



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 52, Number 4

April 2012

Sean Penn—Socialist Revolutionist

by Humberto Fontova

Sean Penn was Hugo Chavez's guest of honor (again) last week, serving as keynote speaker at graduation ceremonies for Venezuela's Salvador Allende Medical School. "Allow me to impart a little anecdote," beamed the two-time Oscar winner to the enchanted crowd. "I had the privilege to introduce my children to comandante Fidel Castro and as he posed for a photo between them I told him: 'President, I'll now be denounced in the US for educating my children as socialist revolutionaries.'"

So Castro responded: "That's among the best things that could happen to them."

Besides his fame as a baseball bat-swinging wifebeater, Sean Penn also claims fame as an advocate against the death penalty. His Oscar-winning role in "Dead Man Walking," where he played a convicted rapist and murderer who perished by lethal-injection in Louisiana, seems to have made a deep impression upon Penn.

Unlike Louisiana's penal system, however, the role model for Penn's kids used firing squads, forced labor, and prison beatings to murder his thousands of defenseless victims. And their "convictions" were curtly explained by Castro's chief hangman, Che Guevara: "Judicial evidence is an archaic bourgeois detail. We execute from revolutionary conviction," he once said.

Castro himself confirmed: "Legal proof is impossible to obtain against war criminals. So we sentence them based on moral conviction."

Among these "war criminals" were farm kids younger than Penn's children. Carlos Machado was 15 years old in 1963 when a volley from Castro's firing squad shattered his body. His twin brother and father crumpled beside Carlos from the same volley and tumbled into the same mass grave. All had resisted Castro and Che's theft of their humble family farm, all refused blindfolds and all died sneering at their Communist murderers, as did thousands of their valiant countrymen.

This "moral conviction" allowed the role model for Sean Penn's children to jail more political prisoners as a percentage of population than Stalin and murder more people (out of a population of 6.5 million) in his first three years in power than Hitler murdered (out of a population of 65 million) in his first six.

Enlightened opinion, including most "liberal," "human-rights" and "peace" groups worldwide, either yawned or actually applauded the bloodbath. Harvard Law School merits special attention regarding the latter.

By April 1959, almost a thousand Cubans had been "judged" (see above) and murdered by Castro and Che's firing squads. Cuba's prisons were packed to suffocation with ten times the number of political prisoners as during "the Tyrant" Batista's reign. Among Castro and Che Guevara's prisoners were hundreds of women, a Stalinist horror utterly unknown in our hemisphere until it was introduced by the "leader" swooned over by Barbara Walters, Andrea Mitchell, and Diane Sawyer.

Furthermore, the death penalty was being applied retroactively (none had existed under the unspeakable Batista regime). Habeas Corpus had been abolished. Cuban defense lawyers attempting to defend the accused were being jailed themselves.

That's when Fidel Castro received a fawning invitation from Harvard Law School asking the honor of his addressing them. Seems that both the student body and faculty were smitten with the Cuban Revolution's shining judicial record. Castro accepted on the spot, making Harvard the last gig on his 1959 US tour.

"Castro Visit Triumphant!" headlined Harvard's Law School Forum for April 30, 1959. "The audience got what it wanted: the chance of seeing the Cuban hero in person!"

"Viva Fidel!" roared these fervent foes of capital punishment and double jeopardy upon first glimpsing their hero.

Though the adoring crowd was too enormous to fit into any campus arena they remained chipper, “even if we didn’t see Castro at as close a range as might have been desired,” an attendee was quoted as saying.

Interestingly, Fidel Castro had actually applied to Harvard Law School in 1948. This was brought to light by Harvard’s Arts and Sciences Dean, McGeorge Bundy, (later to serve as JFK’s national security advisor). “Caught up in the exuberance of the event,” continues the Harvard Law Forum, “Harvard Dean, McGeorge Bundy, declared that Harvard was ready to make amends for its mistake in 1948. ‘I’ve decided to admit him!’ declared Dean Bundy.”

“Viva Fidel!” The Dean’s quip brought the house down and shook the very roof. “Viva Fidel!” roared and cheered the cream of America’s law students (and their faculty).

Alas, given the law of averages, an independent thinker was bound to pop up—even among ten thousand Harvard students and faculty. One such wiseacre brought up the questionable legal procedures preceding those hundreds of executions in Cuba.

“If the defendant has a right to appeal,” answered Castro, “then so do the people! And don’t forget, Cuba’s is the only people’s revolution in Latin America!”

Well, this assembly of America’s most nimble verbal gladiators went absolutely wild over Castro’s brilliant riposte. They erupted again, roaring and whooping at the mass-murderer’s incontestable rejoinder. This creme de la creme of America’s most cunning ratiocinators found the Stalinist’s logic not only perfectly airtight but positively dazzling in its ingenuity and completely sound in its principle of justice. A delirious pandemonium swept the hall as America’s most ingenious and best-tutored law students (along with their tutors) went absolutely berserk with veneration and joy at this point-blank elucidation of Castroite justice.

Similar receptions had come at the National Press Club, Overseas Press Club, United Nations, and on Meet the Press.

Not one heckler from among America’s brightest and cheekiest college kids. Not one rebuttal from America’s biggest assemblies of its top journalists. Not one snigger or frown from the top cut of America’s adversarial press. Not one raised eyebrow from the nation’s most hard-boiled investigative reporters.

So let’s be fair: why pick on Sean Penn?

—FrontPageMagazine, February 24, 2012

Castro’s Executioneer and Mercedes Benz

by Humberto Fontova

The top act at the Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas this week featured Mercedes Benz’ Chairman Dieter Zetsche peddling his company’s new gadgetry under a huge picture of Che Guevara, who sported the Mercedes logo on his beret. “Viva la Revolucion!” beamed the cheeky Herr Zetsche while unveiling his brilliant ad campaign.

In other words: to sell cars in the US, Mercedes Benz is relying on the mass appeal in the US of the mass-murdering Stalinist who craved to destroy the US.

“The US is the great enemy of mankind!” raved Mercedes Benz’ new US sales icon. “Against those hyenas there is no option but extermination! We will bring the war to the imperialist enemies’ (Americans) very home, to his places of work and recreation. The imperialist enemy (Americans) must feel like a hunted animal wherever he moves. Thus we’ll destroy him! We must keep our hatred (against the US) alive and fan it to paroxysm! If the nuclear missiles had remained (in Cuba) we would have fired them against the heart of the US including New York City. The solutions to the world’s problems lie behind the Iron Curtain. The victory of socialism is well worth millions of atomic victims!”

No doubt Mercedes-Benz chuckles at the ironic cheekiness of using a Communist “man of the people” to tout a luxury product. After all, *Time* magazine’s encomium to Che Guevara in 1999 as “Hero and Icon of the Century” asserted that: “Nothing could be more vicariously gratifying than Che Guevara’s disdain for material comfort and everyday desires.”

Alas *Time*’s (and Mercedes’) “research” overlooked some important details. In fact, quite unwittingly, Mercedes-Benz has chosen an ideal sales emblem—and one utterly devoid of irony. To wit:

Che’s mansion was among the most luxurious in Cuba,” wrote Cuban journalist Antonio Llano Montes in 1960. After a hard day at the office signing firing-squad murder warrants and blasting defenseless teenagers’ skull’s apart with the coup-de-grace, Che Guevara repaired to his new domicile just outside Havana on the pristine beachfront (today reserved exclusively for tourists and regime apparatchiks.) Until a few weeks prior, it had

belonged to Cuba's most successful building contractor, who escaped Cuba just ahead of a Guevara firing squad. "The mansion had a boat dock, a huge swimming pool, seven bathrooms, a sauna, a massage salon, and several television sets," continues Llano Montes. "One TV had been specially designed in the US and had a screen ten feet wide and was operated by remote control (remember, this was 1959.) This was thought to be the only TV of its kind in Latin America. The mansion's garden had a veritable jungle of imported plants, a pool with waterfall, ponds filled with exotic tropical fish, and several bird houses filled with parrots and other exotic birds. The habitation was something out of *A Thousand and One Nights*.

The "austere idealist," Che, hadn't done too badly for himself in this real estate transaction, known in non-"revolutionary" societies as armed robbery.

Llano Montes wrote the above in exile. In February 1959 he didn't go quite into such detail in his article which appeared in the Cuban magazine *Carteles*. He simply wrote that, "Comandante Che Guevara has fixed his residence in one of the most luxurious houses on Tarara beach."

Two days after his article ran, while lunching at Havana's El Carmelo restaurant, Llano Montes looked up from his plate to see three heavily armed soldiers instructing him to accompany them. Shortly, the journalist found himself in Che Guevara's La Cabana office, seated a few feet in front of the Stalinist hangman's desk, which was piled with papers.

It took half an hour but Che finally made his grand entrance, "reeking horribly, as was his custom" recalls Llano Montes. "Without looking at me. He started grabbing papers on his desk and brusquely signing them with 'Che.' His assistant came in and Che spoke to him over his shoulder. 'I'm signing these 50 executions so we can take care of this tonight.'

"Then he got up and walked out. Half an hour later he walks back in and starts signing more execution (murder, actually. "Execution" implies some form of judicial process) warrants. Finished signing, he picks up a book and starts reading—never once looking at me. Another half hour goes by and he finally puts the book down. 'So you're Llano Montes,' he finally sneers, 'who says I appropriated a luxurious house.'

"I simply wrote that you had moved into a luxurious

house, which is the truth," replied Llano Montes.

"We're not going to allow all the press foolishness (freedom) that Batista allowed. I can have you executed this very night. How about that!"

"You'll need proof that I've broken some law" responded Montes.

"We don't need proof. We manufacture the proof," Che said while stroking his long hair, a habit of his. One of his prosecutors, a man nicknamed 'Puddle-of-blood' then walked in and started talking. 'Don't let the stupid jabbering of those defense lawyers delay the executions!' Che yelled at him. 'Threaten them with execution. Accuse them of being accomplices of the Batistianos.' Then Che jerked another handful of execution warrants from Mr. Puddle and started signing them.

"This type of thing went on from noon until 6:30 PM when Che finally turned to his aides and said. 'Get this man out of here. I don't want him in my presence.'"

This was Che's habitual manner of dealing with defenseless men. Against armed men on an equal footing, his behavior was markedly different, particularly upon his capture in Bolivia. "Don't shoot!" he whimpered. "I'm Che! I'm worth more to you alive than dead!"

—Townhall.com, January 16, 2012

The Marxist-Leninist College Student

by Ronald Kessler

As a college student, Barack Obama expressed Marxist views, including the need for a new socialist US government, according to a student who says he shared the future president's opinion at the time.

Such views by a college student may not be surprising. And like most students who hold radical views, Obama's positions, at least publicly, have evolved substantially.

However, this new window on Obama's youth and early political thinking demonstrates how little is known about the background of America's 44th president.

Dr. John C. Drew, a grant writing consultant in Laguna Niguel, CA, tells *Newsmax* he met Obama in 1980 when Obama was a sophomore at Occidental College in Los Angeles. Drew had just graduated from Occidental and was attending graduate school at Cornell University.

Drew's then girlfriend, Caroline Boss—now Grauman-Boss—knew Obama because she shared classes with

him at Occidental.

During Christmas break, Drew says he was at Grauman-Boss' home in Palo Alto when Obama came over with Mohammed Hasan Chandoo, his roommate from Pakistan.

"Barack and Hasan showed up at the house in a BMW, and then we went to a restaurant together," Drew says. "We had a nice meal, and then we came back to the house and smoked cigarettes and drank and argued politics."

For the next several hours, they discussed Marxism.

"He was arguing a straightforward Marxist-Leninist class-struggle point of view, which anticipated that there would be a revolution of the working class, led by revolutionaries, who would overthrow the capitalist system and institute a new socialist government that would redistribute the wealth," says Drew, who says he himself was then a Marxist.

"The idea was basically that wealthy people were exploiting others," Drew says. "That this was the secret of their wealth, that they weren't paying others enough for their work, and they were using and taking advantage of other people. He was convinced that a revolution would take place, and it would be a good thing."

Drew concluded that Obama thought of himself as "part of an intelligent, radical vanguard that was leading the way towards this revolution and towards this new society."

In contrast, "My more pessimistic Marxist perspective indicated this was not a realistic possibility, that we really hadn't seen a sort of complete revolution take place anywhere in Western Europe, and that this isn't what had happened in more socialistic Germany or in France," Drew says. "He was pretty persistent that I didn't know what I was talking about."

Drew's viewpoint that a revolution was unrealistic "made me very unpopular that evening. It was considered a reactionary and insensitive thing to argue," says Drew.

Drew saw Obama again at a party Obama and Chandoo gave in June 1981 at the house they shared. Drew went on to become an assistant professor of political science at Williams College.

In 1981, Obama left Occidental to attend Columbia University. During that year, Obama spent "about three

weeks" visiting Chandoo and his family in Karachi, Pakistan, according to the account of Obama spokesman Bill Burton during the campaign.

Chandoo is now a financial consultant who was formerly a broker at Oppenheimer & Co. He has contributed to Obama's campaign and helped raise more than \$100,000 for him as a bundler.

"If that's what John Drew said, that's what he said," Chandoo commented. "I can't remember Obama ever talking like that. It sounds a bit absurd to me, but that's my opinion. I can't remember him ever expressing an interest in being a Marxist."

Much of what is known about Obama's past has been revealed and defined by Obama himself, largely through his two bestselling books *Dreams from My Father*, and *The Audacity of Hope*.

In these works and throughout his career, Obama has clearly identified with the oppressed. In *Dreams from My Father* Obama details how white settlers and sugar companies came to dominate and exploit his native Hawaii.

In that memoir, Obama said that at Occidental, "To avoid being mistaken for a sellout, I chose my friends carefully. The more politically active black students. The foreign students. The Chicanos. The Marxist professors and structural feminists and punk-rock performance poets."

As president, Obama has espoused the view that the rich are not sharing their wealth with the less fortunate. In a Sept. 6, 2001, radio interview, Obama expressed regret that the Supreme Court hadn't engaged in wealth redistribution.

In some ways, Obama's opinions about American-style capitalism seem to mirror the views of the Rev. Jeremiah Wright Jr., Obama's minister who was his self-described mentor and "sounding board" for 20 years. Wright's "Black Value System" denounced "our racist competitive society" and included the disavowal of the pursuit of "middle-classness."

The Black Value System defined "middle-classness" as a way American society seduced blacks into achieving economic success, thus snaring them rather than "killing them off directly."

In a similar vein, when he discussed politics with him

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 and is offered free of charge to anyone asking for it. The Crusade's address is P.O. Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.

in 1980, Drew says that in Obama's view, "America was definitely the enemy, and American elites were the enemy, and whatever America was doing was definitely wrong and bad. He thought that perhaps the Soviet Union was misunderstood, and it was doing a better job for its people than most people realized."

Chandoo said he doesn't know which professors Obama was referring to in his book. Asked when he last saw Obama, Chandoo said he has not seen nor talked with him since before Obama became a US senator. However, under "community member," the White House listed Chandoo as a guest at Obama's Ramadan dinner last fall.

When asked about that, Chandoo acknowledged from his home in Armonk, NY, that he attended the dinner. Despite the fact that fewer than 70 people were in attendance, Chandoo added, "I did not get a chance to see the boss." He then said he shook hands with Obama in a receiving line.

Chandoo said he has been in touch with Caroline Grauman-Boss over the years. She did not respond to a request for comment.

Burton, now deputy White House press secretary, also did not respond to a request for comment.

Drew's encounter with Obama's early political thinking adds to the mystery that has shrouded his past.

For more than a year during the campaign, the media were aware of Obama's ties with the Rev. Wright, for example, but the press did not reveal them until Obama was far ahead in the primaries.

Obama has contributed to the lack of knowledge about his past by refusing to release early documentation about his life, including his college and Harvard Law School transcripts and his senior thesis at Columbia.

Referring to Obama's quote from *Dreams from My Father* that he associated with Marxist professors, Drew says, "What he's not saying is that he was in 100 percent total agreement with those Marxist professors. When you understand that, Obama's later associations and policies make more sense, including why he was taken in by Rev. Wright's ideology."

In 1983 and 1984, Drew says he came to realize that his own Marxist views were rubbish. He now considers himself a conservative.

In contrast, Drew says, Obama has never revealed how his political thinking evolved and "what were the logical steps he took to get out of his Marxist world view."

—*Newsmax*, February 8, 2010

OWS vs. DNC

by Matthew Vadum

The anti-American activists of the Occupy Wall Street movement announced they plan to violently disrupt the G8/NATO summit in Chicago on May 19.

Adbusters, the Noam Chomsky-friendly magazine that spearheaded the Occupy movement, claims the movement will conduct a massive occupation of Chicago "in the tradition of the Chicago 8."

Of course the radicals of the Chicago 8 organized riots at the Democratic Party's national convention in that city in 1968. Hundreds of police officers were injured.

Adbusters vows that this time the rioters won't give an inch to the police. A massive occupation of Chicago involving "50,000 people from all over the world" will begin on May 1:

And this time around we're not going to put up with the kind of police repression that happened during the Democratic National Convention protests in Chicago, 1968...nor will we abide by any phony restrictions the City of Chicago may want to impose on our first amendment rights. We'll go there with our heads held high and assemble for a month-long people's summit...we'll march and chant and sing and shout and exercise our right to tell our elected representatives what we want ... the constitution will be our guide. [ellipses in original]

When the nations of the G8 and NATO begin meeting May 19, the movement plans to press its demands. Occupiers want an economy-killing "Robin Hood Tax" to be imposed on financial transactions, an international agreement to curb carbon emissions, and "a nuclear-free Middle East" (translation: the unilateral nuclear disarmament of Israel), according to *Adbusters*.

And woe to the powers that be if they don't give in to the radicals' demands.

And if they don't listen... if they ignore us and put our demands on the back burner like they've done so many times before...then, with Gandhian ferocity, we'll flashmob the streets, shut down stock exchanges, campuses, corporate headquarters, and cities across the globe...we'll make the price of doing

business as usual too much to bear. [ellipses in original]

The Occupy Wall Street movement grew out of an event last Sept. 17 in lower Manhattan called the US Day of Rage that was organized by *Adbusters*. Organizers vowed that the mass protest would be nonviolent in nature. This raised the question of why they named their event after the original “Days of Rage” that took place in Chicago in 1969. That tumultuous year, members of what was later to become known as the Weather Underground provoked four days of riots and demonstrations against The System.

Occupy Wall Street, and the satellite protests it spawned in cities across the US and around the world have been spectacularly violent. Radical activists are responsible for hundreds of crimes, including assault, gang rape, arson, rioting, robbery, and a host of others.

Adbusters Media Foundation of Vancouver, Canada, the nonprofit behind the so-called anti-consumerist magazine, has received funding from organizations associated with radical philanthropist George Soros’s Democracy Alliance, a donor collaborative that wants to push America even farther left. The foundation has received \$176,500 since 2001 from the Glaser Progress Foundation, which was created by Alliance member Rob Glaser. Glaser heads the online multimedia company RealNetworks.

The Adbusters Media Foundation has also taken in \$317,773 from the Tides Foundation since 2001. Tides was created by Drummond Pike, a close friend of ACORN founder Wade Rathke. Rathke was a longtime member of the Tides board of directors. When it was revealed in 2008 that Rathke’s brother Dale had embezzled nearly a million dollars from ACORN, Pike tried to squelch the scandal by writing a six-figure check to cover the perpetrator’s remaining restitution payments.

In anticipation of the May protests, Chicago mayor Rahm Emanuel, himself a radical Saul Alinsky-inspired thug, has increased fines for resisting a police officer.

Longtime Chicago activist Don Rose was undeterred. “The more pugnacious the city gets, the more provocative it becomes.”

—FrontPageMagazine, January 30, 2012

The Theology of Bureaucracy

by Dr. Michael Bauman

Sound theology is rooted in the Bible. Because the Bible is theologically front-loaded, sound theology needs to take into account what we know about God, about human beings, and about creation. We begin there:

The first thing we learn about God in Scripture is that He is a communal and articulate Maker. His very name, Elohim, is a plural word. In its opening verse, the Bible combines that plural name with a singular verb (“create”), thus demonstrating that God is a plurality in unity. He is communal; indeed He is Divine Community, something He Himself indicates a few sentences later when He declares His creative intention regarding us in Genesis 1: 26: “Let us (plural) make (singular) man in our (plural) image (singular).”

Second, when we say that God is an articulate Maker, we mean that He makes worlds by His powerful and creative Word. All reality emerges from his Word and relies upon it.

Relatedly then, the first thing we learn about human beings is that we are made in God’s image, implying that we, too, are to be communal and articulate makers. To be in His image means that we are to be both God’s picture and God’s partner. Like Him, though on a lower level, we are to exercise dominion over the earth; we are to fill it and to subdue it.

To be like God and to do as He did—communally to bring order out of chaos by our words and to carry out the dominion mandate—is a high and serious calling. The burden of this brief essay is to explain the ways in which bureaucracy hinders that high calling, both in its communal and verbal dimensions. In short, bureaucracy, as do all things, has a theology, in this case a very bad one. It is our focus.

“Bureaucracy” is a portmanteau word combining the French word for desk or office (“bureau”) with the ancient Greek word for government or rule (“kratos”). Thus, bureaucracy is “government from the desk,” or “rule by office.”

Notice that from this conception of governance all

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.

living things have effectively been removed. It posits no identifiable living being, whether divine or human. No persons are left to speak, to bring order out of chaos, or to do so in communion with others. More importantly for the desk dweller, no one is left to answer or to blame. Instead, government is the function of a nondescript, faceless, nameless office—a deskocracy.

No doubt a real human person sits behind that desk, but not a person functioning like God in God's stead, not a person who, by his or her words, brings wisdom, insight, compassion, creativity, and eloquence to bear upon the task at hand, namely bringing order out of political and social chaos and making the best he or she can of the earth's potential. That's not what happens at the DMV, or in any bureaucracy I can imagine.

Within the organization, within the ruling deskocracy, humanity has been defaced, removed, and exiled. Those who operate within it find their essentially human characteristics eliminated: (1) *Conscience is gone*. Officials may no longer exercise compassionate judgment or offer creative solutions to the dazzling array of challenges that interaction with real human beings incessantly brings. They must follow procedures. They must follow the manual, which replaces conscience. (2) *Discernment is gone*. Bureaucrats may not bring wisdom, creative compassion, or personal insight to bear upon the infinite variety of human circumstances that confronts them; they must do as directed by the manual, a text written and approved by other nameless and faceless apparatchiks inside the system. (3) *Community is gone*. Bureaucrats no longer are human beings dealing with other human beings; they are caseworkers handling cases—cases with numbers—and doing so in the sterile and schematic way prescribed by the approved, unresponsive, bureaucratic procedures aimed at nothing so much as getting quickly to closure and moving on to the next case, the next number. You've heard it over the loudspeaker: "Number 17, please."

In other words, what the deskocracy does to its workers it does also to those for whom it allegedly works: It makes them non-persons, or tries.

Consider this scenario: If you are a bureaucrat, if you occupy a desk, and if you actually tried to treat human beings as individuals by dealing with them not as numbered cases but in accordance with their infinitely unique and unpredictable circumstances, you could never finish your work, or even a significant portion of it. That failure tells you how distant from human reality, both political and theological, government by desk truly is: Good deskocracy is, literally, impossible. Deskocracy simply cannot accom-

modate the facts about us. But rather than despairing of its foolishness, rather than bringing the whole wrong-headed misadventure to a merciful end, rather than adjusting itself to human and theological reality, it doubles down. It marches boldly forward, undaunted even by reality itself. It aims to do what cannot be done. It aims to change human nature, to remake it in its own image, to undo what God Himself has done, and to accomplish what only the redemptive grace of God can accomplish, namely to make human nature anew.

But the new you, the one intended by deskocracy, is not a redeemed and better you. It is a soulless and faceless number, just like those whom the system sends to deal with you. Of course, soulless and mindless go together. Having made the deskocrats sacrifice conscience for procedure, the system now finds reason to sacrifice reason as well, and to the same god—systemic uniformity—which devours free intellect the way Moloch devoured children.

Where intellect and conscience go, beauty goes too. No one, I dare say, ever left a government office with the grateful impression that they'd been standing for hours before Rembrandt's "Night Watch" or listening to Debussy's "Clair de Lune." Deskocracy is the death of beauty, truth, and goodness; the death of their Divine origin; and, therefore, the death of the truly human as well. The name on the desk before which you sit, and the departmental name on the door through which you passed when you entered, are the names on your tombstone.

Because one of the things that raises us above the animals and makes us like God is the creative speech that brings order out of chaos, one ought to consider the anti-human, anti-reality language of bureaucratese, which is an endless immersion in the passive voice. Unlike in active and indicative speech—speech in which doers do deeds—in the language of deskocracy, even though no one actually does anything, "mistakes were made." It's not that Mr. Jones did wrong. That is too personal for bureaucratese. Mr. Jones could do no wrong because "procedures were followed." No deskocrat can say, "I goofed," because in bureaucratese there is no "I," just desks and procedures to which no effective appeal can be made and to which no accusation of personal failure can stick unless, of course, there is a Congressional hearing and the system has to offer up one of its own as a scapegoat. Rather than imitating the speech of God, which brings things like human beings into existence, bureaucratese takes them out of it.

To be true to yourself and to the God Who made you like Him, you must resist the de-personalization of the

cumbrous and mechanistic overlord that occupies all the desks. You must resist it in eloquent, courageous, purposeful concord with other human beings determined to keep the inestimable gift God gave them. Either you win or it does. If it wins, you will be folded, spindled, stapled, and mutilated. That dire end is your only alternative to the freedom and dignity that are yours as God's picture and partner.

I cannot tell you precisely, step by step, how that victory is accomplished. Simply for me to try would be to mimic the deskocracy and its arrogant procedures.

But I do know this: You are a human being. You and your allies must insist on being treated as children of the King, as royalty. If you do not win back that respect for yourself, if you do not carve it out by your own will, cunning, courage, eloquence, and excellence, you will never have it again—not in this life, and not from this deskocratic tyranny. The deskocracy is not programmed to deal with children of the King.

A Change of Trajectory

by Chuck Colson

We're hearing more and more about students who "Fail to Launch." What does that mean, and why is it important?

Vaclav Havel, who helped overcome communist rule in Czechoslovakia, once said, "It's not that modern man knows less and less about the meaning of life. It's that it bothers him less and less."

He might well have been talking about many teenagers today. As Diana West noted in her book, *The Death of the Grownup*, many young adults struggle to, well, grow up. It's been called "Failure to Launch," or "Peter Pan Syndrome," or "perpetual adolescence."

Much has been made of adolescence as a stage of development, but in America we make too much of it today. We treat teens like kids, market to them incessantly, and never ask them to grow up.

It's a mistake and it's contagious. In the 1980s, the movie characters who were the slackers were teenagers; in the 90s they were 20-somethings. But today, with movies like *The Hangover*, the goofball, perverted adolescents are now adult men! And, studies show men in their 30s spend more time and money on video games than teens do!

We used to think of adolescence as the stage of say

between the ages of 13-18, now the National Academy of Sciences defines adolescence as the stage of life between 11 and 30! And when more people know the names of celebrities than their elected officials, and when our knowledge of entertainment trivia trumps our knowledge of Holy Scripture—we've got a problem.

According to my friend Jim Dobson, that's where his son Ryan was. A good kid, but with a very small vision of the world—one limited to skateboarding and meeting girls. Then, he went to a Summit Ministries Student conference and everything changed.

According to Ryan, the two weeks he spent at Summit Ministries literally changed the trajectory of his life. Learning about the consequences of ideas, how the Biblical worldview is true and how to defend it against other worldviews, led him to a bigger vision of life and put him on the path of standing for truth and making a difference in society.

My colleague John Stonestreet, host of "The Point," works and teaches with Summit Ministries. John told me that a recent survey of Summit graduates revealed that they are more likely to pray, read the Bible, share their faith, and have beliefs in line with a biblical worldview than the typical Christian student. They also watch less television and read more books—and vote more often than their peers. What parent wouldn't want that for their children?

What's Summit Ministries secret? They treat students like adults and raise expectations about what they need to learn. A lot of youth camps focus on fun and games, but at Summit they focus on student learning—especially preparing them for the many challenges that will assault their faith in college and from the culture.

And, you know what? The students love it. They want to be challenged, because for too long they've been the victim of low expectations.

Summit has set the gold standard for training students in Christian worldview. Ryan Dobson and a lot of others are proof it works.

Come to BreakPoint.org, click on this commentary, and we'll link you to Summit so you can find out more about their upcoming conferences for high-school- and college-age students. And you can search our website and find all sorts of materials you can use to have talks with your kids that treat them like serious adults. There is no excuse for perpetual adolescence.

—*Breakpoint*, March 13, 2012

