



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 51, Number 9



Dr. David Noebel

September 2011

Christianity, Science, and Evolution

by David A. Noebel

Free Inquiry, the publication of the Council for Secular Humanism, conducted a panel discussion at its 30th anniversary (October 2010) entitled “Science and Religion: Confrontation or Accommodation?” (June/July 2011). Two of the panelists favored accommodation (Eugenie C. Scott and Chris Mooney), and two favored confrontation (P.Z. Myers and Victor J. Stenger).

Some of their observations are right on target: “Science per se is not a worldview; it’s a way of understanding the natural world. Philosophical naturalism is a worldview. . . . Science is an equal-opportunity methodology suitable for anyone, no matter from which personal philosophy he or she creates meaning. And yes, many supernaturalists, including Christians, also use science to refine their sense of meaning and purpose” (Eugenie C. Scott).

Some of their other observations are loony: “The universe is eternal, and so the question is moot. Something did not have to come from anything. Something always existed. And, if the universe always existed, then there was no creation and consequently no creator. . . . In fact, current cosmological theories suggest that our universe is just one in a ‘multiverse’ of an unlimited number of universes” (Victor J. Stenger).

Of these two, it is obvious that Scott is much more attuned to the normal meaning of “science,” while Stenger, a professor of philosophy at the University of Colorado, is dealing philosophical speculation under the guise of doing science. There is no scientific method to determine “unlimited number of universes.” This is the argument of atheists who need to avoid the implications of the presently known “finely-tuned” universe. (See William Gairdner’s *The Book of Absolutes*.)

But more interesting to me is the emphasis that all four panelists place on the theory of evolution. All four are convinced that Christians are “anti-science” if they fail to accept Darwinian evolution as scientific fact.

Scott: “Our expert witness John Haught, a Catholic theologian, is fond of saying, ‘Nothing in theology makes sense except in the light of evolution.’”

Mooney: “Nisbet sought a middle way to frame the issue that says ‘There doesn’t need to be a conflict; you can have your religion and eat evolution, too.’”

Myers: “Evolution is a real process built on raw chance driven by the brutal engines of selection.”

Stenger: “Let me begin with creationism, which is much more than simply challenging evolution; it also includes what I will call ‘cosmic creationism [a finely-tuned universe, etc.]’”

P.Z. Myers, a professor of biology at the University of Minnesota, defines evolution as follows: “Evolution is a real process built on raw chance driven by the brutal engines of selection. And there is no sign of a loving personal god, just billions of years of pitiless winnowing without any direction, other than short-term survival and reproduction. It’s not pretty, it’s not consoling . . . but it’s got one soaring virtue that trumps all the others: it’s true.”

And these Secular Humanists wonder why most evangelical Christians turn their back on Darwinian evolution! The universe doesn’t appear to be “raw chance.” The heavens we appreciate and study “declare the glory of God.” The “pitiless winnowing without any direction” does not come close to describing the magnificent make-up of the human body (see Stephen Meyer’s *Signature of the Cell*), and the human mind certainly doesn’t seem to be directionless! And, of course, for Christians the appearance of Jesus Christ on earth 2,000 years ago answers the charge of “no personal, loving God.” (Atheists enjoy spelling God “god.”)

Evangelical Christians read in Scripture that “from the beginning of creation God made them male and female” (Mark 10:6). Nothing here (or in Genesis 1–3) about evolving males and females. This itself presents a problem for evolution-

ists—since the female body is more complicated physiologically, it should take longer for her to evolve than the male. And because her parts are evolving “directionless,” each part certainly takes hundreds of thousands of years. Question: What does the male do while waiting for all her parts to develop?

But Scripture places male and female together at the same time and in the same place, eliminating that argument. I would like to read or hear a Christian evolutionist’s thoughts on this issue. Perhaps someone at the Darrel Falk’s Biologos Foundation could tackle it. Biologos is currently featuring Denis Lamoureux’s work *I Love Jesus and I Accept Evolution*. Perhaps Falk and Lamoureux would like to accept this challenge.

Since Jesus accepted Adam and Eve as historical (Mark 10:6-8), I would like to see how Lamoureux explains their evolutionary process from a first speck of life to fully formed man and woman.

But there is more to this issue. Humanists are heavily involved in promoting the homosexual agenda (Vern L. Bullough was *Free Inquiry*’s most vocal advocate of the homosexual movement including “consensual pedophilia”), and there is presently an attempt to downplay labels like “male” and “female.” The science of biology seems to be taking second place to the pseudo-science “gender” classification. Humanists continue to have difficulty justifying evolution’s “survival of the fittest” dogma and homosexual antics. Myers talks of “the brutal engines of selection.” But selection involves “reproduction,” and homosexuals do not reproduce. They may seduce five- and six-year-olds into their camp under the guise of “queering elementary education,” but they are biologically sterile.

The President of the United States put his homosexual friend Kevin Jennings in charge of “queering elementary education,” and Jennings insists the program is going very well, although he is leaving his “safe school czar” post. I surmise that his departure has something to do with the upcoming election season. What Obama advocate could effectively defend “queering elementary” children? What Obama advocate could effectively defend Jennings’ now famous statement, “Ex-gay messages have no place in our nation’s public schools. A line has been drawn. There is no ‘other side’ when you’re talking about lesbian, gay, and bisexual students.” I wonder if Jennings has the same attitude toward ex-drug addicts! But what about the ex-gays with the message detailing the health risks associated with homosexual acts? Jennings has made their public school appearances an impossible occurrence certainly to the detriment of the youth being brainwashed by homosexual

propaganda and its message of gay is good, gay is healthy, gay is genetic, gay is normal, etc.

Every Secular Humanist knows of Yale’s Larry Kramer and his homosexual exploits. But few are honest enough to admit that his confession to murdering many of his hundreds of “lovers” by infecting them with the AIDS virus should have put a dent in their campaign to harvest elementary children into the homosexual camp.

It is baffling to read in *Free Inquiry* that Christians are anti-science because they reject, in the main, Darwinian “raw chance” evolution, but Humanists loudly defend homosexuality, an obviously anti-evolutionary lifestyle whose various sexual practices are abnormal, unhealthy, and immoral according to every major religion. The exception, of course, is that the minor religion of Secular Humanism does not condemn the very sexual practices that are a guaranteed biological dead end!

Case closed!

Our “Gay Pride” President

by David A. Noebel

The President of the United States has again declared June 2011 “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender [LGBT] Pride Month.”

For reasons I will try to explain below, however, his declaration did not include the “Q” in the LGBTQIA family of perversions from the norm of male/female biology even though Queer Youth Advocacy Day is an important part of the new educational curriculum “to unite and educate lawmakers on the needs of LGBTQ youth and what is needed to end harassment and discrimination in school.” Harvard and Yale University’s “queer studies” are a vital part of the same curriculum. “We’re here, we’re queer, get used to it” is the theme of much of the homosexual propaganda and all these parts of gay activism fit within the president’s proclamation.

Apparently “Queer” may still be considered too radical for the general public to comprehend and/or appreciate. Case in point, Joe six-pack may find Larry Kramer’s (Yale graduate and author of *Faggots*) confession that he murdered some of his lovers, including ‘sweet young boys’ by infecting them with the AIDS virus difficult to stomach. “Queer” also adds ammunition to the “homophobic, right wing” of the evangelical Christian community,

which insists that homosexuality is an insult to the Creator who “from the beginning of creation made them male and female.” (Mark 10:6) Then, too, the “I” (intersexual/intergendered and inner trannie) and the “A” (asexual and allies) are considered “family only” behavior. With Obama in the White House, these perversions will probably be celebrated soon and made a part of the “queering elementary education” curriculum. The truth is none of the sexual practices of the LGBTQIA family is made for television or dinner table conversation, and of the fifteen or so sexual activities (sodomy, showers, S&M, rimming, fisting, etc.) none should be labeled normal, healthy or moral. They are all abnormal, unhealthy, and immoral.

Nevertheless, the President of the United States confidently stated the following: “Since taking office, my Administration has made significant progress towards achieving equality for LGBT Americans. Last December, I was proud to sign the repeal of the discriminatory ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ policy. With this repeal, gay and lesbian [bisexual, transgendered, queer, intersexual, trannies] Americans will be able to serve openly in our Armed Forces for the first time in our Nation’s history. Our national security will be strengthened [which is a deadly joke manufactured in downtown Sodom-on-the-Potomac] and the heroic contributions these Americans make to our military, and have made throughout our history, will be fully recognized.

“My Administration,” says Obama “has also taken steps to eliminate discrimination against LGBT [transgendered, queer, etc.] Americans in Federal housing programs and to give LGBT Americans the right to visit their loved ones in the hospital. We have made clear through executive branch nondiscrimination policies that discrimination on the basis of gender identity in the Federal workplace will not be tolerated. I have continued to nominate and appoint highly qualified, openly LGBT [transgendered, queer, etc.] individuals to executive branch and judicial positions.

“Because we recognize that LGBT rights are human rights [for example, to celebrate and promote queering elementary education], my Administration stands with advocates of equality around the world in leading the fight against pernicious laws targeting LGBT persons and malicious attempts to exclude LGBT organizations from full participation in the international system.”

The organizations Obama is referring to include GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Educational Network), GSA (Gay Student Alliances), International Gay and Lesbian Archives in Los Angeles, IGLYO (International

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth and Student Organization), GAGA (Girls against Gender Assignment), GALE (Gay and Lesbian Educators), NEA Gay & Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Caucus, NEA Drag Queen Caucus, Harvard Gay and Lesbian Caucus, National Queer Art Festival, Queer Nation, Human Rights Campaign, IGLHRC (International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission), Lambda Legal, PFLAG (Parents, Families, & Friends of Lesbians & Gays), NGLTF (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force), GLAAD (Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation), GRIN (Global Respect in Education), ILGA (International Lesbian and Gay Association), ILGLaw (International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Law Association), Empire State Pride Agenda, ACT UP, GLF (Gay Liberation Front), GAA (Gay Activists Alliance), GSANI (Gay Straight Alliance Network International), and on and on and on. There are thousands of such organizations!

Is it any wonder that Sen. Tom Coburn (R-OK) said, “The gay community has infiltrated the very centers of power in every area across this country, and they wield extreme power.”

And it all begins early! President Obama appointed his homosexual friend Kevin Jennings as the Assistant Deputy Secretary for the Office of Safe & Drug Free Schools. This appointment alone should have been enough to get the President impeached if child molestation is an impeachable offense! And if “queering elementary students” isn’t child molestation, the concept has lost all meaning!

Jennings wrote the foreword to William J. Letts IV and James T. Sears *Queering Elementary Education: Advancing the Dialogue about Sexualities and Schooling*. The book is about exposing elementary school children to the homosexual lifestyle and was endorsed by none other than Prof. Peter McLaren, University of California-Los Angeles, who wrote, “This volume marks the beginning of the queering of critical pedagogy and is long overdue.” Another professor at the University of London said that “Together and individually, the chapters of this book make a compelling case for queering elementary education, to the benefit of all children in all their diversity.”

It contained such chapters as “Teaching Queerly: Some Elementary Propositions,” “Why Discuss Sexuality in Elementary School?,” “It’s Okay to be Gay: Interrupting Straight Thinking in the English Classroom,” “When Queer and Teacher Meet.” These are just a sampling.

The President of the United States finds nothing unacceptable in this kind of education, nor do his friends at the NEA. The NEA has established the Gay & Lesbian,

Bisexual, and Transgender Caucus along with the NEA Drag Queen Caucus to queer elementary school children who aren't old enough to know that they are being manipulated by professional perverts.

In 2003, the former president of the NEA, Bob Chase, gave a glowing endorsement of GLSEN (founded by Kevin Jennings) and its elementary training material. Said Chase, "Schools cannot be neutral when dealing with issues of human dignity and human rights. I'm not talking about tolerance, I'm talking about acceptance."

"Acceptance" has become a key word. Accept the gay lifestyle or be considered homophobic, intolerant, mean, yea, immoral! Another current word is "celebrate." Celebrate the gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender/queer/intersexual lifestyle or be considered an enemy of the human race. In fact, celebrate might not be even strong enough since queering elementary students involves making sure that 5 and 6 year-olds "support, admire, appreciate, and nurture" the homosexual lifestyle. Unbelievably, the American public is putting up with this nonsense! God, the Bible, and prayer (and almost the pledge to the American flag) have been dismissed and replaced with "queer education."

According to Michael L. Brown in his exceedingly well-documented *A Queer Thing Happened to America*, the poem "Here at School the Slant is Gay" is an accurate picture of the contemporary American school system. The poem reads:

Little Johnny went to school
 There to learn a brand new rule
 No longer could the boys be boys
 Or have their special trucks and toys
 Only six, so young and tender
 It's time for him to unlearn gender
 And break the binding two-sex mold
 That hurtful thinking that's so old
 Parents at home can have their say
 But here at school, the slant is gay
 In other words, to make this clear
 There's nothing wrong with being queer
 Having two moms is mighty fine
 To disagree is out of line
 We'll deconstruct the family
 And smash religious bigotry
 And keep the church out of the state
 By saying faith is really hate
 Free speech can only go one way
 Since here at school, the slant is gay
 So little ones, it's time to learn

'bout famous queers, each one in turn
 Lesbian greets long neglected
 Well-known gays just now detected
 Some, perhaps, were man/boy lovers
 We'll keep that stuff under the covers
 GLSEN will fill in for Granny
 And help kids find their inner-trannie
 Those born in a body that's wrong
 Will hear of sex-change before long
 And through the years as Johnny grows
 He will learn that anything goes
 With Bill, who's trans and Joe who's bi
 And Sue who thinks that she's a guy
 United in the Day of Silence
 Joining the Gay Straight Alliance
 A queer new system rules the day
 Since here at school, the slant is gay

The brainwashing is augmented by children's books that present gay and lesbian family life as perfectly normal. Some of the more popular titles are *Oh the Things Mommies Do? What Could be Better than Having Two?*, *Two Daddies and Me*, *A Family Alphabet Book*, *Molly's Family*, *Heather Has Two Mommies*, *Daddy's Roommate*, *King and King*, *King and King and Family*.

History lessons are also rewritten to acknowledge known homosexuals as heroes not just for their achievements, but also for their lifestyle. A major problem, however, is that many of the new hero list are also on the NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Association) list as practicing pedophiles. According to NAMBLA, "From famous couples such as Oscar Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas, to cultural institutions such as that of ancient Greek pederasty, to cultural concepts such as China's 'passion of the cut sleeve,' to iconic figures such as Francis Bacon or Walt Whitman...man/boy love spans every dimension of history, both Western and non-Western." Although NAMBLA may proudly list some of these historical heroes as "man/boy lovers," others would call them a different name—pedophiles.

If Mr. and Mrs. America knew the full extent of the meaning of "queering elementary education" and the implications of President Obama's proclamation, they would be shocked into action. Something is terribly wrong when: a) schools are now admonished not to use such words as "boys" and "girls," "husbands" and "wives," or identify themselves as male and female because such labels are an affront and an insult to LGBT persons and their agenda. Anyone who protests is labeled Nazi or homophobic bigot or worse, b) The *Richmond Times-Dispatch* announces the

Richmond Federal Reserve Bank is flying the rainbow flag in honor of homosexual activism at the request of PRISM—a Richmond Federal group representing gays, lesbians, bisexual, transgender, and queer employees and allies, c) Obama has succeeded in sodomizing the United States military in sympathy with the gay agenda by repealing the policy of Don't Ask, d) AIDS, a disease that has its roots in the gay lifestyle, is not part of the queering elementary curriculum in spite of the fact that the disease has already killed 750,000 Americans and left another 1.1 million infected and doomed to a shortened life. Engaging in normal, healthy, moral sexual behavior is now viewed by the humanist elite as puritanical, religious, bigoted, unexciting, moralistic nonsense.

One has to wonder why the President of the United States is so intent on promoting gay pride. It could be that he was introduced to such perversion by his teenage mentor, Franklin Marshall Davis, a known Communist who was certainly aware of the lifestyle of his fellow Communist Henry Hay, founder of the homosexual Mattachine Society—an early organization launched to homosexualize the United States. Now the Hollywood gay mafia (GLAAD), America's educational system (kindergarten through grad school), and federal and state governments are working overtime to make sure that gay is good and those protesting its perversions and seeking to protect their children are labeled abnormal, charged with hate crimes, and closeted.

This is no doubt what Prof. Robert Weissberg (University of Illinois-Urbana) had in mind in his warning to America: “Make no mistake, this is not just telling youngsters to ignore ‘odd’ classmates, the traditional tolerance-based solution. Rather, this is a drive to legitimize homosexuality, swathed in the rhetoric of tolerance, by portraying this sexual predilection as ‘normal’ at a time when youngsters barely grasp sexuality of any variety. This quarrel is hardly an academic one: confrontations are real, and, ironically as so often is the case, their tumultuousness undermines the very social tranquility tolerance instruction is supposed to bring.”

America is no longer slouching toward Sodom and Gomorrah—America is sitting at the corner of Main and First Street!

A New John Lennon

by Gary DeMar

Former theist and now self-avowed atheist Dan Barker, who is co-president of the Freedom of Religion Foundation, promoted a “Beware of Dogma” campaign using billboards that also included the line “Imagine No Religion,” borrowed from John Lennon's atheist national anthem “Imagine.” I wonder if the FRF's call for everyone to “beware of dogma” includes the dogma of atheism, which is funded by my tax dollars in government schools.

Recently we've come to learn that Lennon was embarrassed by his early political and social radicalism. Fred Seaman, who worked with Lennon from 1979 to his death on December 8, 1980, claims that the music legend “was a Ronald Reagan fan who enjoyed arguing with left-wing radicals who reminded him of his former self.” Seaman continued:

I also saw John embark in some really brutal arguments with my uncle, who's an old-time communist. . . . He enjoyed really provoking my uncle. . . . Maybe he was being provocative . . . but it was pretty obvious to me he had moved away from his earlier radicalism. He was a very different person back in 1979 and 80 than he'd been when he wrote “Imagine.” By 1979 he looked back on that guy and was embarrassed by that guy's naivete.

In a series of interviews published after his death, “[t]he man who famously called for imagining a world with ‘No religion’ also jettisoned his anti-theism,” Jordan Michael Smith of *The American Conservative* writes. “‘People got the image I was anti-Christ or antireligion,’ he said. ‘I'm not at all. I'm a most religious fellow. I'm religious in the sense of admitting there is more to it than meets the eye. I'm certainly not an atheist.’”

Not only did Lennon reject atheism, he also rejected extreme forms of evolution. He instinctively knew that there was something special about humans and different about the animal world even if he did not know how the theory of evolution is argued.

“Nor do I think we came from monkeys, by 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.

way,” he insisted. “That’s another piece of garbage. What the hell’s it based on? We couldn’t have come from anything—fish, maybe, but not monkeys. I don’t believe in the evolution of fish to monkeys to men. Why aren’t monkeys changing into men now? It’s absolute garbage. It’s absolutely irrational garbage, as mad as the ones who believe the world was made only four thousand years ago, the fundamentalists. That and the monkey thing are both as insane as the apes standing up suddenly.

What happened to Lennon? Why did his views change? He grew up. He matured. He was willing to look reality in the face without blinking and say, “I was wrong.” The man who imagined a world with “no religion” and “no possessions” left an estate of more than \$275 million, “not bad for one who referred to himself as an ‘instinctive socialist,’ for one who believed in the abolition of ‘all money, police, and government.’” His early flirtation with the theory of socialism was naive. He knew that sending money to poor nations was counter-productive.

When it was pointed out that a Beatles reunion could possibly raise \$200 million for a poverty-stricken country in South America, Lennon had no time for it. “You know, America has poured billions into places like that. It doesn’t mean a damn thing. After they’ve eaten that meal, then what? It lasts for only a day. After the \$200,000,000 is gone, then what? It goes round and round in circles.”

It’s time that atheists and liberals follow Lennon’s lead and also grow up. Atheism and socialism are literal dead ends. They are destroyers of people and societies. If there is no God, then Lennon’s death at the hands of Mark David Chapman was the result of the survival of the fittest, the fittest being Chapman.

We don’t have to imagine what our world would be like without religion. Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924) gives us a window into such a world:

Our propaganda necessarily includes the propaganda of atheism. . . . We shall now probably have to follow the advice Engels once gave to the German Socialists: to translate and widely disseminate the literature of the eighteenth-century French Enlighteners and atheists.

The French “enlighteners” worshipped reason. “The

success of the physical and other sciences in England in the seventeenth century,” Robert Conquest observes, “gave the French intelligentsia the idea that everything could be determined by Reason—in whose name the Revolution was made—with the ‘Romantic’ input from Rousseau as part of the meld.” What was the result? The guillotine and blood in the streets. All together now, “Imagine no religion. It’s easy if you try.”

The atheism that spawned Communism was very reasonable and led to the deaths of 100 million people in the 20th century. When I made this statement in response to an email I received, I was met with this challenge: “Who are these high priests of atheism exactly? Name them and quote them. Then I want to know how many people were killed in what country during what period exactly and who killed them, within a million or so. I need you to account for all 100 million, Gary, or close to it. I have history books in three languages and they don’t mention a word about atheists killing anyone.”

Lenin, Stalin, Cambodia’s Pol Pot (remember the “killing fields”?), Romania’s Nicolae Ceaucescu, China’s Mao Zedong, North Korea’s Kim Il Sung—all atheists and Communists—committed well-documented atrocities that led to the deaths of mega millions. The authors of *The Black Book of Communism* (1999) offer the needed documentation that the e-mailer demanded me to produce. Tony Judt of the *New York Times* writes of the book:

An 800-page compendium of the crimes of Communist regimes worldwide, recorded and analyzed in ghastly detail by a team of scholars. The facts and figures, some of them well known, others newly confirmed in hitherto inaccessible archives, are irrefutable. The myth of the well-intentioned founders — the good czar Lenin betrayed his evil heirs — has been laid to rest for good. No one will any longer be able to claim ignorance or uncertainty about the criminal nature of Communism, and those who had begun to forget will be forced to remember anew.

From *The Black Book of Communism* he can move on to Robert Conquest’s *Reflections on a Ravaged Century* (1999) and *The Great Terror* (1990). Conquest writes:

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.

Organized *irreligion* in the twentieth century committed atrocities on a scale that the fiercest religious wars never approached. The scientific racism of Nazi Germany killed forty million and attempted genocide against Europe's Jews. The scientific socialism of the Communist countries killed a hundred million (and still counting) people around the globe. As the Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky has noted, people in the West routinely invoke the Spanish Inquisition as an example of religious horror. And they are right to do so. But the Inquisition, in the course of three centuries, and after legal procedures of a sort, killed fewer people—probably around three thousand—than the Soviet Union killed on an average day.

It is significant to note that “after 1949 when the communists took control of China, the first new text introduced to all the schools was neither Marxist nor Leninist, but Darwinian.” With Darwin, all things are permissible. For a fleeting moment, Communism was seen as the new god that would save the world. But even here, disillusionment set in as the logical extension of its materialist assumptions were worked out consistently.

On the atheist foundation of Marxist Communism, see *Religion in Soviet Russia: 1917–1942* (1942) by N. S. Timasheff, the doctoral dissertation *The Role of Atheism in the Marxist Tradition* (1979) by David B. T. Aikman, *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless* (1998) by Daniel Peris, and the three-volume *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Anti-Religious Policies* by Dimitry V. Pospelovsky (1987). For the most comprehensive study of the philosophical roots of Communism, take a look at Francis Nigel Lee's *Communist Eschatology* (1974). There are 120 pages of chapter notes with 30 to 50 notes per page in the 1100-page volume.

Barker's Freedom From Religion Foundation has a lot to live up to. The billboard people in Grand Rapids, Michigan, refused to display the atheist advertisement. I think they should have done it. Churches should have countered with a billboard that reads:

Imagine no Religion? We already did—100 million dead!

—*American Vision*, July 4, 2011

An Old Jane Fonda

by Mark Tapson

Last Saturday, actress-turned-fitness guru Jane Fonda was to appear on the shopping TV network QVC to peddle her new lifestyle book *Prime Time*, until the channel suddenly canceled her appearance. In response, Fonda wrote an angry opinion piece for the showbiz website “The Wrap,” explaining that “The network said they got a lot of calls yesterday criticizing me for my opposition to the Vietnam War and threatening to boycott the show.” (QVC issued a statement that answered Fonda's comments only by noting that such scheduling changes happen often and unexpectedly on the network.)

Fonda was “deeply disappointed that QVC caved to this kind of insane pressure by some well funded and organized political extremist groups.” Perhaps the actress in Fonda can't resist the melodramatic wording, but a threatened boycott on the part of some QVC viewers does not constitute “insane pressure.” Threats of murder and mayhem from Islamists against Comedy Central's South Park creators, yes; a boycott against a prominent actress always able to command a megaphone, no. Surely such a successful anti-war activist, as Ms. Fonda was in one of her previous lives, understands that a boycott is a perfectly fair and reasonable form of protest. It's curious that she is so irked by one, since she boasts that “threats of boycotts are nothing new for me and have never prevented me from having best-selling books and exercise DVDs, films, and a Broadway play.” If boycotts have no effect on her success, then why the outrage? Perhaps it has less to do with book sales and more to do with what she dismisses as “far right lies.”

She doesn't name these “well funded and organized political extremist groups” or provide evidence that a concerted effort was behind the phone calls to QVC. Labeling her complainants as “far right” and “extremist” is an attempt to marginalize them. Her suggestion is that she was “astroturfed,” as in Nancy Pelosi's term, by moneyed, extremist organizations, rather than by individual citizens expressing genuine disapproval of Fonda for what many consider to be a traitorous past.

“Bottom line,” Fonda continues, “this has gone on far too long, this spreading of lies about me! None of it is true. NONE OF IT! I love my country. I have never done anything to hurt my country or the men and women who have fought and continue to fight for us.” Since she doesn't specify what lies she's referring to, it's difficult

to refute her claim that none of them is true—which is precisely why she is purposefully vague about them. So let's recapitulate her own lie instead—that she has “never done anything to hurt my country or the men and women who have fought and continue to fight for us.”

As is well-known (though Fonda would prefer not to be judged for it), in the early '70s the privileged Hollywood star Jane Fonda preached communism to college students and was a rabid anti-military and anti-war activist, calling the Vietnam War “US imperialism” and “white man's racist aggression.” In the summer of '72, while the war still raged, the actress traveled to North Vietnam and played the part of their puppet with Oscar-winning commitment. She posed grinning with our enemy for pictures on an anti-aircraft gun that had been used to shoot down American planes. She volunteered to carry out radio propaganda from Hanoi, telling American pilots that they were war criminals and urging the South Vietnamese soldiers to desert. And, arguably most reprehensibly, she met with tortured American POWs in another scripted propaganda performance, lectured them about carrying out genocide against the Vietnamese, and returned to tell the world that these guests of the Hanoi Hilton were being well-treated and they regretted their warmongering. (The book *Aid and Comfort* details her shocking lies and actions and how they helped undermine us in the war effort, and it marshals the evidence for indicting Fonda for treason.)

“When stories about the torture of POWs later surfaced,” John Perazzo notes, Fonda called them lies. When the POWs began coming home in 1973, Fonda derided them as “liars, hypocrites, and pawns,” dismissing any charge that they had been brutalized: “Tortured men do not march smartly off planes, salute the flag, and kiss their wives. They are liars. I also want to say that these men are not heroes.”

“I have never shied away from talking about this as I have nothing to hide,” Fonda claims proudly in her Wrap editorial. Not true. Fonda's own autobiography gives her Vietnam-era actions miniscule shrift, and, as with the POWs then and the QVC boycotters now, she simply brands anyone who haunts her with the truth as a liar.

Some would say that Fonda's actions were decades in the past, and that her critics should forgive and move on. But there should be no forgiveness

without repentance, and it's clear from her Wrap editorial that Fonda not only still refuses to acknowledge the depth of her betrayals, but still labels those critics liars and political extremists.

And she persists in her blame-America-first anti-war activism. In “A Hate-America ‘Peace’ Rally,” John Perazzo reported that Fonda came out of protest retirement and was “the sentimental favorite” at a 2007 anti-war protest in Washington D.C., which featured a parade of speakers faulting America for all poverty, war, and racism. At that protest, Fonda once again complained about “the lies that have been, and continue to be, spread about me” before joining in with the other speakers lying about the war in Iraq. She is a supporter of the radical anti-war group Code Pink and calls Jodie Evans, its co-founder, a “dear friend.” Evans and Code Pink today are serving even more aid and comfort, literally, to our enemies the Taliban, Hamas, and Iran, than Fonda did to North Vietnam in her day.

“I do not understand what the far right stands to gain by continuing with these myths,” Jane Fonda muses disingenuously in her Wrap article. But the objective of the persistent effort to bring La Fonda to account is clear: preserving the historical record from her self-serving revisionism, honoring the memory of our servicemen who suffered so horribly in captivity or died at the hands of her Communist friends, and exposing her unrepentant complicity with the enemy. With her, there will always be a war between the power of memory and the power of forgetting.

—*FrontPageMagazine*, July 21, 2011



further your education.
foster your intellect.
inspire your imagination.
impact your world.

summit oxford
developing the mind for Christ and culture