The Schwarz Report

Dr. Fred Schwarz | Volume 52, Number 12 | Dr. David Noebel

December 2012

Merry Christmas!

The Birth of Jesus Christ

In those days a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that the whole empire should be registered. This first registration took place while Quirinius was governing Syria. So everyone went to be registered, each to his own town.

And Joseph also went up from the town of Nazareth in Galilee, to Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family line of David, to be registered along with Mary, who was engaged to him and was pregnant. While they were there, the time came for her to give birth. Then she gave birth to her firstborn Son, and she wrapped Him snugly in cloth and laid Him in a feeding trough—because there was no room for them at the lodging place.

In the same region, shepherds were staying out in the fields and keeping watch at night over their flock. Then an angel of the Lord stood before them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified. But the angel said to them, "Don't be afraid, for look, I proclaim to you good news of great joy that will be for all the people: Today a Savior, who is Messiah the Lord, was born for you in the city of David. This will be the sign for you: You will find a baby wrapped snugly in cloth and lying in a feeding trough."

Suddenly there was a multitude of the heavenly host with the angel, praising God and saying:

"Glory to God in the highest heaven,
and peace on earth to people He favors!"

When the angels had left them and returned to heaven, the shepherds said to one another, "Let's go straight to Bethlehem and see what has happened, which the Lord has made known to us."

They hurried off and found both Mary and Joseph, and the baby who was lying in the feeding trough.

After seeing them, they reported the message they were told about this child, and all who heard it were amazed at what the shepherds said to them. But Mary was treasuring up all these things in her heart and meditating on them. The shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all they had seen and heard, just as they had been told.

—Luke 2:1-20, Holman Christian Standard Bible

Progressive/Socialist Law Schools

by Bradley C. S. Watson

"Socialism likewise is reflected by many symptoms. Perversion of law through our courts; treason in government; corruption and graft to attain power and wealth; mob rule in our streets; corrupting the clergy and the pulpit as political agents for leftist atheism; and the steady erosion of the morals of our youth is symptomatic of the insidious influence of leftist manipulators." Archibald B. Roosevelt, *The Great Deceit*, p.336

"Almost everyone who cares earnestly about freedom is aroused against the Communists. But it is not only the communists; it is in a more subtle way the socialists who are blocking the efforts of the free world to recover its poise and its once firm resistance to tyranny." Max Eastman, *Reflections on the Failure of Socialism*, p. 23, in *The Great Deceit*, p. 333

"The American Civil Liberties Union had previously operated under the name of the National Civil Liberties Bureau, which gained prominence for '. . . attempting to influence the foreign policy of his country towards Soviet Russia.' Chief organizers of the predecessor group were much well-known socialists as Norman Thomas, Jane Addams, A. A. Berle, and Scott Nearing." *The Great Deceit*, Research Director Zygmund Dobbs, p. 328

"Felix Frankfurter organized the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in 1920, in company with Morris Hillquit (head of the American Socialist Party), Harold J. Laski, Roger N. Baldwin, Jane Addams, Harry F. Ward, A.J. Muste, Scott Nearing, and Norman Thomas. This organization was a socialist front, pure and simple." *The Great Deceit*, p. 327

"The socialists calculated that by getting control of the Supreme Court they could take power by 'judicial coup d'état', or 'judicial revolution'." *The Great Deceit*, p. 318

"Among themselves socialists and communists consider the law as a fundamentally capitalistic symbol, which they plan to exploit and to eliminate. They hope to fool the American people with the semblance of socialized law until they can consolidate their power, meantime steadily transforming the Constitution from its original purpose of guarding individual freedom into an irresistible instrument of oppression." *The Great Deceit*, p. 311

"It is impossible to attempt the overthrow of capitalism as an economic system without at the same time attacking the substance of capitalist law." Felix Cohen, *The Great Deceit*, p. 304

"Morris Cohen's activities in propounding the socialistic theory of jurisprudence carried him into the classrooms of Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and the University of Chicago. Since 1923, he had been a lecturer in sociological jurisprudence at the leftist New School for Social Research. He was busy trying to influence such notables of the law as Oliver Wendell Holmes, Louis D. Brandeis, and Benjamin Cardozo, while they were members of the United States Supreme Court." Dobbs, *The Great Deceit*, p. 294

"For over 70 years, leftists railed against the Constitution as a reactionary document. Among others, socialist Professor Richard T. Ely wrote against 'the excessive development of constitutionalism' and advocated in its place a free-wheeling application of law.'" *The Great Deceit*, p. 290

"Sociological jurisprudence is the magniloquent name bestowed by its originators on the philosophical theory of law which subordinates individual rights to the aggrandizement of the state. It may be more tersely and significantly termed 'socialized law.'" *The Great Deceit*, p. 271

"Whereas the criminal underworld wants to seize for its own benefit a portion of the wealth of society, the left-wingers have as their aim the seizing of all society. This includes not only all wealth and political power, but also control through conditioning and manipulation of the mind and spirit of all mankind. This aim was outlined from the very beginning by Saint-Simon, the father of modern socialism and communism. Fascism and Nazism came from the same source." *The Great Deceit*, p. 279

"The state is not to serve the well-being of the separate parts or individuals; the latter are to serve the spiritual, moral, and economic well-being of the state." *The Great Deceit*, p. 283

"The American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution carried on the principles of Magna Carta and the English Common Law." *The Great Deceit*, p. 287

"The basic creed proclaimed by all left-wingers is that the American legal and political system was designed to benefit big business and the rich. But the historical facts directly contradict that thesis. Nowhere in the world has there been so much legal action against trusts, combines, and monopolies, and in no other nation has there been a sharper reaction against injustices to the poor and the oppressed." *The Great Deceit*, p. 287

Editor's Comment: One might get the impression that your editor thinks very highly of *The Great Deceit*—

Social Pseudo-Sciences. You would be right. It is one of the most important works of the whole 20th century relating to the socialist/communist takeover of the United States of America. It was primarily the work of a number of Harvard graduates who made up the Veritas Foundation and decided to expose the leftwing infiltration of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, etc. Zygmund Dobbs was its Research Director who nailed down much of the documentation of the work, and as far as I can tell, his research has stood the test of time. The following article published in the *National Review* by Bradley C. S. Watson more than verifies such a contention.

In an appearance on Egyptian television in early 2012, Supreme Court justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg lamented the fact that she operated "under a rather old constitution." She told Egyptians that she wouldn't "look to the US Constitution if [she] were drafting a constitution in the year 2012," and that they should rather pay close attention to "all the constitution-writing that has gone on since the end of World War II." She particularly commended the constitutional documents of South Africa, Canada, and the European Union. The important things about these models, according to Ginsburg, are explicit guarantees of human rights along with independent judiciaries to interpret those guarantees. And of course, she pointed out, they're new.

She thus expressed the core teaching of progressive jurisprudence: Our Founders' Constitution is an anachronism, little more than a dusty historical curiosity in the National Archives. Further, constitutional text, tradition, logic, and structure are not terribly important for guaranteeing rights. That job can be done much better by cleverly drafted parchment barriers and powerful judges.

Ginsburg and other progressive jurists didn't come by such views incidentally. Instead, they imbibed them in the first instance in law schools. For decades, many of America's best and brightest college students have aspired to attend those law schools—usually the "national" elite schools where progressive jurisprudence was invented and still finds its most sophisticated expression. The effects are even more deleterious in the context of a system that fails spectacularly to provide a civic education to republican citizens. Today's law students, having been consistently let down by educational institutions at all levels, have no sense of their constitutional fathers' wisdom. Not having the faith of Daniel, they enter the lion's den only to be consumed.

Each September, the assumptions and methodologies of law-school curricula are handed down as if from Sinai to tens of thousands of 1Ls. They are readily accepted by the students, who are under enormous pressure to assimilate and adjust to them quickly. Students are told nothing of progressive philosophy's origins or ultimate purposes, and notice little of its hostility to the Founders' Constitution. Such lack of awareness is evident even among many law-school faculty members, who act as Moses without self-knowledge, sensible only of the first commandment.

For those with the passion to rule—which describes most bright twentysomethings—such a sensibility is very useful. They see themselves doing God's work, or something like it, for they do at least know that God is banished from the public square. In his recent book *Schools for Misrule*, Walter Olson recounts how the dean of one of the nation's most prestigious law schools routinely greeted incoming students by welcoming them to "the republic of conscience." Of course, it's a conscience to be imposed by the cognoscenti, through the mechanism of the courts, on the unwashed masses who still conceive of politics as something to be done the old fashioned way, i.e., consensually. What the students quickly imbibe in the law schools is uniquely well-suited to breaking the constraints imposed by self-government and the Constitution.

The modern law school came into existence largely as an adjunct of progressive ideology. It was to be the training ground for progressives dedicated to overcoming early-20th-century judicial resistance to the political assault on our Constitution of limited and enumerated powers. As with the modern discipline of political science, the modern law school was built around core progressive assumptions: a philosophy of history, a faith in the power of scientific intelligence to smooth the movement of history, and a deep suspicion of existing institutional forms. By the 1920s, leading legal scholars were confident they had discovered a new science of jurisprudence—one that would emphasize evolutionary growth rather than black-letter law or theories of law rooted in the permanent nature of human beings. This melding of social Darwinism and philosophical pragmatism animated the growing legal professoriate to direct its attention to processes, functions, and change more than principles, rules, and continuity. The new approach to the study of law had many manifestations. It defined the aspirations of important legal movements such as sociological jurisprudence and legal realism, which sought to ensure, respectively, that legal interpretation would be informed by social data, and that legal outcomes would be determined by perceived social benefits rather than the strict construction of law. The old-fashioned common lawyer was out, to be replaced by a progressive social engineer with legal training.

An important if not entirely intentional grounding for these developments was the adoption of the now-ubiquitous case method in the late 19th century. This method, first imposed by Christopher Langdell, the dean of Harvard Law School, requires students to concentrate on a large number of primarily appellate decisions, especially those of the Supreme Court, in order to familiarize themselves with the logic of judicial reasoning. Langdell's view was that legal principles, rules, and procedures are best discerned through study of—and induction from—many individual cases. Each case—as an individual datum—contributed to a new scientific understanding of the law relying on empirical observation rather than unchanging principles.

The spirit of pragmatism and Darwinism has run through the case method since its inception. Advocates of the method claimed that it could reduce jurisprudence to an exact science. It was presented by progressives as a breath of fresh air in comparison with attempts to systematize principles independent of "experience" and teach them in lecture format. Or course, it helped the reformers that they defined "experience" as the goings-on in courts of law. The older method's concern for transmission of established principles seemed, in the progressive mind, to embrace stasis and even Aristotelian purposes in an era that opened its arms only to pragmatism, progress, and history.

The case method had its early critics, both in the practicing bar and the academy, who saw it as a triumph of method over content and process over doctrine, since it separated legal principles from their roots in the natural law, the old common law, and American constitutionalism broadly conceived. The case method presented law in fragmentary form, without purpose or even existence beyond the distillation of principles from the transitory aims of litigants and their appellate arguments. The belief that constantly changing social "facts" are determinative of legal principles is an almost irresistible conclusion when cases become the only lens through which the common law is viewed. And even more integral to the case method than induction is the notion that the law is what courts say it is.

The case method caught on like wildfire, owing in no small part to the prestige of Harvard and the sense that academic respectability required emulation. Even Columbia—the dominant force in American legal education until the turn of the century, and initially resistant to newfangled approaches—quickly succumbed. Nowadays, the method is so widely practiced that law students cannot imagine that constitutional law might be approached in any other way: for example, by serious study of the words and deeds of the Founders.

The case method isn't the only thing responsible for ending serious study of the Constitution in American law schools over the past century. It took some decades after the embrace of the case method for the independence of constitutional principles to be directly challenged on the basis that they should be subservient to the requirement of social life, or, for that matter, the preferences of individual judges. This challenge came with the growth throughout the 1920s and 1930s of legal realism, which borrowed from progressive political thought and sociological jurisprudence and melded them into a jurisprudential theory of law suited to the new demands of a 20th-century nation that was of necessity bound to throw off the shackles of its constitutional heritage. As sociological jurisprudence was the analogue to the Progressive era in American politics, so realist theory was the analogue to the New Deal.

By the 1920s, a plethora of disciplines were deemed relevant to law in ways they had not been before. The insights, real or alleged, of all the social sciences were increasingly brought to bear on the legal curriculum. As economic, sociological, psychological, or political circumstances changed, so must the law, and it inevitably did. Curricular revisions and new faculty followed. Casebooks appeared with titles such as "Cases and Materials on X" rather than simply "Cases on X." For example, Yale Law School in the 1930s added significant social science material to its library holding, hired more social scientists for its teaching faculty, and created a joint institute for the study of law and psychology. The sheer number and specialized nature of course offerings and supporting materials increased markedly at the leading realist institutions, driven by an understanding of law as inseparable from social problems—particularly those addressed by the administrative state. Through the 1930s and 1940s,

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.

courses in pubic-law fields, including administrative law, burgeoned, and they continued to grow throughout the postwar period.

These courses promoted a view of law as the problem-solving tool of the new age rather than a set of constraints on human conduct. Law tended to be seen as a means of social control and of dealing with corporate groups, which were to have their interests harmonized by elite mechanism rather than spontaneous activities in a large republic. Nowhere was this clearer than in the development of the field of labor law during the 1920s. The move from "constitutional" law to "public" law in the law schools followed, paralleling the progressive mind's shift from constitutionalism to the administrative state and the new emphasis on regulatory and entitlement politics in the regime as a whole.

Whatever the theoretical roots or disciplinary orientations of the realists, all saw the Constitution as a fundamentally flawed document and decried any efforts to interpret it on its own terms. Statutory law, and even more the Constitution, was seen as an epiphenomenon of deep class biases and social forces unrelated to principles of right or justice. At the same time, it was assumed the best and brightest could extract themselves from the influence of these social phenomena that swept others along like tiny corks on a great river. Given a clear-eyed view of what law "really" is, along with sympathetic legislatures, the right kinds of sociological arguments, and, eventually, a less conservative judiciary, they could put themselves in the vanguard of history. Healthy evolution always lay just over the horizon for most of the realists, as it had for the earlier advocates of sociological jurisprudence.

The relationship between legal ideas and legal practices was central. In 1921, while a judge on the New York Court of Appeals, Benjamin Cardozo was arguing publicly and theoretically, in his Storrs Lectures at Yale, for the centrality of sociological jurisprudence to the law. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes reduced law to questions of the management of social forces according to personal and class beliefs, academics worked out theories of the idiosyncratic role of judges. While Louis Brandeis concentrated on the role of social needs in deciding cases, Dean Roscoe Pound at Harvard formulated the same ideas in theory, writing that "the sociological movement in jurisprudence is a movement for pragmatism as a philosophy of law" and a movement away from "assumed first principles."

By the time the New Deal hit Washington, there was a new sense of professionalism among law watchers, marked by a specialized knowledge of the new science of jurisprudence. The creation of the Association of American Law schools at the dawn of the 20th century punctuated the importance of professionalism. Even today, the AALS website reminds students that lawyers once entered legal practice without—*gasp*—having gone to law school. The AALS did much to elevate the "educated" lawyer over the "trained" practitioner of yore, a key difference being the former's knowledge of the latest trends in historicist jurisprudence.

As legal education through the 20th century transformed itself from a system of rules to be learned into principles or predictions to be gleaned from cases, and then into a vehicle for social change, American lawyers saw themselves as the facilitators of change and the formulators of public policy. Policymaking is always and everywhere a normative endeavor. It was a small step from a concern with policy to a concern with "values," which quickly made their way into the law-school curriculum, particularly at elite institutions. This occurred largely in what is seen as the "post-realist" period commencing in the 1960s, a period better understood as an inevitable outgrowth of realism, or perhaps a realism that is simply clearer about its purposes.

Through this period and beyond, the case method persisted, but its function has come to be understood in an even more radicalized light. The inductive search for principles has fully given way to the search for strategies—rooted in various social-science disciplines—for winning policy outcomes. The "values" that guide the study and application of law come from outside the law. Law and constitutionalism itself are not to be revered for their reflection of eternal truths or their embodiment of the insights of the wise, but for what policy victories they can deliver to a variety of hungry constituencies.

Realism of one form or another, informed by a strong sense of evolution and the necessity of forward historical motion, still defines much of the curriculum and intellectual categories within the contemporary law school, as well as the thinking of important constitutional actors such as Supreme Court justices. The intellectual assumptions of these jurisprudential progressives are often without anchor, floating on an ever-changing river; hence the inclination of members of the Supreme Court to look to other, more advanced lands for guidance.

Malcolm Muggeridge long ago described early progressive intellectuals as "beating a path between Harvard and Princeton, and Washington D.C.; swarming like migrant birds from the London School of Economics, Oxford, and Cambridge into Whitehall." These were "scholars, philosophers, artists, scientists, and the like; the favoured children of a troubled age. Held in respect

as being sages who know all the answers; sought after by governments and international agencies; holding forth in the press and on the air." Nowadays, in America at least, these are our lawyers. Our overextended executive branch and sclerotic bureaucracies, each claiming in progressive fashion to be all things to all people, are increasingly capable of nothing. They have been reduced to lumbering beasts exhibiting only survival instincts. Furthermore, while the early progressives concentrated on expanding the administrative state and its list of clients for the purposes of economic engineering, today's progressives are far more enchanted by larger-scale social engineering best implemented through the prerogatives of the judicial branch. Progressive change is to be effected in courts of what now can only loosely be termed "law."

And so it is that the chief justice of the United States, schooled in the best "conservative" principles of today's legally educated elites, could in good conscience declare constitutional a federal tax unlinked to any enumerated power that the Founders would have recognized. Careful reflection on the text and tradition of the Founders' Constitution in its establishment of the national taxing power "to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" might have led him to decide otherwise.

This autumn, as every autumn, thousands of America's most gifted students sit shell-shocked, enduring their first semester in the progressive academy we know as the law school. And even those among them who sense there's something amiss will be hard pressed to say exactly what it is.

—*National Review*, October 29, 2012, p. 37-39

Che Guevara—Hollywood Keeps Lying

by Humberto Fontova

"Steven Soderbergh made certain his movie, "Che," about the life of revolutionary Ernesto "Che" Guevara, couldn't be attacked—at least on a factual level," stressed CNN Entertainment, upon the movie's release in 2009.

"[What] I didn't want was for somebody to be able to look at a scene and say, 'That never happened.'" (Steven Soderbergh CNN Entertainment, January 1, 2009)

Well, Mr. Steven Soderbergh (and CNN,) pull up a chair.

Soderbergh's movie shows Che Guevara steely-eyed and snarling with defiance during his capture (45 years ago this week.) Why, according to Soderbergh, only seconds before his capture, Che's very M-2 carbine had been blasted from his hands and rendered useless by a CIA-Fascist machine gun burst!

Then the bravely grimacing Guevara jerks out his pistol and blasts his very last bullets at the approaching hordes of CIA-Fascist soldiers!

The (typical) viewer gapes at the spectacle. His very eyes mist and lips tremble at Soderbergh and Benicio Del Toro's impeccable depiction of such undaunted pluck and valor.

OK, but just where did Soderbergh and Benicio Del Toro (who starred as Che and co-produced the movie) obtain this version of Che's capture? Remember they were both utterly obsessed with "historical accuracy."

Well, the notoriously skeptical towards US businessmen (see Erin Brockovich) director Steven Soderbergh transcribed this sterling account of Che's capture exactly as penned by Fidel Castro, who apparently cannot tell a lie, according to Hollywood.

The man who mentored Soderbergh's film for impeccable historical honesty is also on record for the following testaments:

"Again I stress I am not a communist. And Communists have absolutely no influence in my nation!" (Fidel Castro, April 1959)

"Political power does not interest me in the least! And I will never assume such power!" (Fidel Castro, April 1959)

As evidenced by Steven Soderbergh's film, the author of these proclamations merits his version of Che's capture transcribed on the silver screen as gospel. Fidel Castro, you see, wrote the forward to Che's *Diaries* wherein this Davy Crocket-esque-at-the-Alamo version of events appears. These diaries were published in Castro's fiefdom by the Stalinist dictator's very own propaganda ministry. So to guarantee their film's historical accuracy, Soderbergh and co-producer Benicio Del Toro were scrupulous in repeatedly visiting a Stalinist regime's propaganda ministers for the unvarnished truth!

Actually they follow a fine Hollywood tradition. Robert Redford privately screened "Motorcycle Diaries" for Fidel Castro and Che's widow. Only after the approval of these two Stalinists was the movie released by this adamant proponent of artistic freedom.

On the other hand, a mental defect diagnosed by my physician as "not believing Communist dictators, especially after living under them" led your humble servant here while researching his books, to dig-up and study the actual records of the men actually on the scene of Che

Guevara's capture, and to interview those who today live in places where they need not fear Castro's firing squads and torture chambers for the crime of telling the truth.

As might be expected, this mental defect led to the discovery of major "discrepancies" between Soderbergh and Del Toro's Fidel Castro-mentored film and the historical truth.

In fact: on his second to last day alive, Che Guevara ordered his guerrilla charges to give no quarter, to fight to the last breath and to the last bullet. "Che drummed it into us," recalls Cuban guerrilla Dariel Alarcon, who indeed fought to his last bullet in Bolivia, escaped back to Cuba, defected, and today lives in Paris. "Never surrender," Che always stressed. "Never, never!" He drilled it into us almost every day of the guerrilla campaign. "A Cuban revolutionary cannot surrender!" Che thundered. "Save your last bullet for yourself!"

With his men doing exactly that, Che, with a trifling flesh leg-wound (though Soderbergh's movie depicts Che's leg wound as ghastlier than Burt Reynolds' in "Deliverance"), snuck away from the firefight, crawled towards the Bolivian soldiers doing the firing—then as soon as he spotted two of them at a distance, stood and yelled: "Don't Shoot! I'm Che! I'm worth more to you alive than dead!"

Learning of Che's whimpering capture with fully loaded weapons after his sissified escape from the firefight started Alarcon's long road to total disillusionment with Castroism.

His captor's official Bolivian army records that they took from Ernesto "Che" Guevara: a fully-loaded PPK 9mm pistol. And the damaged carbine was an M-1—NOT the M-2 Che records in his own diaries as carrying. The damaged M-1 carbine probably belonged to the hapless guerrilla charge, Willi, who Che dragged along—also to his doom.

But it was only after his (obviously voluntary) capture that Che segued into full Eddie-Hasquell-Greeting-June-Cleaver-Mode. "What's your name, young man?!" Che quickly asked one of his captors. "Why, what a lovely name for a Bolivian soldier!"

"So what will they do with me?" Che, obviously desperate to ingratiate himself, asked Bolivian Captain Gary Prado. "I don't suppose you will kill me. I'm surely more valuable alive . . . . And you, Captain Prado!" Che commended his captor. "You are a very special person! . . . I have been talking to some of your men. They think very highly of you, captain! . . . Now, could you please find out what they plan to do with me?"

From that stage on, Che Guevara's fully-documented Eddie Haskell-isms only get more uproarious (or nauseating.) But somehow none of these found their way into Soderbergh's film.

—townhall.com, October 13, 2012

China Navy Plan

by Mark Halprin

During the recent foreign policy debate, the president presumed to instruct his opponent: "Governor Romney maybe hasn't spent enough time looking at how our military works. You mentioned the Navy, for example, and that we have fewer ships than we did in 1916. Well, Governor, we also have fewer horses and bayonets, because the nature of our military's changed. We have these things called aircraft carriers, where planes land on them. We have these ships that go underwater, nuclear submarines. And so the question is not a game of Battleship, where we're counting ships. It's what are our capabilities."

Yes, the Army's horses have been superseded by tanks and helicopters, and its bayonets rendered mainly ceremonial by armor and long-range, automatic fire, but what, precisely, has superseded ships in the Navy? The commander in chief patronizingly shared his epiphany that the ships of today could beat the hell out of those of 1916. To which one could say, like Neil Kinnock, "I know that, Prime Minister," and go on to add that we must configure the Navy to face not the dreadnoughts of 1916 but "things called aircraft carriers, where planes land on them," and "ships that go underwater," and also ballistic missiles, land-based aviation, and electronic warfare.

To hold that numbers and mass in war are unnecessary is as dangerous as believing that they are sufficient. Defense contractor Norman Augustine famously observed that at the rate fighter planes are becoming complex and expensive, soon we will be able to build just one. Neither

Joy to the World!

Joy to the World, the Lord is come!
Let earth receive her King;
Let every heart prepare Him room,
And Heaven and nature sing,
And Heaven and nature sing,
And Heaven, and Heaven, and nature sing.

Joy to the World, the Savior reigns!
Let men their songs employ;
While fields and floods, rocks, hills and plains
Repeat the sounding joy,
Repeat the sounding joy,
Repeat, repeat, the sounding joy.

No more let sins and sorrows grow,
Nor thorns infest the ground;
He comes to make His blessings flow
Far as the curse is found,
Far as the curse is found,
Far as, far as, the curse is found.

He rules the world with truth and grace,
And makes the nations prove
The glories of His righteousness,
And wonders of His love,
And wonders of His love,
And wonders, wonders, of His love.

—Isaac Watts

a plane nor a ship, no matter how capable, can be in more than one place at once. And if one ship that is in some ways equivalent to 100 is damaged or lost, we have lost the equivalent of 100. But, in fact, except for advances in situational awareness, missile defense, and the effect of precision-guided munitions in greatly multiplying the target coverage of carrier-launched aircraft, the Navy is significantly less capable than it was a relatively short time ago in antisubmarine warfare, mine warfare, the ability to return ships to battle, and the numbers required to accomplish the tasks of deterrence or war.

For example, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's diplomacy in the South China Sea is doomed to impotence because it consists entirely of declarations without the backing of sufficient naval potential, even now when China's navy is not half of what it will be in a decade. China's claims, equivalent to American expropriation of Caribbean waters all the way to the coast of Venezuela, are much like Hitler's annexations. But we no longer have bases in the area, our supply lines are attenuated across the vastness of the Pacific, we have much more than decimated our long-range aircraft, and even with a maximum carrier surge we would have to battle at least twice as many Chinese fighters.

Not until recently would China have been so aggressive in the South China Sea, but it has a plan, which is to grow; we have a plan, which is to shrink; and you get what you pay for. To wit, China is purposefully, efficiently, and successfully modernizing its forces and often accepting reductions in favor of quality. And yet, to touch upon just a few examples, whereas 20 years ago it possessed one ballistic-missile submarine and the US 34, now it has three (with two more coming) and the US 14. Over the same span, China has gone from 94 to 71 submarines in total, while the US has gone from 121 to 71. As our numbers decrease at a faster pace, China is also closing the gap in quality.

The effect in principal surface warships is yet more pronounced. While China has risen from 56 to 78, the US has descended from 207 to 114. In addition to parities, China is successfully focusing on exactly what it needs—terminal ballistic missile guidance, superfast torpedoes and wave-skimming missiles, swarms of oceangoing missile craft, battle-picture blinding—to address American vulnerabilities, while our counters are insufficient or nonexistent.

Nor is China our only potential naval adversary, and with aircraft, surface-to-surface missiles, and over-the-horizon radars, the littoral countries need not have navies to assert themselves over millions of square miles of sea. Even the Somali pirates, with only outboard motors, skiffs, RPGs, and Kalashnikovs, have taxed the maritime forces of the leading naval states.

What, then, is a relatively safe number of highly capable ships appropriate for the world's richest country and leading naval power? Not the less than 300 at present, or the 200 to which we are headed, and not 330 or 350 either, but 600, as in the 1980s. Then, we were facing the Soviet Union; but now China, better suited as a maritime power, is rising faster than this country at present is willing to face.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, October 29, 2012, p. A 21