



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 11



Dr. David Noebel

November 2013

HAPPY THANKSGIVING

October 3, 1789, from the US Capitol in New York City, President George Washington issued the first Proclamation of a National Day of Thanksgiving and Prayer to Almighty God.

Why? Just one week earlier, the first session of the US Congress successfully approved the Bill of Rights, which put ten limitations on the power of the new Federal Government. The States were concerned the Federal Government would get too powerful.

The Preamble to the Bill of Rights explained: “The Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added . . . as amendments to the Constitution of the United States.”

The First of the Ten Amendments restricting the Federal Government’s abuse of its powers began: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

President George Washington thanked God for the “Constitutions of government . . . particularly the national one now lately instituted,” stating in his Proclamation, October 3, 1789: “Whereas it is the Duty of all nations to acknowledge the Providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor; and—Whereas both Houses of Congress have, by their joint committee, requested me “to recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many and signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness:” Now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday, the 26th day of November next, to be devoted by the people of these States to the service of that great and glorious Being who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be; that we may then all unite in rendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks for His kind care and protection of the people of this country previous to their becoming a nation; for the signal and manifold mercies and the favor, able interpositions of His providence in the course and conclusion of the late war; for the great degree of tranquillity, union, and plenty which we have since enjoyed; for the peaceable and rational manner in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted; for the civil and religious liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and, in general, for all the great and various favors which He has been pleased to confer upon us. And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions; to enable us all, whether in public or private stations, to perform our several and relative duties properly and punctually; to render our National Government a blessing to all the people by constantly being a Government of wise, just, and constitutional laws, discreetly and faithfully executed and obeyed; to protect and guide all sovereigns and nations (especially such as have shown kindness to us), and to bless them with good governments, peace, and concord; to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us; and, generally, to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.

Given under my hand at the City of New York the third day of October in the year of our Lord 1789.—George Washington.”

—Bill Federer, *American Minute*, October 3, 2013

Communists, Socialists, Globalists

by William F. Jasper

On February 12, 2013, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) hosted a speaker program entitled *The G-20: Prospects and Challenges for Global Governance*. The program, which was video-recorded and is available for viewing on the CFR website (www.cfr.org), featured a lineup of top-drawer talent from the CFR brain trust. It also yielded a number of revealing statements by the panel participants. But an admission by Eurasia Group President Ian Bremmer is especially noteworthy, in that it once again publicly confirms what critics of the European Union have been saying for decades, but which CFR globalists such as Bremmer have usually denied. Bremmer admitted—with apparent approval—that “there’s real subversion of sovereignty by the EU.”

The sponsoring organization and the participants in the above-noted event are significant and worth mentioning, as they have been providing key political and intellectual leadership for the ongoing phenomenon of regionalization.

The CFR panel included:

- Nicolas Berggruen, chairman of the Berggruen Institute on Governance and coauthor of *Intelligent Governance for the 21st Century: A Middle Way Between West and East*;

- Ian Bremmer, president, Eurasia Group;

- Stewart M. Patrick, senior fellow and director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program at the CFR; and

- Anne-Marie Slaughter, Bert G. Kerstetter, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, and recently the director of Policy Planning for the Obama State Department under Hillary Clinton.

Professor Slaughter, who served as the presider of the CFR panel discussion, has taught at the University of Chicago and Harvard University, and is a former president of the American Society of International Law. She has also authored some of the most blatant appeals—for the CFR journal *Foreign Affairs* and other establishment periodicals—in favor of subverting national sovereignty with regional schemes of “transnational governance.”

But we digress; let us return to the Bremmer subversion quote referred to above. His outburst came amidst the venting of frustration by the panelists over what they see as the “ineffectiveness” of the G20 process. Professor Slaughter and Berggruen, particularly, argued that the G20

needed to be given actual powers that would enable it to do more to effect global governance. According to the CFR panelists, national sovereignty and national interests get in the way of this desired goal. Thus, Bremmer commented: “The EU is much more significant. There’s real subversion of sovereignty by the EU that works.”

The New American has pointed out for many years that the designers of the European Union intended from the very start of the EU—which began in the 1950s as the six-member European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC)—that it would gradually develop into a supra-national regional government, eventually subverting the sovereignty of, and usurping legislative, executive, and judicial powers of, its member states. This plan of intentional subversion has been documented from many sources, including the personal correspondence, diaries, and memoirs of many of the EU architects, as well as official papers, many of which had been hidden under a cloak of secrecy for decades.

We also have pointed out that it was key CFR members in the Truman and Eisenhower administrations who provided the indispensable aid—political, diplomatic, and economic—in post-World War II Europe that guaranteed the Eurofederalists would be ascendant. Utilizing Marshall Plan funds and America’s new power on the war-ravaged continent, the CFR globalists running the US State and Treasury departments—Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Christian Herter, David Bruce, John J. McCloy, C. Douglas Dillon, George Ball, et al.—raised to power those who championed an amalgamated, “integrated” Europe, and cast down those who clung to “outmoded” notions of national sovereignty and independence.

One of the most astute observers and chroniclers of this subversive process over the course of five decades was the late Hilaire du Berrier, publisher of the authoritative, Monaco-based *HduB Reports*. Du Berrier was also a longtime contributing editor to *The New American* (and to its predecessors, *American Opinion* and *The Review of the News*), “The CFR,” wrote du Berrier in the January 1973 issue of *HduB Reports*, “saw the Common Market from the first as a regional government to which more and more nations would be added until the world government which [the] UN had failed to bring about would be realized. At a favorable point in the Common Market’s development America would be brought in. But the American public had to be softened first and leaders groomed for the change-over.”

The American and European co-conspirators in this subversive restructuring of the continent did not, of course, openly admit to the people of Europe how revolutionary

their plans were and how radical and extensive the integration process would be. To the contrary, the leaders of the Eurofication movement repeatedly assured concerned citizens and skeptical political opponents that they had nothing to fear; the Common Market would never morph into an actual government that would in any way override national and local authority.

One of the most infamous false assurances in this regard was promulgated by British prime minister and Conservative Party leader Edward Heath, when he led Britain into the European Economic Community (as the EU was then known) in 1973. “There are some in this country who fear that in going into Europe we shall in some way sacrifice independence and sovereignty,” Heath stated in a prime ministerial TV broadcast in January 1973. “These fears, I need hardly say, are completely unjustified.”

Official British papers released decades later confirmed what many people already knew: that Heath had lied, that he knew full well he was taking Britain into a sovereignty-destroying arrangement, and that he colluded with Labor Party leaders to deliver the combined votes needed to cinch this national suicide. Heath was following the lead of the CFR’s sister organization in England, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA, also known as Chatham House). One of the RIIA’s most famous members, and a key player in promoting the EU, was Arnold J. Toynbee, who stated in an address to his colleagues:

“I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.”

Heath was not alone; many other European politicians followed Toynbee’s advice of “denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.” The Peterson Institute for International Economics, one of the CFR’s most important adjunct think tanks, approvingly refers to this ongoing deception in the EU process as “integration by stealth.”

Gradually, the new rulers of Europe have dropped hints and made statements validating the worst fears expressed by critics and opponents of the EU. In July 1988, former European Commission President Jacques Delors shocked many with the prediction that within 10 years 80 percent of economic legislation, and perhaps also fiscal and social legislation, would come not from national parliaments, but from the European Parliament, the European Commission, and other EU institutions. Various studies using differing methods of calculation have produced widely disparate estimates of the extent to which EU laws and regulations are influencing and overriding national

legislation. A study in 2010 by the British House of Commons reported: “In the UK data suggest that from 1997 to 2009 6.8% of primary legislation (Statutes) and 14.1% of secondary legislation (Statutory Instruments) had a role in implementing EU obligations, although the degree of involvement varied from passing reference to explicit implementation. Estimates of the proportion of national laws based on EU laws in other EU Member States vary widely, ranging from around 6% to 84%.”

In the past few years since the 2008 financial crisis, the power of the Eurocrats in Brussels has dramatically increased. It may not yet have attained the sway that Delors predicted, but the trajectory is still in that direction.

The EU integration process is referred to as “deepening and widening”: The “deepening” refers to the steady usurpation of more and more powers by the EU’s supranational institutions over more and more of the domestic functions of national and local governments; the “widening” refers to the adding of new member nation states.

One-worlders readily acknowledge that regional governance, as exemplified by the European Union’s subversive process and steady growth, is the path that will most successfully lead to eventual world government.

The UN-appointed Commission on Global Governance, for instance, declares in its seminal 1995 report, *Our Global Neighborhood*: “The UN must gear itself for a time when regionalism becomes more ascendant worldwide and assist the process in advance of that time. Regional co-operation and integration should be seen as an important and integral part of a balanced system of global governance.”

Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter’s national security advisor, a longtime CFR member, and a founder of David Rockefeller’s Trilateral Commission, told world leaders at Mikhail Gorbachev’s 1995 State of the World Forum: “We cannot leap into world government in one quick step. [It] requires a process of gradually expanding the range of democratic cooperation as well as the range of personal and national security, a widening, step by step, stone by stone, [of] existing relatively narrow zones of stability in the world of security and cooperation. In brief, the precondition for eventual globalization—genuine globalization—is progressive regionalization, because thereby we move toward larger, more stable, more cooperative units.”

In a July 13, 2000 interview with the Italian newspaper *La Stampa*, Italian Prime Minister Giuliano Amato made some startlingly candid remarks about the deception utilized by the EU. Amato would shortly after this interview go on to become the vice-president of the EU Constitu-

tional Convention, where, along with Giscard d'Estaing, he employed the very same deceptive practices he had described. Here are excerpts of his *La Stampa* interview:

One must act “as if” in Europe: as if one wanted only very few things, in order to obtain a great deal. As if nations were to remain sovereign, in order to convince them to surrender their sovereignty. The Commission in Brussels, for example, must act as if it were a technical organism, in order to operate like a government . . . and so on, camouflaging and toning down. The sovereignty lost at national level does not pass to any new subject. It is entrusted to a faceless entity: NATO, the UN and eventually the EU. The Union is the vanguard of this changing world: it indicates a future of Princes without sovereignty. The new entity is faceless and those who are in command can neither be pinned down nor elected. . . . That is the way Europe was made too: by creating communitarian organisms without giving the organisms presided over by national governments the impression that they were being subjected to a higher power. . . .

I don't think it is a good idea to replace this slow and effective method—which keeps national States free from anxiety while they are being stripped of power—with great institutional leaps. Therefore I prefer to go slowly, to crumble pieces of sovereignty up little by little, avoiding brusque transitions from national to [EU] federal power.

Supporters of the EU's regional approach to governance scoff at critics who see a totalitarian design emerging from the shadows in Brussels. However, the constant centralizing of power and steady erosion of the remaining vestiges of national sovereignty point toward more, not less, despotic rule. It should be of more than passing interest then to note that the EU program fits well within the model of regional unification outlined by top communist leaders such as Stalin, Lenin, and Trotsky.

Stalin's 1936 official program of the Communist International declared: “This world dictatorship can be established only when the victory of socialism has been achieved in certain countries or groups of countries, when the newly established proletarian republics enter into a federative union with the already existing proletarian republics . . . [and] when these federations of republics have finally grown into a World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics uniting the whole of mankind under the hege-

mony of the international proletariat organized as a state.”

V.I. Lenin's *Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions*, which was adopted by the Second Comintern Congress, 28 July 1920, declared: “Federation is a transitional form towards the complete union . . . of all nations”

“The Soviet United States of Europe,” said Leon Trotsky, in *The Bulletin of the Opposition*, 1930, “is the only correct slogan pointing the way out from European disunity, a disunity which threatens not only Germany but the whole of Europe with complete structural and cultural decline.”

Less well known than the above-mentioned communist leaders, but perhaps more influential in helping to put their plans into practice, was Alexander Kojeve: philosopher, intellectual gadfly, and confidant to European presidents and prime ministers. Kojeve, it turns out, was also a longtime KGB mole, serving the Soviet Union. Keith Patchen at the *National Observer*, who has dug out a tremendous amount of detail on Kojeve's activities, has noted that as early as the 1950s Kojeve “wrote to [political philosopher] Leo Strauss that a world socialist state might be realized through the gradual expansion of the European integration across the globe.”

Kojeve, Stalin, Lenin, and Trotsky would heartily approve of the EU-style regionalism that has been spreading across the globe under the guise of free trade agreements.

—*The New American*, September 2, 2013, p. 12-15

Occupy Wall Street: Radicalism is the New Norm

by Lee Stranahan

Occupy Wall Street got off to a shaky start in New York City two years today. From a small group of disaffected communists and anarchists staging what amounted to a fancy sit-in September 17, 2011, to the media explosion that happened two weeks later with hundreds of arrests on the Brooklyn Bridge, Occupy Wall Street was everywhere in the fall of 2011.

While some view Occupy Wall Street as a failure or a flash-in-the-pan, the movement actually hasn't gone anywhere.

It's more than just the catchphrases and imagery that OWS gave us: the 99% versus the 1%, Guy Fawkes masks, the Black Bloc. It was about much more than just the reelection of President Barack Obama in a campaign that was largely won on the rich versus poor messaging, as shown in Stephen K. Bannon's film “Occupy Unmasked.”

The real triumph of Occupy Wall Street is both invisible and omnipresent. We now live in the post-Occupy era where radicalism is the new normal.

Occupy Wall Street was able to introduce the peace and justice movement activism that began in the 1960s to a whole new generation of unemployed, disaffected youth. The significance of Occupy Wall Street is not that they supported Barack Obama. OWS is the radical bleeding edge and by that yardstick, Obama was too conservative for them. The occupiers themselves see Obama and mainstream Democrats as part of the problem, although they clearly see the Democrat party as 100 times better than the racist, sexist, xenophobic, patriarchal, rich, greedy personifications of evil that are Republicans.

No, the big deal was never that Occupy Wall Street supported Obama. It's that Barack Obama supported the Occupy Wall Street movement.

The stunner is that we have a sitting US president who is sympathetic to the goals, ideals, and tactics of the extreme left. This is the genius of Obama's stealth radicalism: the community organizer in chief giving the appearance of moderation for the left while chaos fomented in the streets and around the world.

It's had an impact on both international and domestic policy. While the Arab Spring movement that preceded Occupy Wall Street promoted anti-American, anti-Western, anticapitalist jihadist Islam, the Occupy Wall Street movement promoted anti-American, anti-Western, anticapitalist revolutionary domestic change. On issues ranging from Syria to immigration reform to gun control to race relations, radicalism has seized the day and essentially become the platform of the Democratic Party.

None of this was accomplished in a vacuum. Obama, like every good horsetrader, knows the basic rules of negotiation: set the opening bid higher than you want, then let the other guy "talk you down" to what you really wanted in the first place.

The whole purpose of Occupy Wall Street is to create that high bid. They are the extreme, which makes Obama seem moderate.

Think Occupy Wall Street is dead? One current remnant of the Occupy movement is the current wave of fast food strikes that have been going on across the country all summer. Like Occupy, they aren't spontaneous or driven from the bottom up. They have been coordinated by radical left groups working in concert with the unions.

As FOXNews reported last month: "The protests are underway in cities including New York, Boston, and Chicago, and organizers are expecting the biggest national walkouts yet."

A McDonald's restaurant in Detroit closed Thursday morning as workers and protesters chanted "hey hey, ho ho, \$7.40's got to go," outside, WJBK reports.

These Astroturf protests have a goal of raising the minimum wage, based on the left's principal of a "living wage." Never mind that all jobs are not meant to provide a living wage. Never mind the jobs lost at restaurants like that McDonald's in Detroit, that were forced to close. The strikes are classic post-Occupy Wall Street community organizing. They provide street theater and headlines and give the appearance of a nationwide movement.

The protesters are asking for \$15 an hour to work at fast food jobs. That's double the current minimum wage.

So there is your high bid: \$15 an hour for flipping burgers. What is the Obama administration stand on this? FOXNews continues: "The movement comes amid calls from the White House, some members of Congress, and economists to hike the federal minimum wage. But most proposals seek a far more modest increase than the one workers are asking for, with President Barack Obama wanting to boost it to \$9 an hour."

In a wide-ranging interview with the Associated Press, Labor Secretary Thomas Perez said the strikes are another sign of the need to raise the minimum wage for all workers. He compared the protests to the demands of demonstrators in the 1963 March on Washington, who sought a national minimum wage to give workers better living standards.

Well, look at that. Compared to \$15 an hour, \$9 an hour for flipping burgers seems almost reasonable.

This is a pattern you'll see over and over again. Occupy Wall Street-inspired protesters, working closely with institutional left groups and the unions, push the edges, as the Obama administration leads from the rear with its "moderate and reasonable" proposals.

In case you have any doubts about this coordination, the "Occupy For Fast Food Workers" was the kickoff event for today's planned Occupy Wall Street commemoration activities. A protest is planned at the McDonald's across the street from Zuccotti park.

There's something especially stinky about that protest outside that particular McDonald's, by the way. Look how the Occupy movement repays the kindness of the very same McDonald's that allowed them to use their restrooms during the occupation. An article in *The New York Observer* sets the scene from October 2011 so well you can almost smell it: "It was around 7 p.m. Monday night, and the McDonald's across from Zuccotti Park was packed. Tired cops who had just spent two hours corralling protesters during one of Occupy Wall Street's marches waited in line behind tired protesters still caked in zombie

makeup. The lines for the bathroom were twenty people long; once inside a stall, the used toilet paper is stacked higher than the actual toilets.

“A couple of families hurried in and out, one woman dragging her daughter away from two white guys in dreads who were giggling over some tablets of white powder.”

Two years after Occupy Wall Street began, the tents may be gone but the movement hasn't gone anywhere. The frame has moved further left.

—Breitbart.com, September 18, 2013

Che Guevara: Revolution Justice

by Humberto Fontova

Any professor in the US who utters the “N-word” even offhandedly gets cashiered instantly. Examples abound. Nowadays even using the perfectly proper term “Negro” can get an educator fired, as in the case of a Bronx teacher.

The trick to—not only keeping one's academic job—but catapulting to emeritus status apparently involves using the term “Negro” only for anti-communist black people that you lynched. I use the word “lynch” here—not in the current conservative context referring to liberal handling of Herman Cain, Allen West, Clarence Thomas, etc.—but literally, as in murdering. An example exists:

The first (victim) was a tall handsome mulatto. He stood blindfolded before the paredon (firing squad wall), his hands bound in front of him. “Muchachos,” he said calmly, “The only crime you are going to commit is to kill me, because I am innocent.”

I stepped into the field and shouted: “Ready! Aim! FIRE!” . . . the man went down and I went up to him immediately, commanding the firing squad to order arms as I walked. There were bullet holes in his shirt and he seemed dead, but I wasted no time in putting the automatic to his head and pulled the trigger. It made a neat round hole.

Next (victim) to die was a Negro who was hauled kicking and screaming to the paredon. . . . I told the jailers to throw him up against the wall and get out of the way. . . . The condemned man froze in terror when he saw his executioners arrayed before him.

“READY!” My command jolted him out of his trance.

“NO!—NO!” he cried. “Do NOT get ready.” He tried to climb the wall.

“NO!” he yelled while trying to hide behind one of the execution stakes, but the gun muzzles tracked him relentlessly.

“FIRE!” He turned his head and ducked just as the guns went off. Most of the bullets struck him in profile, tearing his nose, lips, chin, and most of his cheeks. His face was transformed into a raw, red mass of flesh and bone that contrasted sharply to the smooth black skin bordering it. He lay on his back with what was left of his face turned to the firing squad. Anyone that hideously blasted, I thought, had to be dead. . . . “[W]ell,” I commented to the firing squad, “it is not necessary to give him the tiro de gracia.”

“Yes, Americano!” shouted one of my men. “He still lives! Give him the shot!” His arms and legs were twitching. His movement ceased only when a bullet from my pistol entered his skull.

The above comes from University of Florida Professor Emeritus Neill Macaulay's memoirs titled, *A Rebel in Cuba*, published in 1970. The judicial process these black Cubans had undergone was best described by Fidel and Che themselves:

“Judicial evidence is an archaic bourgeois detail. This is a revolution, We execute from Revolutionary conviction.” (Che Guevara, Feb. 1959)

“Legal proof is impossible to obtain against war criminals. So we sentence them based on moral conviction.” (Fidel Castro Feb. 1959)

“The whole procedure was sickening,” wrote *New York Times* (no less) correspondent, Ruby Hart Phillips, about a trial she attended in Havana in early 1959. “The defense attorney made absolutely no defense, instead he apologized to the court for defending the prisoner.”

Edwin Tetlow, Havana correspondent for London's *Daily Telegraph*, wrote about a “trial” by Che Guevara's judicial dream-team where he noticed the dozens of death sentences posted on a board—before the trial had started.

The future professor Emeritus who gleefully carried out these death sentences continued gloating: “Escalona (a communist commander later notorious for exterminating rural Cuban rebels with Soviet arms and officers) introduced me to Fidel as ‘the man who is training the firing squads.’ Fidel threw his head back and roared with laughter. As I stretched out my hand, he grabbed me by my shoulders and gave me a bear hug. Everybody was happy.

At the University (of Havana) he was known as Greaseball. To me, however, he (Fidel) was very attractive.”

This attraction probably grew when Fidel Castro gifted Yankee executioner Neill Macaulay with property stolen from rightful Cuban owners under penalty of firing squad and torture chamber. More from professor Macaulay’s book: “Fidel says to give the Americano what he wants. So I selected a plot of about sixty-five acres from an immense plantation that had been jointly owned by some friends of Batista. The INRA (Che Guevara’s Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria) gave me virtually unlimited credit . . . there was no house on my land so I chose as a residence the former country home of Pepe Fraga, Batista’s former chief of parking meters in Havana. Late in July, my wife and infant son joined me there.”

An American mercenary joins Castro and Che Guevara’s criminal band, executes (murders, actually) Cubans without trial, steals the property of Cubans at gunpoint. Then he serves for decades as Professor Emeritus of Latin American Studies at University of Florida, apparently with nobody batting an eye.

The University of Florida is a state college, so there’s a good chance his salary was paid partly by his victims’ families. And again apparently nobody bats an eye.

Upon Macaulay’s death in 2007 (some suspect from suicide) Leftist professor and documentarian Glenn Gebhard wrote: “He (Macaulay) was not a socialist or a communist, and he left (Cuba) after he realized he couldn’t make a living. . . . He was a man of action and really smart.”

Che Guevara, whatever else we can say about him, seemed to actually believe in the Communist holy book. Macaulay apparently murdered Cubans for fun and profit.

Quite fittingly, among Professor Neill Macaulay’s final academic duties was to hail a book by Castro “agent-of-influence” (also the Council on Foreign Relations Latin American “expert”) Julia Sweig as: “the best book ever written about Fidel Castro’s revolutionary movement.”

In the early 1960s, South Carolinian Neill Macaulay briefly lost his US citizenship for serving in a foreign nation’s military. Then “family friend” Strom Thurmond pulled some strings to get it back. In brief: a “good ‘ole southern boy” boasts of murdering “Negroes” as a mercenary. Then among the nation’s most prominent segregationists of the time (Strom Thurmond) retrieves his US citizenship. Then a southern institute of higher learning hires and honors him.

And not one liberal peeps in protest. Who but a gleeful servant of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara could get away with something like this in the eyes of US media and academia?

—FrontPage Magazine, September 30, 2013

Traitor in Embryo

by David Aikman

It will probably never be known how many people died because they were betrayed by Kim Philby to the NKVD, or its successor, the KGB. Konstantin Volkov, a KGB agent working under diplomatic cover as a consular officer in Istanbul in 1945, is just one standout example. For the sum of £5,000, Volkov offered to defect to the British with a treasure trove of intelligence information: the names of 314 KGB agents in Turkey and 250 in Britain. He also claimed to have the names of senior British intelligence officers who were working as double agents for the Soviet Union. He quite possibly knew about Philby’s longtime work for Moscow.

Philby, then heading the Section IX counterintelligence section of Britain’s Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), was ordered to Istanbul by the head of SIS in order to arrange for Volkov to be expatriated safely to England. He dragged his feet in getting there, meanwhile passing along to Moscow all the information Volkov claimed to have available. By the time Philby made it to Istanbul, Volkov had been kidnapped by the Russians, swathed in bandages, and then shipped back to Moscow on a Soviet military plane. There he was interrogated and summarily executed.

Philby was the most prominent—and certainly the most dangerous—of a group of British traitors who came to be known as the Cambridge Five. They included diplomats Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean, who defected to Moscow in 1951, and the art historian Anthony Blunt, revealed publicly in 1979 to have been a spy for Moscow since shortly after graduating from Cambridge.

Why and how did Harold Adrian Russell Philby come into a life as an intelligence officer and then a double life as a KGB informant within British intelligence? The usual motives of people who become spies and then traitors to their own country are described by analysts of intelligence as falling into the acronym MICE: Money, Ideology, Compromise/Control by another country’s spy agency, and Ego. Since Philby defected to Moscow from Beirut in 1963, and then wrote a memoir of his double life, *My Silent War* (1968), it has come to be generally accepted that he was a heart-and-soul convert, almost in a religious sense, to Moscow’s global Marxist-Leninist agenda.

This basic reckoning of the Philby phenomenon is probably true and is affirmed by Edward Harrison. The consensus view, however, fails to deal with other important questions: Was Philby living out his own version of the colorful antics of his father, the convert-to-Islam Ara-

bist and sometime intelligence officer St. John Philby? At what point did Philby's attraction to communism become the core of a danger-prone life providing intelligence to the enemy and going against everything his country stood for?

This remarkable, intriguing, and highly detailed study of Philby in his early years answers many of these questions. Harrison has done the historical record a favor by going through recently declassified SIS records and matching what they tell about Philby with Russian academic research into those parts of the NKVD archives that became available to scholars after 1991.

Philby was drawn to the ideals of international socialism while still a scholar at Westminster School, which his father had also attended. Westminster's assistant head-master was an idealistic clergyman who preached that there was a fundamental flaw in capitalism and that young people should serve the world less selfishly. He was a great enthusiast for the League of Nations. But it was at Cambridge that Philby was first attracted to communism, becoming an enthusiastic member of the Cambridge University Socialist Society (CUSS). A Cambridge lecturer, Maurice Dobb, was doing his best to persuade CUSS members to go for the heady brew of revolutionary communism rather than the less violent alternative of, say, Fabian socialism.

It was through a connection of Dobb's that Philby set off after Cambridge for Vienna, where he worked to protect German and Austrian refugees from the Nazis. There he married Litzi Friedmann, an older divorcée who had spent time in an Austrian prison for her Communist activities. It was through his wife's connections that Philby was first introduced to an NKVD control officer in London.

Philby's political leanings from his time at Cambridge were known to several people in the British establishment, but they were always dismissed as having been part of a youthful phase that he later outgrew—a characterization Philby himself cultivated. He was aided by the fact that his eccentric father, who had made a career of opposing the policies of the British government, was able to persuade Philby's future superiors in British intelligence that his son was unlikely to betray his own class. And in a later, remarkable parallel to Philby's treachery, when Whittaker Chambers of *Time* was trying to prove that Alger Hiss had been a Soviet spy, his boss Henry Luce made the observa-

tion to Chambers that it was always the upper classes of Britain and America who were first to betray their countries.

Philby was an able intelligence officer, working effectively for SIS in its efforts to penetrate Nazi intelligence operations during World War II. But in addition to his care in doing his work, his most important asset in avoiding detection as a Soviet double agent may have been his charm. During the war, and afterwards, the top precincts of SIS seem to have been snakepits of backbiting and professional backstabbing; in his memoirs, Philby claims credit for obtaining his position as chief of SIS counter-espionage through masterful manipulation of his rivals.

In fact, as Harrison shows, Philby was as much the beneficiary of good luck as of bureaucratic skills: A candidate for a top position at SIS who might have uncovered Philby's treachery was passed over for promotion because of internecine rivalry; Philby was identified publicly as the suspected "third man" of the Cambridge Five, but was exonerated in Parliament because of the absence of proof.

The strain of living a double life, of working in the intelligence circles of one country while passing information to its enemy, finally took its toll on Philby. He was often drunk, went through three marriages before his defection to Moscow, and, once in Moscow, had an affair with the wife of fellow-defector Donald Maclean. Philby was ultimately disappointed by the Soviet Union: He turned out *not* to have been a KGB colonel, as he had claimed, and could find no substantive work with his new masters for several years after his defection. He died in 1988, on the eve of the collapse of the Soviet empire.

One of the more intriguing aspects of Harrison's study is how lacking in curiosity Philby's British colleagues were about his worldview and philosophical allegiances. Of course, it is unlikely that a man like Philby would survive scrutiny today, by skeptical colleagues and superiors in, say, the CIA. Unlikely, but not impossible. Arrogance about one's own views is often the generator of negligence in checking the views of others. Philby was from "the right drawer," in British snobspeak, but philosophically he was something else.

Ask the Volkov family.

David Aikman is the author, most recently, of *The Mirage of Peace: Understanding the Never-Ending Conflict in the Middle East*.

—*The Weekly Standard*, July 29, 2013, p. 41, 42

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 PO 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. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at www.schwarzreport.org. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.