



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 12



Dr. David Noebel

December 2013

Merry Christmas!

Jesus Christ, whose birthday is celebrated throughout the world this month, has had a greater impact on human history than any person who ever lived. Though he died at the age of 33, the year in which we live is dated from his birth. Though he lived in an obscure corner of the Roman Empire nearly 2,000 years ago, more than one billion people today call themselves followers of Christ. Though he never wrote a book, tens of thousands of books have been written about his life and teachings.

Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem, a town in Roman-occupied Palestine, around 4 B.C. After a flight into Egypt to escape the murderous wrath of King Herod, Jesus returned to Palestine with Mary and Joseph and grew up in the village of Nazareth, where he worked in Joseph's carpenter shop.

At the age of 30, Jesus left Nazareth, gathered around him 12 men who became known as his apostles, and traveled throughout Palestine preaching love of God and love of neighbor and attracting followers by the thousands. He was a marvelous storyteller, illustrating his teachings with examples and parables about persons, places, and things that were familiar to his listeners. Christ's parables (e.g., The Good Samaritan, The Prodigal Son) are often cited even by non-Christians as literary and moral masterpieces for their simple, yet profound, messages.

The core of Jesus' moral code was love, not only of God and neighbor, but even of enemies because "this will prove that you are sons of your heavenly Father, for his sun rises on the bad and the good." He adhered to this difficult standard himself on the cross by asking forgiveness for those who had crucified him.

Jesus urged his followers personally to help those in need—the hungry, the thirsty, the sick, the imprisoned—saying that whatever they did "for one of my least brothers, you did it for me." He asked them to forgive the faults of others and laid down the Golden Rule: "Treat others the way you would have them treat you." He forbade murder, adultery, anger, and hatred, and encouraged prayer and fasting and sacrifice, saying that "if a man wishes to come after me, he must deny his very self, take up his cross, and follow in my steps."

Thousands of people were drawn to Jesus by his tenderness and compassion for the sick and the suffering ("Come to me, all you who are weary and find life burdensome, and I will refresh you."), by his mercy and forgiveness toward sinners (Jesus said, "People who are healthy do not need a doctor; sick people do"), and by his courage and fearlessness (He chased the moneychangers out of the temple and condemned the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, calling them "white-washed tombs—beautiful to look at on the outside but inside full of filth and dead men's bones").

The Pharisees, angry at Jesus' criticism of them and jealous of the crowds that followed him, sent clever men out to question Jesus while he was speaking in the hope of tripping him up. But he confounded them time and again, as when they asked him if it was lawful to pay taxes to the hated Romans, and he replied: "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, but give to God what is God's." Or when they asked if a woman caught in adultery should be stoned to death, and Christ said: "Let the man among you who has no sin be the first to cast a stone at her."

But Christians throughout the world believe that Jesus was more than just a good and holy man; they believe that he was the Son of God, the Messiah promised in the Old Testament. As evidence of their belief, Christians cite the fulfillment in Jesus of Old Testament prophecies regarding the place and circumstances of the Messiah's birth, the betrayal and suffering he endured, and the manner of his death.

But the most convincing evidence of Jesus' claim to be God was the spectacular miracles he performed before hundreds and even thousands of eyewitnesses—"These very works which I perform testify on my behalf that the Father has sent me." He changed water into wine; cured the blind, deaf, and lame; exorcized demons from people; fed thousands with only

a few loaves of bread and fishes; and raised three people from the dead, including his friend Lazarus.

The raising of Lazarus four days after he had died was the last straw as far as the chief priests and Pharisees were concerned and they wove a plot to kill Jesus, getting unexpected help from one of Christ's own apostles, Judas, who was willing to betray his master for 30 pieces of silver. Jesus was arrested late at night, put through the mockery of a trial, beaten and tortured, and then put to death on the orders of Pontius Pilate.

The followers of Jesus thought they had seen the last of him when his body was taken down from the cross and placed in a borrowed grave outside Jerusalem nearly 2,000 years ago. But, three days later, the tomb was found to be empty and more than a dozen people reported having seen Jesus alive that Sunday. Over the next 40 days, Jesus was seen in different places at different times by small groups of people and by large groups, including a crowd of 500. On the 40th day, according to reliable eyewitness accounts, he gave his apostles their final instructions, to carry his teachings "to the ends of the earth," and then rose up into the heavens, not to return until the end of the world.

Whatever attitude people hold toward Jesus Christ, whether they believe him to be God or not, there is no question that if his teachings were followed faithfully by everyone, the world would be a better and more peaceful place to live.

—This article originally appeared in the December 23, 1981 issue of *The Review of the News*, a predecessor of *The New American*.

Radicalism and Public Schools

by R. Albert Mohler, Jr.

Should Christian parents send their children to the public schools? That question has emerged as one of the most controversial debates of our times. And yet, every family must come to terms with the issues involved in the public school debate—and fast.

Most parents already know that a great deal is at stake in this question. We start with the affirmation that it is parents who bear responsibility for the education of their children. God will hold every parent accountable for the decisions we make about our children and the context, as well as the content, of their education (Deuteronomy 6:1–26; Ephesians 6:1–4). In the truest sense, Christians

understand that every home is a church, a government, and a school—the first church, the first government, and the first school that a child will come to know. The duty of Christian parents to raise their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord cannot be delegated to anyone else—not to the state, not to the schools, and not even to the church.

In today's context, most parents still send their children to the public schools. This has been the norm and expectation for most American parents since the beginning of the twentieth century. Until fairly recently, exceptions to this rule have been seen as profoundly anti-democratic and practically un-American. Homeschoolers were seen as marginal eccentrics, Catholics were seen as hopelessly sectarian, and those who sent their children to private schools were seen as elitist snobs.

For the most part, American evangelicals in the twentieth century agreed with this assessment. Evangelical families sent their children to the public schools with confidence and with eagerness. They had little interest in other alternatives for the simple reason that they saw little need for any alternative. Evangelical Christians were happy with the public schools and saw them as both effective and efficient in the delivery of an American education. They also saw the public schools as safe and healthy places for children, and they grew to love the athletic programs and extracurricular activities that grew along with the schools in the American Century, as the last century came to be known.

Then, something happened. By the end of the twentieth century, American evangelicals were abandoning the public schools by the millions. The last four decades have witnessed the explosive expansion of the Christian school movement in America and the emergence of homeschooling as a mainstream educational option among the nation's Christians. Why?

A Tradition of Local Control

To understand the reason for this vast backlash against the public schools, a bit of historical perspective is required. The earliest public schools in the United States were community-based and parent-controlled. Parents and fellow citizens within a community would establish a school and hire a schoolmaster. The community would establish the curriculum, and the schoolmaster was expected to maintain discipline within the school as well as to guide the education of the students.

This pattern prevailed even when the nation grew and village schools gave way to the vast suburban expansion of modern America. The public schools were public in

the sense that they were community schools maintained for and by the citizens of a community. Local control was axiomatic, and parents had a direct influence in the curriculum and policies of the schools.

That model of the public school, though rightly cherished in the American memory, is no more. First came the educational authorities who pushed for a “progressive” understanding of the schools and their function. Figures such as John Dewey argued in the early years of the last century that the public schools should form a common liberal culture as their main purpose. Without hiding their agenda, these educators argued that the public schools should separate children from the religious “prejudices” of their parents and redefine Americanism as what Dewey called a secular “common faith.”

Still, the full impact of the progressivist agenda took decades to emerge. For the most part, the public schools in rural and suburban America remained community schools. Local school boards, elected by the community, set policy and controlled the schools. The schools continued to teach the basic disciplines and to maintain order and discipline in the classrooms. That condition did not last, however, and the last half of the twentieth century saw the public schools radically transformed in the vast majority of communities.

Decisions of the US Supreme Court secularized the schools in a way that separated the schools from their communities and families. The courts also turned the schools into arenas of endless litigation. The evil of racial segregation was rightly ended. But as a result, court-ordered busing programs eliminated any sense of a community school for many families.

The Fruit of Revolution

But the most radical transformation of the public schools was political and ideological in origin. Control of the schools, enforced through both funding and mandates, migrated to the national government where an army of educational bureaucrats replaced local school boards as the real arbiters of educational policy. Labor unions for teachers, rather than parents, now exert vast influence over the schools.

The ideological revolution has been even more damaging than the political change. Those who set educational policy are now overwhelmingly committed to a radically naturalistic and evolutionistic worldview that sees the schools as engines of social revolution. The classrooms are being transformed rapidly into laboratories for ideological experimentation and indoctrination. The great engines for Americanization are now forces for the radicalization of

In Their Own Words

Here are sample resolutions from the 2012–2013 convention of the National Education Association. If your school has not yet implemented these resolutions, it seems the NEA would like to change that.

The NEA pushes educational programs that increase acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle, regardless of the parents’ views.

“Plans, activities, and programs must . . . increase respect, understanding, acceptance, and sensitivity toward individuals and groups in a diverse society composed of such groups as . . . gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transgender persons . . .” Such plans, activities and programs must . . . encourage all members of the educational community to examine assumptions and prejudices, including, but not limited to, racism, sexism, and homophobia.”

—B-14. Racism, Sexism, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identification Discrimination.

The NEA believes government schools should supply family planning instruction and resources directly to children.

“The National Education Association believes that every child should have direct and confidential access to comprehensive health, social, and psychological programs and services. . . . The Association also believes that schools should provide . . . family-planning counseling and access to birth control methods.”

—C-25. Comprehensive School Health, Social, and Psychological Programs and Services.

The NEA opposes parental efforts to restrict obscene and offensive books in school libraries and classrooms.

“The Association deplors prepublishing censorship, book-burning crusades, and attempts to ban books from school library media centers and school curricula.”

—E-3. Selection and Challenges of Materials and Teaching Techniques.

everything from human sexuality to postmodern understandings of truth and the meaning of texts. Compulsory sex education, the creation of “comprehensive health clinics,” revisionist understandings of American history, Darwinian understandings of science and humanity, and a host of other ideological developments now shape the norm in the public school experience. If these developments have not come to your local school, they almost surely will soon.

Added to these worries is the general breakdown of discipline within the schools and the fact that the public schools are now seen as social service centers. Many schools are asked to do social work as much as education, and the very idea of what such an education should be is up for debate. Standards have fallen, discipline has evaporated, armed guards roam many hallways, and teachers feel increasingly unable to teach or to maintain order.

This is not just the fault of the schools and educators. Politicians demand that the schools fix society’s problems. But no school can replace a broken or dysfunctional family; no teacher can replace a missing father.

Many fine teachers and administrators serve in the public schools, and many Christians serve among them. In some parts of the country, the public schools still operate in some sense as community schools under local control. And yet, this is already not the case for the vast majority of schools and communities, and the handwriting is on the wall for the rest.

Is public school an option? For Christians who take the Christian worldview seriously and who understand the issues at stake, the answer is increasingly no. The number of Christian parents coming to this conclusion increases each year. We can understand the nostalgia that many Christians hold about the public schools. I spent every minute of my school life from the first grade to high school graduation in a public school. And yet, I saw the ideological transformation of the schools before my own eyes. Long ago, the public schools entered a Brave New World from which no retreat now seems possible.

—AnswersMagazine.com, Oct-Dec 2013, p. 65, 67

Don’t miss a minute of the news and analysis by David Noebel.

Check out our blog at:

www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com

Case Against Foreign Aid

by Fred Andrews

In his new book, Angus Deaton, an expert’s expert on global poverty and foreign aid, puts his considerable reputation on the line and declares that foreign aid does more harm than good. It corrupts governments and rarely reaches the poor, he argues, and it is high time for the paternalistic West to step away and allow the developing world to solve its own problems.

It is a provocative and cogently argued claim. The only odd part is how it is made. It is tacked on as the concluding section of *The Great Escape: Health, Wealth, and the Origins of Inequality* (Princeton University Press, 360 pages), an illuminating and inspiring history of how mankind’s longevity and prosperity have soared to breathtaking heights in modern times.

Mr. Deaton is the Eisenhower Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton. He has spent decades working with the World Bank in creating basic yardsticks for measuring global poverty and with the Gallup Organization in creating survey-based measures of well-being.

The “great escape” of the title, he writes, is “the story of mankind’s escaping from deprivation and early death.” His book gives a stirring overview of the economic progress and medical milestones that, starting with the Industrial Revolution and accelerating after World War II, have caused life expectancies to soar.

Professor Deaton is a fluent writer, but his book is a demanding read. Its guts are his statistical comparisons, region by region and country by country, of how things stand today. They show how, when, and whether higher incomes have promoted greater life expectancies and higher well-being across the globe. Professor Deaton tells us that a rising tide has lifted almost all the world’s boats—but some far higher than others. Some have scarcely moved; a few have sunk. Obviously, some developing nations have done phenomenally well, yet, on average, the distance between “rich” and “poor” countries remains the same.

China and India continually come to the fore. For all their extraordinary progress in lifting millions of people out of poverty, it is still the case that about half of the world’s poor are Chinese or Indian.

In today’s world, with all we have mastered in medicine, public health, and development, Professor Deaton says, it is also still the case that almost a billion people “live in material destitution, millions of children still die through the accident of where they are born, and wasting

and wanting still disfigure the bodies of nearly half of India's children."

That troubling statement leads to his indictment of foreign aid, which is jarring and odd only in that nowhere in the first 266 pages of his historical analysis has he even mentioned foreign aid, either positively or negatively. A new character joins the play in its final act and becomes the villain of the piece.

In his considered judgment, global poverty today is no longer a result of lack of resources or opportunity, but of poor institutions, poor government, and toxic politics. Though about \$134 billion in official aid still flows from donor governments to recipient governments, there is no mystery, he says, as to why foreign aid fails to erase poverty. That is not its mission, he asserts: typically it serves commercial interests at home or buys political allies abroad, too often unsavory ones.

All aid is distorted by politics at both ends, he says, citing the example of Mauritania several years back, when aid was in danger of being cut off. The country's president hatched the brilliant idea of becoming one of the few Arab countries to recognize Israel. The aid taps were reopened and the reforms rescinded.

The author has found no credible evidence that foreign aid promotes economic growth; indeed, he says, signs show that the relationship is negative. Regretfully, he identifies a "central dilemma": When the conditions for development are present, aid is not required. When they do not exist, aid is not useful and probably damaging.

Professor Deaton makes the case that foreign aid is antidemocratic because it frees local leaders from having to obtain the consent of the governed. "Western-led population control, often with the assistance of nondemocratic or well-rewarded recipient governments, is the most egregious example of antidemocratic and oppressive aid," he writes. In its day, it seemed like a no-brainer. Yet the global population grew by four billion in half a century, and the vast majority of the seven billion people now on the planet live longer and more prosperous lives than their parents did.

So what should the West do instead of providing aid? Well, it can invest in finding a vaccine for malaria, still a mass killer. It can push drug companies to tackle diseases that threaten poorer countries. It can support the free flow of information about inventions and new management techniques. It can relax trade barriers and provide poor countries with expert advice at the bargaining table. It can ease immigration restraints and accept more newcomers.

Many options exist, but Professor Deaton suggests that the question is fundamentally wrong and self-centered.

"Why is it we who must do something?" he wonders. "Who put us in charge?" What the West should do, he says, is stand aside and let poorer countries find their own paths, in fits and starts, at their own pace, to development and prosperity, just as the West had to do a century or so earlier.

That is a powerful argument from a scholar who has done his homework, but it is more provocative than ultimately convincing. Defenders of foreign aid would reply that past efforts have contributed greatly to the enormous gains in life expectancy that the professor celebrates. The professor's maverick views fly in the face of an enormous global effort, and he paints with a very broad brush. The World Bank counts nearly 12,000 projects under way in 172 countries. It's hard to believe that all are nearly as flawed or misguided as Professor Deaton suggests. Aid is not a door that should slam shut.

—*The New York Times*, October 12, 2013

New York City and the Sandinistas

by Marta Cecilia Aviles Asman

Shortly after Bill de Blasio won the Democratic nomination for New York City mayor in September, his long-ago flirtation with radical governments in Cuba and Nicaragua flared as a campaign issue. But he is far ahead in the polls, and New Yorkers seem to have decided that the matter is not relevant to the job he is now seeking. To me and my family, though, the would-be mayor's activism hits home. That's because when Mr. de Blasio was visiting Nicaragua to show his support for the Sandinista government in 1988, my son and I were moving to New York, fleeing that government.

Twenty-five years is a long time, and people change. But on this subject, Mr. de Blasio has made clear that he has not.

Last month, a Cuban-American radio host asked Mr. de Blasio to explain his 1991 honeymoon to Cuba. While acknowledging that there are a "huge number of problems" with the country's communist government, Mr. de Blasio praised Cuba's healthcare system, saying: "I also think it's well known that there's been some good things that happened in that government."

He has been even more effusive about the Sandinistas, the violent revolutionaries in Nicaragua who overthrew the Somoza regime in 1979 and installed a socialist government that ruled until 1990. Mr. de Blasio told the

New York Times recently that the Sandinistas showed a “youthful energy and idealism mixed with a human ability and practicality that was really inspirational.” In the same article, one unrepentant Sandinista activist complained about some Sandinista supporters who later dropped their support for the cause. “Bill wasn’t like that,” she said.

For those who became disillusioned with the Sandinistas, a turning point came when the regime showed that it was determined to wipe out peaceful opposition. I was a member of that opposition.

I was not one of the Contra rebels who attacked the regime. I lived peacefully in Managua, the capital. I also wasn’t a supporter of the Somoza family, whose long rule the Sandinistas overturned. My family had fought the Somozas for generations, and my brother was a hero in the Sandinista revolution, rising to the rank of colonel. I was working for the Sandinista cause in the late 1970s when much of my family moved to Mexico to escape the war.

After the revolution in 1979, I joined the government. I was hired to help “humanize” Nicaraguan prisons. I was enthusiastic about the work—until I found out that Sandinista-style “humanization” often involved extrajudicial executions.

I once appealed to a prison warden to allow a diabetic prisoner his dose of insulin. The warden refused, telling me: “If it was up to you, we’d let them all out!” When I wrote a note to higher-ups complaining about all this, I was told by co-workers to get out of government before I was silenced permanently.

My moment of truth came at a meeting of government workers with Interior Minister Tomas Borge several months after the revolution. Borge was a confirmed Marxist but had been discreet until that moment. “Why not say it?” Borge said to the crowd. “We are going toward socialism.” The Sandinistas had already nationalized the banks and were confiscating property and executing opponents in the streets. I was scared to see what would come next.

I left the government after a few months, and got a job with IBM until the Sandinistas made doing business impossible for all American corporations. At that point, in 1986, I found work at the British Embassy. Because of my family’s connections with the Sandinistas, I was not immediately in danger. That changed when a friend was thrown in prison for organizing peaceful demonstrations against the government.

When I began visiting him in prison with his wife, the secret police began harassing me and my family. I was followed and my phone was tapped. That’s when I began planning my escape with my future husband, a

journalist who was then writing about Latin America for this newspaper.

It was a long, hard road that led to my finally stepping off a plane in New York with my 7-year-old boy and an overnight bag to start a new life. The transition was even harder for my son, who spoke not a word of English and who had left his extended family behind. I never would have left Nicaragua had I not been convinced that the alternative was unacceptable.

Nov. 4 will mark the anniversary of the day I arrived in New York. It was a rough time for the city—crime was rampant and the city seemed to be falling apart. But New York was home. I find it hard to believe that on Nov. 5, New Yorkers may elect a man who continues to praise the brutal government that I fled.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, October 23, 2013, p. A 13

New York City’s Marxist Power Couple

by Cliff Kincaid

“De Blasio opens up to Baldwin” is how MSNBC described Alec Baldwin’s show with New York City’s Obama-backed Democratic “progressive” mayoral candidate, Bill de Blasio. “I was an early supporter of de Blasio’s,” Baldwin acknowledged.

Having been a virtual arm of the Obama White House for years, MSNBC is now turning into an arm of the de Blasio campaign. De Blasio, a former aide to socialist New York City Mayor David Dinkins, faces law-and-order Republican candidate Joe Lhota on November 5.

De Blasio’s support for communist regimes in Cuba and Nicaragua, and his embrace of Islam as an emerging political force, were highlighted in a recent *New York Times* article. The paper also noted his illegal “honeymoon” to Communist Cuba. However, the mysterious trip occurred in either 1991 or 1994, depending on which paper you read, and much about the nature of the travel remains unknown.

Our review of documents concerning de Blasio’s involvement in the communist-front Nicaragua Solidarity Network confirms that notes of one meeting in 1991 say that he stated that Islam was an emerging “power,” and wondered if there were “progressive elements” in Islam “we can work with.”

Marxists like de Blasio who were sympathetic to the Sandinista “liberation” struggle in Nicaragua were typically active in support of the Palestine Liberation Orga-

nization (PLO), a Soviet/Cuban-backed terrorist group. Indeed, anti-Israel and pro-PLO material was found in the archives of the Nicaragua Solidarity Network.

Another document regarding the “vision” of the group says, “End world capitalism and replace it,” and next to de Blasio’s initials are the words “democratic socialism.”

Baldwin’s comments during his MSNBC/de Blasio interview included such observations as, “You seem to have a very warm positive healthy home life.” De Blasio, who is white, married a black woman and former lesbian, Chirlane McCray, and they have had two children together.

Modern-day progressives usually consider it wrong to even discuss the option of voluntarily leaving the homosexual lifestyle, but they have let the matter of McCray’s rejection of lesbianism pass without critical comment.

De Blasio says one of his wife’s poems about “growing up as a young African-American girl in a racist society” helped him to fall in love with her.

There is no indication that McCray abandoned Marxism after living in an enclave known as the Combahee River Collective.

The Combahee River Collective had issued a “revolutionary” 1977 statement saying, “We realize that the liberation of all oppressed peoples necessitates the destruction of the political-economic systems of capitalism and imperialism as well as patriarchy. We are socialists because we believe that work must be organized for the collective benefit of those who do the work and create the products, and not for the profit of the bosses. Material resources must be equally distributed among those who create these resources. We are not convinced, however, that a socialist revolution that is not also a feminist and anti-racist revolution will guarantee our liberation.”

The “collective” has been depicted by the media as a respectable group of feminist intellectuals, who were merely “radical” in some of their thinking.

The Combahee River Collective “statement” was favorably cited by Harvard Professor Richard Levins in a *Monthly Review* article called, “Continuing Sources of Marxism: Looking for the Movement as a Whole.”

In discussing the emergence of the Combahee River Collective and other such groups, he wrote, “In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels state that what distinguishes communists from other socialists is internationalism and looking for the movement as a whole. ‘Looking for the movement as a whole’ is a fluid concept that expands to embrace ever more inclusive struggles against capitalism and for a just and sustainable world. Increasingly, a movement centered on the working class

has to champion the entire cause of the species.”

He mentions the Combahee River Collective after noting that a “core of strong proto-feminist women [had] emerged in the Communist Party USA just at the time when McCarthyism was making all red organizing difficult.”

He went on, “Groups such as Redstockings, the Chicago Women’s Liberation Union, and the Combahee River Collective and publications such as *Sojourner* developed a stance against the whole system of oppression. Within feminism, Marxists have played a leading role in insisting on a class analysis that showed that ‘women’ cannot be treated as a homogeneous mass with common interests, and also struggled against racism within the feminist movement.”

Bringing the situation up to date, *New York* magazine ran a story declaring that Chirlane McCray “would be a First Lady in the mold” of Hillary Clinton.

On a Spanish language New York radio station, WADO 1280 AM, de Blasio was asked about his Cuba trip and he proved evasive: “What did you see in Cuba, what is your impression going on your honeymoon in a country that hasn’t had free elections in the last 50 years. What did you get from the trip?” The radio host went on, “If I can ask you one thing you came back from Cuba with, what was that thing?”

As noted by the *New York Daily News*, de Blasio dodged the questions and replied, “I didn’t go on a trip to fully study the country, I don’t pretend to have full perspective on the country. I have a huge critique of the current government there, because it’s undemocratic.”

But it was just as undemocratic then as it is now. So why did he visit the communist-controlled island, and what did he see and do there?

De Blasio’s opponent, Joe Lhota, has said that de Blasio “needs to explain himself—and explain himself now—to the hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers who escaped Marxist tyranny in Asia, Central America, and from behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe.”

Lhota noted that de Blasio’s involvement with the communist Sandinistas “didn’t happen in 1917; it happened 70 years later when the cruelty and intrinsic failure of communism had become crystal clear to anyone with a modicum of reason.”

He added that de Blasio, who promises to tax the rich and spend more public money, is pursuing a “class warfare strategy” that is “directly out of the Marxist playbook.”

The new MSNBC show, “Up Late with Alec Baldwin,” did include some legitimate news reaffirming de Blasio’s controversial announced intention to crack down

on police surveillance of terrorists and criminals. De Blasio opposes the stop-and-frisk practices of the New York Police Department (NYPD) and wants to replace Police Commissioner Ray Kelly, who has authorized surveillance of radical Muslims in order to thwart terrorist attacks.

“There have been 16 known terrorist plots against New York City since September 11, 2001,” the NYPD says.

The current mayor is Michael Bloomberg, a liberal who has nevertheless been a strong supporter of aggressive police tactics against potential criminals and terrorists. Bloomberg says, for example, that overturning stop-and-frisk would turn “over the streets to the criminals.”

Mike Long, the chairman of the Conservative Party of New York, told Emily Miller of *The Washington Times*, “I don’t often agree with Mike Bloomberg, but stop and frisk has made New York City that much safer. It has clearly saved the lives of people of color and is absolutely an important tool for making New York City one of the safest cities in the country.” Long said that without this enforcement mechanism, “we will be like Chicago in very short order.”

But the liberal media are betting that Lhota’s “Republican” label will be more objectionable than the communist sympathies of de Blasio and his wife, sympathies that are being played down by most reporters.

—USASurvival.org, October 24, 2013

ObamaCare—Fantastic Success

by Wayne Allyn Root

There are two major political parties in America. I’m a member of the naïve, stupid, and cowardly one. I’m a Republican.

How stupid is the GOP? They still don’t get it.

I told them 5 years ago, 2 books ago, a national best-seller ago (*The Ultimate Obama Survival Guide*), and in hundreds of articles and commentaries, that ObamaCare was never meant to help America, or heal the sick, or lower healthcare costs, or lower the debt, or expand the economy.

The GOP needs to stop calling ObamaCare a “trainwreck.” That means it’s a mistake, or accident. That means it’s a gigantic flop, or failure. It’s NOT.

This is a brilliant, cynical, and purposeful attempt to damage the US economy, kill jobs, and bring down capitalism.

It’s not a failure, it’s Obama’s grand success.

It’s not a “trainwreck,” ObamaCare is a suicide attack. He wants to hurt us, to bring us to our knees, to capitulate—so we agree under duress to accept big government.

Obama’s hero and mentor was Saul Alinsky—a radical Marxist intent on destroying capitalism. Alinsky’s stated advice was to call the other guy “a terrorist” to hide your own intentions.

To scream that the other guy is “ruining America,” while you are the one actually plotting the destruction of America. To claim again and again. . . in every sentence of every speech. . . that you are “saving the middle class,” while you are busy wiping out the middle class.

The GOP is so stupid they can’t see it. There are no mistakes here. This is a planned purposeful attack.

The tell-tale sign isn’t the disastrous start to ObamaCare. Or the devastating effect the new taxes are having on the economy. Or the death of full-time jobs. Or the overwhelming debt. Or the dramatic increases in health insurance rates. Or the 70% of doctors now thinking of retiring—bringing on a healthcare crisis of unimaginable proportions. Forget all that.

The real sign that this is a purposeful attack upon capitalism is how many Obama administration members and Democratic Congressmen are openly calling Tea Party Republicans and anyone who wants to stop ObamaCare “terrorists.”

There’s the clue. Even the clueless GOP should be able to see that.

They are calling the reasonable people. . . the patriots. . . the people who believe in the Constitution. . . the people who believe exactly what the Founding Fathers believed. . . the people who want to take power away from corrupt politicians who have put America \$17 trillion in debt. . . terrorists?

That’s because they are Saul Alinsky-ing the GOP. The people trying to purposely hurt America, capitalism, and the middle class. . . are calling the patriots by a terrible name to fool, confuse, and distract the public.

ObamaCare is a raving, rollicking, fantastic success.

—Complete article at FoxNews.com, Oct. 21, 2013

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.