



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 54, Number 6



Dr. David Noebel

June 2014

Communist China and Christianity

by Tom Phillips

It is said to be China's biggest church and on Easter Sunday thousands of worshippers will flock to this Asian mega-temple to pledge their allegiance—not to the Communist Party, but to the Cross.

The 5,000-capacity Liushi church, which boasts more than twice as many seats as Westminster Abbey and a 206 foot crucifix that can be seen for miles around, opened last year with one theologian declaring it a “miracle that such a small town was able to build such a grand church”.

The £8 million building is also one of the most visible symbols of Communist China's breakneck conversion as it evolves into one of the largest Christian congregations on earth.

“It is a wonderful thing to be a follower of Jesus Christ. It gives us great confidence,” beamed Jin Hongxin, a 40-year-old visitor who was admiring the golden cross above Liushi's altar in the lead up to Holy Week.

“If everyone in China believed in Jesus then we would have no more need for police stations. There would be no more bad people and therefore no more crime,” she added.

Officially, the People's Republic of China is an atheist country, but that is changing fast as many of its 1.3 billion citizens seek meaning and spiritual comfort that neither communism nor capitalism seem to have supplied.

Christian congregations in particular have skyrocketed since churches began reopening when Chairman Mao's death in 1976 signalled the end of the Cultural Revolution.

Less than four decades later, some believe China is now poised to become not just the world's number one economy, but also its most numerous Christian nation.

“By my calculations China is destined to become the largest Christian country in the world very soon,” said Feng-gang Yang, a professor of sociology at Purdue University and author of *Religion in China: Survival and Revival under Communist Rule*.

“It is going to be less than a generation. Not many people are prepared for this dramatic change.”

China's Protestant community, which had just one million members in 1949, has already overtaken those of countries more commonly associated with an evangelical boom. In 2010 there were more than 58 million Protestants in China, compared to 40 million in Brazil and 36 million in South Africa, according to the Pew Research Centre's Forum on Religion and Public Life.

Prof Yang, a leading expert on religion in China, believes that number will swell to around 160 million by 2025. That would likely put China ahead even of the United States, which had around 159 million Protestants in 2010 but whose congregations are in decline.

By 2030, China's total Christian population, including Catholics, would exceed 247 million, placing it above Mexico, Brazil, and the United States as the largest Christian congregation in the world, he predicted.

“Mao thought he could eliminate religion. He thought he had accomplished this,” Prof Yang said. “It's ironic—they didn't. They actually failed completely.”

Like many Chinese churches, the church in the town of Liushi, 200 miles south of Shanghai in Zhejiang province, has had a turbulent history.

It was founded in 1886 after William Edward Soothill, a Yorkshire-born missionary and future Oxford University professor, began evangelizing local communities.

But by the late 1950s, as the region was engulfed by Mao's violent anti-Christian campaigns, it was forced to close.

Liushi remained shut throughout the decade of the Cultural Revolution that began in 1966, as places of worship were destroyed across the country.

Since it reopened in 1978 its congregation has gone from strength to strength as part of China's officially sanctioned Christian church—along with thousands of others that have accepted Communist Party oversight in return for being allowed to worship.

Today it has 2,600 regular churchgoers and holds up to 70 baptisms each year, according to Shi Xiaoli, its 27-year-old preacher. The parish's revival reached a crescendo last year with the opening of its new mega-church, reputedly the biggest in mainland China.

"Our old church was small and hard to find," said Ms. Shi. "There wasn't room in the old building for all the followers, especially at Christmas and at Easter. The new one is big and eye-catching."

The Liushi church is not alone. From Yunnan province in China's balmy southwest to Liaoning in its industrial northeast, congregations are booming and more Chinese are thought to attend Sunday services each week than do Christians across the whole of Europe.

A recent study found that online searches for the words "Christian Congregation" and "Jesus" far outnumbered those for "The Communist Party" and "Xi Jinping", China's president.

Among China's Protestants are also many millions who worship at illegal underground "house churches," which hold unsupervised services—often in people's homes—in an attempt to evade the prying eyes of the Communist Party.

Such churches are mostly behind China's embryonic missionary movement—a reversal of roles after the country was for centuries the target of foreign missionaries. Now it is starting to send its own missionaries abroad, notably into North Korea, in search of souls.

"We want to help and it is easier for us than for British, South Korean, or American missionaries," said one underground church leader in north China who asked not to be named.

The new spread of Christianity has the Communist Party scratching its head.

"The child suddenly grew up and the parents don't know how to deal with the adult," the preacher, who is from China's illegal house-church movement, said.

Some officials argue that religious groups can provide social services the government cannot, while simultaneously helping reverse a growing moral crisis in a land where cash, not Communism, has now become king.

They appear to agree with David Cameron, the British

prime minister, who said last week that Christianity could help boost Britain's "spiritual, physical, and moral" state.

Ms. Shi, Liushi's preacher, who is careful to describe her church as "patriotic," said: "We have two motivations: one is our gospel mission and the other is serving society. Christianity can also play a role in maintaining peace and stability in society. Without God, people can do as they please."

Yet others within China's leadership worry about how the religious landscape might shape its political future, and its possible impact on the Communist Party's grip on power, despite the clause in the country's 1982 constitution that guarantees citizens the right to engage in "normal religious activities."

As a result, a close watch is still kept on churchgoers, and preachers are routinely monitored to ensure their sermons do not diverge from what the Party considers acceptable.

In Liushi church a closed circuit television camera hangs from the ceiling, directly in front of the lectern.

"They want the pastor to preach in a Communist way. They want to train people to practice in a Communist way," said the house-church preacher, who said state churches often shunned potentially subversive sections of the Bible. The Old Testament book in which the exiled Daniel refuses to obey orders to worship the king rather than his own god is seen as "very dangerous," the preacher added.

Such fears may not be entirely unwarranted. Christians' growing power was on show earlier this month when thousands flocked to defend a church in Wenzhou, a city known as the "Jerusalem of the East," after government threats to demolish it. Faced with the congregation's very public show of resistance, officials appear to have backed away from their plans, negotiating a compromise with church leaders.

"They do not trust the church, but they have to tolerate or accept it because the growth is there," said the church leader. "The number of Christians is growing—they cannot fight it. They do not want the 70 million Christians to be their enemy."

The underground church leader said many government officials viewed religion as "a sickness" that needed curing, and Prof Yang agreed there was a potential threat.

The Communist Party was "still not sure if Christianity would become an opposition political force" and feared it could be used by "Western forces to overthrow the Communist political system," he said.

Churches were likely to face an increasingly "intense" struggle over the coming decade as the Communist Party

sought to stifle Christianity's rise, he predicted.

"There are people in the government who are trying to control the church. I think they are making the last attempt to do that."

—*Telegraph.co.uk*, April 19, 2014

The Bay of Pigs

by Humberto Fontova

(You always hear and read of a "fiasco," a "defeat" a "disaster" at the Bay of Pigs, 53 years ago this week. But you rarely hear about the cause. Here it is.)

"They fought like tigers," writes the CIA officer who helped train the Cubans who splashed ashore at the Bay of Pigs 53 years ago this week. "But their fight was doomed before the first man hit the beach."

That CIA man, Grayston Lynch, knew something about fighting—and about long odds. He carried scars from Omaha Beach, The Battle of the Bulge, and Korea's Heartbreak Ridge. But in those battles Lynch and his band of brothers counted on the support of their Commander in Chief. At the Bay of Pigs, Grayston Lynch (an American) and his band of brothers (Cubans) learned—first in speechless shock and finally in burning rage—that their most powerful enemies were not Castro's Soviet-armed soldiers massing in nearby Santa Clara, but the Ivy League's best and brightest dithering in Washington.

Lynch trained, in his own words, "brave boys who had never before fired a shot in anger"—college students, farmers, doctors, common laborers, whites, blacks, mulattoes. They were known as La Brigada 2506, an almost precise cross-section of Cuban society of the time. The Brigada included men from every social strata and race in Cuba—from sugar cane planters to sugar cane cutters, from aristocrats to their chauffeurs. But mostly, the folks in between, as befit a nation with a larger middle class than most of Europe.

Short on battle experience, yes, but they fairly burst with what Bonaparte and George Patton valued most in a soldier: morale. No navel-gazing about "why they hate us" or the merits of "regime change" for them. They'd seen Castroism point-blank.

Their goals were crystal-clear: firing-squads silenced, families reunited, tens of thousands freed from prisons, torture chambers, and concentration camps. We see it on the History Channel after our GI's took places like Manila and Munich. In 1961 newsreels could have captured such scenes without crossing oceans. When those Cuban freedom-fighters hit the beach at the Bay of Pigs 50 years

ago this week, one of every 18 Cubans suffered in Castro's Gulag. Mass graves dotted the Cuban countryside, piled with hundreds who'd crumpled in front of Castro and Che Guevara's firing squads. Most of the invaders had loved-ones among the above. Modern history records few soldiers with the burning morale of the Bay of Pigs freedom-fighters.

From the lethal fury of the attack and the horrendous casualties their troops and militia were taking, the Castro brothers and Che Guevara assumed they faced at least "20,000 invading mercenaries," as they called them. Yet it was a band of mostly civilian volunteers their Soviet armed and led-troops outnumbered 20-to-1.

"Where are the planes?" kept crackling over US Navy radios two days later. "Where is our ammo? Send planes or we can't last!" Commander Jose San Roman kept pleading to the very fleet that escorted his men to the beachhead (and sat much closer to them than the Sixth Fleet sits to the Libyan coast today). Crazy by hunger and thirst, his men had been shooting and reloading without sleep for three days. Many were hallucinating. By then many suspected they'd been abandoned by the Knights of Camelot.

That's when Castro's Soviet Howitzers opened up, huge 122 mm ones, four batteries' worth. They pounded 2,000 rounds into the freedom-fighters over a four-hour period. "It sounded like the end of the world," one said later. "Rommel's crack Afrika Corps broke and ran under a similar bombardment," wrote Haynes Johnson in his book, *The Bay of Pigs*. By that time the invaders were dazed, delirious with fatigue, thirst, and hunger, too deafened by the bombardment to even hear orders. But these men were in no mood to emulate Rommel's crack Afrika Corps by retreating. Instead they were fortified by a resolve no conquering troops could ever call upon—the burning duty to free their nation.

"If things get rough," the heartsick CIA man Grayston Lynch radioed back, "we can come in and evacuate you."

"We will NOT be evacuated!" San Roman roared back to his friend Lynch. "We came here to fight! We don't want evacuation! We want more ammo! We want PLANES! This ends here!"

Camelot's criminal idiocy finally brought Adm. Arleigh Burke of the Joints Chief of Staff, who was receiving the battlefield pleas, to the brink of mutiny. Years before, Adm. Burke sailed thousands of miles to smash his nation's enemies at the Battle of Leyte Gulf. Now he was Chief of Naval Operations and stood aghast as new enemies were being given a sanctuary 90 miles away! The fighting admiral was livid. They say his face was

beet red and his facial veins popping as he faced down his commander-in-chief that fateful night of April 18, 1961. “Mr. President, TWO planes from the Essex! (the US Carrier just offshore from the beachhead)” that’s all those Cuban boys need, Mr. President. Let me order . . . !”

JFK was in white tails and a bow tie that evening, having just emerged from an elegant social gathering. “Burke,” he replied. “We can’t get involved in this.”

“WE put those Cuban boys there, Mr. President!” The fighting admiral exploded. “By God, we ARE involved!”

Admiral Burke’s pleas also proved futile.

The freedom-fighters’ spent ammo inevitably forced a retreat. Castro’s jets and Sea Furies were roaming overhead at will and tens of thousands of his Soviet-led and armed troops and armor were closing in. The Castro planes now concentrated on strafing the helpless, ammo-less freedom-fighters.

“Can’t continue,” Lynch’s radio crackled—it was San Roman again. “Have nothing left to fight with . . . out of ammo . . . Russian tanks in view . . . destroying my equipment.”

“Tears flooded my eyes,” wrote Grayston Lynch. “For the first time in my 37 years, I was ashamed of my country.”

When the smoke cleared and their ammo had been expended to the very last bullet, when a hundred of them lay dead and hundreds more wounded, after three days of relentless battle, barely 1,400 of them—without air support (from the US Carriers just offshore) and without a single supporting shot by naval artillery (from US cruisers and destroyers poised just offshore)—had squared off against 21,000 Castro troops, his entire air force, and squadrons of Soviet tanks. The Cuban freedom-fighters inflicted over 3000 casualties on their Soviet-armed and led enemies. This feat of arms still amazes professional military men.

“They fought magnificently and were not defeated,” stressed Marine Col. Jack Hawkins a multi-decorated WWII and Korea vet who helped train them. “They were abandoned on the beach without the supplies and support promised by their sponsor, the Government of the United States.”

“We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty!” proclaimed Lynch and Hawkin’s Commander-in-Chief just three months earlier.

—*Townhall.com*, April 19, 2014

George Soros

New York hedge fund manager George Soros is one of the most politically powerful individuals on earth. Since the mid-1980s in particular, he has used his immense influence to help reconfigure the political landscapes of several countries around the world—in some cases playing a key role in toppling regimes that had held the reins of government for years, even decades. Vis à vis the United States, a strong case can be made for the claim that Soros today affects American politics and culture more profoundly than any other living person.

Much of Soros’s influence derives from his \$13 billion personal fortune, which is further leveraged by at least another \$25 billion in investor assets controlled by his firm, Soros Fund Management. An equally significant source of Soros’s power, however, is his passionate messianic zeal. Soros views himself as a missionary with something of a divine mandate to transform the world and its institutions into something better—as he sees it.

Over the years, Soros has given voice to this sense of grandiosity many times and in a variety of different ways. In his 1987 book *The Alchemy of Finance*, for instance, he wrote: “I admit that I have always harbored an exaggerated view of self-importance—to put it bluntly, I fancied myself as some kind of god or an economic reformer like Keynes or, even better, a scientist like Einstein.” Expanding on this theme in his 1991 book *Underwriting Democracy*, Soros said: “If truth be known, I carried some rather potent messianic fantasies with me from childhood,” fantasies which “I wanted to indulge . . . to the extent that I could afford.” In a June 1993 interview with *The Independent*, Soros, who is an atheist, said he saw himself as “some kind of god, the creator of everything.” In an interview two years later, he portrayed himself as someone who shared numerous attributes with “God in the Old Testament”—“You know, like invisible. I was pretty invisible. Benevolent. I was pretty benevolent. All-seeing. I tried to be all-seeing.” Soros told his biographer Michael Kaufman that his “goal” was nothing less ambitious than “to become the conscience of the world” by using his charitable foundations, which will be discussed at length in this pamphlet, to bankroll organizations and causes that he deems worthwhile.

“I realized [as a young man] that it’s money that makes the world go round,” says Soros, “so I might as well make money But having made it, I could then indulge my social concerns.” Invariably, those concerns center around a desire to change the world generally—and America particularly—into something new, something consistent

with his vision of “social justice.” Claiming to be “driven” by “illusions, or perhaps delusions, of grandeur.” Soros has humorously described himself as “a kind of nut who wants to have an impact” on the workings of the world. The billionaire’s longtime friend Byron Wien, currently the vice chairman of Blackstone Advisory Services, offers this insight: “You must understand [Soros] thinks he’s been anointed by God to solve insoluble problems. The proof is that he has been so successful at making so much [money]. He therefore thinks he has a responsibility to give money away”—to causes that are consistent with his values and agendas.

—*DiscovertheNetworks.org*



George Soros and Marijuana

by Kelly Riddell

Billionaire philanthropist George Soros hopes the US goes to pot, and he is using his money to drive it there.

With a cadre of like-minded, wealthy donors, Mr. Soros is dominating the pro-legalization side of the marijuana debate by funding grass-roots initiatives that begin in New York City and end up affecting local politics elsewhere.

Through a network of nonprofit groups, Mr. Soros has spent at least \$80 million on the legalization effort since 1994, when he diverted a portion of his foundation’s funds to organizations exploring alternative drug policies, according to tax filings.

His spending has been supplemented by Peter B. Lewis, the late chairman of Progressive Insurance Co. and an unabashed pot smoker who channeled more than \$40 million to influence local debates, according to the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws. The two billionaires’ funding has been unmatched by anyone on the other side of the debate.

Mr. Soros makes his donations through the Drug Policy Alliance, a nonprofit he funds with roughly \$4 million in annual contributions from his Foundation to Promote an Open Society.

Mr. Soros also donates annually to the American Civil Liberties Union, which in turn funds marijuana legalization efforts, and he has given periodically to the Marijuana Policy Project, which funds state ballot measures.

Lewis, who died in November, donated to legalization efforts in his name and through the ACLU and the Marijuana Policy Project, on which he served as the chairman

of the board. Lewis’ estate declined to comment for this article.

“The pro-legalization movement hasn’t come from a groundswell of the people. A great deal of its funding and fraud has been perpetrated by George Soros and then promoted by celebrities,” said John Walters, director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy under George W. Bush. “The truth is under attack, and it’s an absolutely dangerous direction for this country to be going in.”

Mr. Soros’ Open Society Foundations have annual assets of more than \$3.5 billion, a pool from which he can dole out grants to pet projects, according to 2011 tax returns, the most recent on file for his charitable organizations.

David and Charles Koch, the billionaire brothers who often are cited for their conservative influence, had \$308 million tied up in their foundation and institute in 2011.

Mr. Soros did not respond to a request to be interviewed.

In his book *Soros on Soros: Staying Ahead of the Curve*, he said the US policy of criminalizing drug use rather than treating it as a medical problem is so ill-conceived that “the remedy is often worse than the disease.”

Although Mr. Soros didn’t outline an alternative in his book, he wrote that he could imagine legalizing some of the less-harmful drugs and directing the money saved from the criminal justice system to treatment.

“Like many parents and grandparents, I am worried about young people getting into trouble with marijuana and other drugs. The best solution, however, is honest and effective drug education,” Mr. Soros said in a 2010 op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal*. “Legalizing marijuana may make it easier for adults to buy marijuana, but it can hardly make it any more accessible to young people. I’d much rather invest in effective education than ineffective arrest and incarceration.”

The Drug Policy Alliance stands firmly behind Mr. Soros’ position.

“Drug use, the use of any substance, is a health issue and we shouldn’t be throwing people in jail for health issues,” said Bill Piper, the alliance’s director of national affairs in Washington. “The No. 1 reason why people with substance abuse disorders don’t seek help is because they’re afraid of getting arrested.

“From a constitutional and legal perspective, states can legalize marijuana if they want, and there’s nothing the federal government can do,” he said. “State after state decided to end the prohibition of alcohol and forced the federal government to change federal law.

“What we’re going to see over the next decade is states repel marijuana prohibition and then the federal government following suit. It’s not a question of whether it’s going to happen; it’s a question of when.”

Drug Policy Alliance Executive Director Ethan Nadelmann said in an email that funding levels from Mr. Soros “have bounced around a bit over the years but it’s roughly \$4 million per year (i.e., 1/3) of DPA’s general operating budget.”

“Other funding comes from other wealthy individuals (including quite a number who agree with Soros on little apart from drug policy), foundations, and about 25,000 people making smaller contributions through the mail and Internet,” Mr. Nadelmann said in the email.

Mr. Soros and Lewis, with help from the Drug Policy Alliance and Marijuana Policy Project, helped 2012 ballot initiatives that legalized the recreational use of marijuana in Washington state and Colorado. Federal law still outlaws possession, use, sale, and distribution of the drug.

Mr. Soros, Lewis, and their various nonprofits provided 68 percent of the funding that went to New Approach to Washington, the group that mobilized signatures to get the initiative on the state ballot and then promoted it.

The Campaign to Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol, a grass-roots group that supported pot legalization in Colorado, was established by the Marijuana Policy Project and was 67 percent funded by nonprofits associated with the two billionaires. The campaign then bankrolled Moms and Dads for Marijuana Regulation, a seemingly unassociated group of pro-legalization parents that in reality consisted of only a billboard and a press release, according to state election records.

“The other side has so much money, it’s incredible, and the bulk of it is coming from a handful of people who want to change public policy,” said Calvina Fay, executive director of Save Our Society From Drugs, whose organization was the largest donor to Smart Colorado, the initiative opposed to legalization.

“When we look at what we’ve been able to raise in other states, they raise millions. We’re lucky if we can raise \$100,000. It’s been a process of basically brainwashing the public. They run ads, put up billboards, get high-profile celebrity support, and glowing media coverage.

If you can repeat a lie often enough, the people believe,” Ms. Fay said.

Mason Tvert, co-director and spokesman for the Marijuana Policy Project’s Colorado campaign, disagrees.

“There simply is no grass-roots support for maintaining marijuana prohibition,” he said. “Anyone who suggests otherwise is just not paying attention. They’re railing against a public policy that most Americans support.”

Mr. Tvert said the Marijuana Policy Project collected no money from Mr. Soros or Lewis for the 2012 initiative.

“Not that we would turn away Mr. Soros’ money in the future,” he said. “There are countless people that want to make marijuana legal, but only so many people who can afford to make it possible.”

Those people are turning out to make the 2014 election cycle look much like the 2012 cycle in Colorado and Washington, state election records show.

- In Alaska, the grass-roots Campaign to Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol has emerged with the help of funding from the Marijuana Policy Project, which gave the campaign its first big contribution of \$210,000.

If history repeats itself, then a few months before the election in Alaska, the Drug Policy Action group, the political arm of Mr. Soros’ Drug Policy Alliance, will start contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars to help fund a media blitz and drive voters to polls to help support the measure.

- In Oregon, New Approach Oregon has collected enough signatures to get a legalization initiative on the ballot and has cashed its first checks: \$96,000 from Lewis before he died last year and \$50,000 from Mr. Soros’ Drug Policy Alliance, according to state election records.

- In Florida, Mr. Soros has teamed up with multimillionaire and Democratic fundraiser John Morgan to donate more than 80 percent of the money to get medical marijuana legalization on the ballot through its initiative “United for Care, People United for Medical Marijuana.”

Calls to Tim Morgan, John Morgan’s brother who is handling press inquiries, were not returned.

The Marijuana Policy Project and Mr. Soros’ Drug Policy Alliance aim to support full legalization measures in 2016 in Arizona and California—where they have funded and won ballot initiatives for medical marijuana use—

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. Our daily blog address is www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com.

and in Massachusetts, Maine, Montana, and Nevada, Mr. Tvert said.

The Marijuana Policy Project also is “focusing a lot of time and resources passing bills” in Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, where it considers legalized marijuana to be a realistic prospect in the next few years, he said.

Mr. Soros also is putting money into studies that show economic benefits from marijuana legalization.

In Colorado, the Drug Policy Alliance helped bankroll the Colorado Center on Law and Policy’s study that found marijuana legalization could generate as much as \$100 million in state revenue after five years. That research was widely considered to have influenced the election.

The ACLU also has penned studies supporting legalization, and the Marijuana Policy Project commonly cites these and Drug Policy Alliance research to argue its case for legal marijuana.

Calls and emails to ACLU headquarters in New York were not returned, but its website says that “removing criminal penalties for marijuana offenses will reduce the US prison population and more effectively protect the public and promote public health.”

Last year, Mr. Soros, via donations from his Open Society Foundation and the Drug Policy Alliance, helped fund Uruguay’s effort to become the first country to legalize the commercialization of pot. He also offered to pay for a study to evaluate the ramifications of the experimental legislation, which he has said will reduce overall drug use and help fight illegal drug trade, according to news reports.

“There are addictive, harmful effects of smoking marijuana,” said Mr. Walters, citing studies by the federal government and organizations such as the American Medical Association. “The silliness of pop culture is pretending this isn’t a serious problem. Their entire message is built on phony propaganda that has been far too successful in the mainstream media.”

The Drug Enforcement Administration agrees, despite President Obama’s proclamations that marijuana is no worse than alcohol.

In the official “DEA Position on Marijuana” paper last April, the agency said marijuana has a “high potential for abuse, and has no accepted medicinal value in treatment in the US.” It also cited that “a few wealthy businessmen—not broad grassroots support—started and sustain the ‘medical’ marijuana and drug legalization movements in the US. Without their money and influence, the drug legalization movement would shrivel.”

Even Mr. Obama’s drug czar said the legalization of marijuana is dangerous.

“Young people are getting the wrong message from the medical marijuana legalization campaign,” drug czar Gil Kerlikowske said in December. “If it’s continued to be talked about as a benign substance that has no ill effects, we’re doing a great disservice to young people by giving them that message.”

But the message is being propagated by Mr. Soros and groups of his supporters who have created their own nonprofits and political action committees. Although these organizations appear on the surface to have no affiliation, closer examination shows all are linked through their personnel and cross-promotion.

Drug Policy Alliance President Ira Glasser is a former executive director of the ACLU. Marijuana Policy Project co-founders Rob Kampia, Chuck Thomas, and Mike Kirshner originally worked at the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, which hosts industry conferences attended and promoted by Drug Policy Alliance staff, and has a political action committee that donates to marijuana advocacy candidates.

The Marijuana Policy Project’s co-founders also frequently speak at events sponsored by the Drug Policy Alliance. The National Cannabis Industry Association—known as the chamber of commerce for marijuana—was co-founded by Aaron Smith, who previously worked at Safe Access Now, another Soros-backed nonprofit that promotes the legalization of pot.

After 20 years trying to influence policy, Mr. Soros’ army is winning the marijuana debate. Last year, for the first time in four decades of polling, the Pew Research Center found that more than half of Americans support legalizing marijuana, compared with 30 percent in 2000. Lawmakers are following suit, with an unprecedented number of legalization bills brought to the floors of state legislatures.

“It’s only a matter of time before marijuana is legalized under federal law,” said Tom Angell, founder and chairman of the Marijuana Majority, an advocacy group based in Washington, D.C. “We now have 20 states plus the District of Columbia with medical marijuana laws, two states have already legalized it for all adults over the age of 21—politicians will have to follow the will of the people on this.”

Or follow Mr. Soros’ money. Mr. Angell’s group is funded, in part, by a grant from the Drug Policy Alliance.

—*The Washington Times*, April 2, 2014, p. 6, 7

Gabriel Garcia-Marquez

by Humberto Fontova

The eulogies for Nobel-winning author Gabriel Garcia Marquez upon his death last week make two points official:

1) No amount of moral and intellectual wretchedness will earn an artist even the mildest rebuke from most of his professional peers and their related institutions—so long as the wretch hires himself out to communists.

2) The masochism of Democratic US Presidents is boundless.

This is not to suggest that the media eulogies sidestep Garcia Marquez's politics. Most are quite upfront about it. Let's take the one run by *The New York Times* as emblematic: "Like many Latin American intellectuals and artists, Mr. Garcia Marquez felt impelled to speak out on the political issues of his day. He viewed the world from a left-wing perspective, bitterly opposing Gen. Augusto Pinochet, the right-wing Chilean dictator, and unwaveringly supporting Fidel Castro in Cuba. Mr. Castro became such a close friend that Mr. Garcia Marquez showed him drafts of his unpublished books."

Notice the word "dictator" above. But with whom does *The New York Times* associate it? Pinochet, of course. Does Fidel Castro also qualify as dictator? *The New York Times* does not tell us.

"Mr. Garcia Marquez's ties to Mr. Castro troubled some intellectuals and human rights advocates," continues the *NY Times*.

Susan Sontag wrote in the 1980s, "To me it's scandalous that a writer of such enormous talent be a spokesperson for a government which has put more people in jail (proportionately to its population) than any other government in the world." . . . He attributed the criticism to what he called Americans' "almost pornographic obsession with Castro." But he became sensitive enough about the issue to intercede on behalf of jailed Cuban dissidents.

In fact, fully contrary to *The New York Times*' white-wash, Garcia Marquez's "intercession" is what got some of those dissidents jailed and tortured by his friend Castro in the first place. Let's not mince words. Let's call out Garcia Marquez categorically: on top of his decades of pro-bono propaganda services for Castroism, Garcia Marquez was also a volunteer snitch for Castro's KGB-mentored secret police.

At this juncture I'll turn over the floor to someone intimately familiar with the issue: Armando Valladares, who himself suffered 22 torture-filled years in Castro's prisons and who was later appointed by Ronald Reagan as

US ambassador to the U.N. Human Rights Commission:

"Many years ago Garcia Marquez became an informer for Castro's secret police," starts a recent exposé by Mr. Valladares. At the time, back in Havana, Cuban dissident and human-rights activist, Ricardo Bofill, with help of the then-reporter for Reuters, Collin McSevengy, managed to enter the Havana hotel where Garcia Marquez was having a few drinks. In a quiet corner, with absolute discretion, Bofill gave Garcia Marquez a series of documents relating to several Cuban artists. A few weeks later Castro's police arrested Ricardo Bofill—and displayed on the table right next to Castro's secret-policeman—were the very documents which Bofill had given Garcia Marquez.

"Bofill, a peaceful human-rights activist inspired by Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., went on to suffer 12 years in Castro's prisons—thanks to Gabriel Garcia Marquez. On October 13, 1968, the Spanish newspapers, ABC and Diario 16, published Bofill's disclosures and headlined that: "Garcia Marquez's revelations led to the imprisonment of numerous Cuban writers and artists."

All of this was conveniently "forgotten" by most media outlets last week.

But enough from me. Instead, let's hear from some folks much closer to this issue. Let's hear from Cuban writers who were suffering in Castro's KGB-designed dungeons and torture chambers while Gabriel Garcia Marquez contributed his literary influence and might towards glorifying their torturer.

The late Reynaldo Arenas' autobiography *Before Night Falls* was on *The New York Times*' list of the ten best books of the year in 1993. In 2000, the book became a movie starring Javier Bardem, Johnny Depp, and Sean Penn. Throughout the '70s, Arenas was jailed and tortured by Castro's police for his rebellious writings and gay lifestyle. He finally escaped on the Mariel boat-lift in 1980. Here's his take on Gabriel Garcia Marquez from 1982: "It's high time for all the intellectuals of the free world (the rest don't exist) to take a stand against this unscrupulous propagandist for totalitarianism. I wonder why these intellectual apologists for communist paradises don't live in them? Or is it that they prefer collecting payment there and here, while enjoying the comforts and guarantees of the western world?"

In fact, Garcia Marquez did live on and off in Cuba, in a (stolen) mansion Castro gifted him, where he frolicked with adolescent girls between traveling through Havana in a (stolen) Mercedes also gifted him by Castro.

Here's Cuban-exile author Roberto Luque Escalona, briefly an Amnesty International prisoner of conscience, who escaped Cuba in 1992:

“Only a five star-scoundrel would put his literary fame in the service of a cause as vile and malignant as the Castro tyranny. Simple frivolity cannot possibly justify an embrace so long and strong as the one Garcia Marquez gave someone who devastated a nation, murdered thousands, jailed and tortured tens of thousands dispersed an entire nation and debased the rest.”

Now let's hear from some people whose fate allowed a more detached view of Gabriel Garcia Marquez than Arenas and Luque Escalona: Bill Clinton and Barack Obama.

“I once had the privilege to meet him in Mexico,” President Obama was quoted in *Politico* last week, where he presented me with an inscribed copy that I cherish to this day. As a proud Colombian, a representative and voice for the people of the Americas, and as a master of the “magic realism” genre, he has inspired so many others. . . . I offer my thoughts to his family and friends, whom I hope take solace in the fact that Gabo's work will live on for generations to come.”

“I was saddened to learn of the passing of Gabriel García Marquez,” mourned Bill Clinton. He continued:

“From the time I read *One Hundred Years of Solitude* more than 40 years ago, I was always amazed by his unique gifts of imagination, clarity of thought, and emotional honesty. I was honored to be his friend and to know his great heart and brilliant mind for more than 20 years.

In an interview with France's *Le Monde* in 1981, Garcia Marquez remarked that, “the problem with visiting men like Fidel Castro is that one winds up loving them too much.” A few years earlier he was denouncing the desperate Vietnamese boat-people as “war-criminals,” “Yankee-lackeys” and worse.

Garcia Marquez shared all of Fidel Castro's hatred against the US, a passion that contributed much to their long and warm friendship. Given this rabid hatred for the nation that elected them, you'd really think—especially given White House speech writing budgets—that these US Presidents could have found a way to express their admiration for Garcia Marquez's art without so warmly embracing the wretched artist himself.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, April 24, 2014