data, which are part of the report Defense Secretary Robert Gates delivered to Congress Nov. 30.

At the very least, Congress should require additional studies and hearings. Remember that Congress, not the executive branch, has the constitutional responsibility under Article 1, Section 8 to establish rules for the military. Congress is under no obligation to accept the Pentagon plan to facilitate implementation by changing laws such as the Uniform Code of Military Justice and should consider additional rules, policies, and laws to guide that process.

But should the Democrats fail to repeal the law, the Republicans have many options. Here are two:

First, the new Congress can ignore the issue with two caveats; closely monitor Obama's Justice Department's defense of the law and the Pentagon's enforcement of the law.

Second, Congress can justify ignoring the issue for now because, as the chiefs of the military services recently testified, our armed forces are fully engaged in two wars and don't want this distraction. But ignoring the homo-

sexual issue won't slow the gay lobby from pressing for relief in the courts, and the Obama administration, which loudly opposes the law, will undermine the law by slowing the discharge process.

We already saw the damage done by one liberal judge supported by Obama's lackluster Justice Department team. This summer a Riverside, Calif., district court judge declared the homosexual ban unconstitutional and then enjoined the Pentagon from enforcing the law. Through a series of what appear to be deliberate moves by the Obama Justice Department, the injunction came dangerously close to lifting the ban across the entire military by judicial fiat.

To counter future judicial malpractice, Congress should hold the Justice Department accountable to vigorously defend the law and when in doubt Congress should file briefs in federal homosexual cases offering time-proven arguments.

President Obama has also essentially lifted the ban by centralizing Pentagon decisions regarding homosexual discharges. The number of discharges for homosexuality is drastically down because the administration created very high hurdles to launch investigations. Besides, very public support for repeal from Obama, Secretary Gates, and Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, discourages commanders from enforcing the law.

To counter future efforts to bureaucratically lift the ban, Congress must demand that Pentagon appointees enforce the homosexual exclusion law. It should closely monitor discharge rates and look for indications officials are creating a command climate that discourages enforcement. Congress could restrict funding of the Defense Department and the services if they refuse to enforce the law.

Second, a superior option would be to monitor the administration's support of the law as outlined above and then sponsor several studies that scientifically examine the issue, followed by hearings. The studies won't reverse the public's growing naiveté regarding homosexuality's threat for the military, but might blunt a future Congress' or some courts' reckless disregard for the military's unique culture.

The studies are also needed to marginalize the Pentagon's new repeal-only report before it is cited as an authoritative source in future homosexual court cases. Congressional studies must consider all policy options, the associated risks for each, and thoroughly document the exclusion law's findings.

The law's findings reflect the military's unique and vulnerable culture. Three of the 15 findings are: "There is no constitutional right to serve in the military." "Military life is fundamentally different from civilian life." And "The presence in the armed forces of persons who demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards of morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion that are the essence of military capability."

The studies must also address the critical issue of manning the force, Congress' primary constitutional responsibility. The Pentagon's report dismisses the view that open homosexuality threatens recruitment and retention but offers little or no empirical support for that conclusion.

Hearings should follow the studies' publication to thoroughly review the results. This approach will demonstrate Congress takes its oversight responsibilities seriously, and only then should Congress entertain readiness for enhancing changes to the exclusion law.

Repealing the ban based solely on the Democrats' political whim and a cursory reading of the Pentagon's one-option, flawed report is dangerous to national security and could be the opening salvo of a new culture war. But if repeal happens, the new Congress must take actions to preserve national security from radical social engineering while hosting hearings on the potential damage to our all-volunteer force.

If the law survives, then the new Congress must be proactive to avert Obama's subversion. It must play defense by monitoring the Obama administration's support of the law and take the offense through stronger policies and by leveraging the appropriations process. It must prepare for future challenges with comprehensive scientific studies and hearings that bolster the record.

—*Human Events*, December 20, 2010 p. 12

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.