

The Schwarz Report

60 Years Defending Our Christian Faith



Dr. Fred Schwarz Volume 61, Number 6 Dr. David Noebel

June 2021

LGBTQIA vs. Christianity by Tyler O'Neil

Last month, a group of 33 current and former students at federally-funded Christian colleges and universities launched a historic assault on religious freedom. They sued the Department of Education (DoE) under President Joe Biden, demanding that the DoE drop the religious exemption to Title IX. This move would force LGBT orthodoxy on Christian colleges, but it also attacks a central evangelical Christian teaching.

"The law does not recognize 'love the sinner, hate the sin," the students wrote in the lawsuit.

While the phrase "love the sinner, hate the sin" does not appear in the Old or New Testaments, it follows logically from the Bible and it forms an essential part of evangelical Christian ethics. Since "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23), God sent His Son, Jesus Christ, to redeem humanity. All Christians are redeemed sinners. While Jesus asks His disciples to preach the gospel and "make disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:18-20), that does not mean Christians are morally superior to non-Christians.

Of course, as Christians make attempts to follow Jesus, with the help of the Holy Spirit, they will improve morally. But that does not give Christians license to look down on non-Christians. We are saved only by the grace of God.

In fact, Jesus commands His disciples to love and to pray for their enemies, whatever their moral state (Matthew 5:43-47). He also commands that we sin no more, and teach others to stop sinning. Christians must love others without condoning their sinful actions.

Therefore, "love the sinner, hate the sin" is a natural application of the gospel in the moral lives of Christians.

Yet the lawsuit takes direct aim at this moral framework, and its argument on this issue is central to the legal claim.

"The law does not recognize an identity/conduct distinction. The law does not recognize 'love the sinner, hate the sin.' Policies and laws targeting 'homosexual conduct' or 'transgender conduct' in fact target LGBTQ+ identity," the lawsuit claims.

Christian colleges and universities often use the "love the sinner, hate the sin" distinction to explain that they are open to students with LGBT identities even though they ask their students to sign a code of conduct barring homosexual activity (and heterosexual activity outside of marriage).

It is not sinful to experience same-sex attraction or gender dysphoria (the condition of persistently identifying with the gender opposite a person's biological sex), but acting on those impulses is sinful. To some degree, a condition/conduct distinction is essential to Christian teaching. The difficulty comes when sexual orientation or gender identity become enshrined as protected statuses and essential identity markers, thus blurring the distinction between impulses and conduct.

Christianity teaches that all identities are secondary to a Christian's identity as a sinner redeemed by Jesus Christ. This world is not our home, and our ultimate hope is in God, not in fulfillment here on earth. That does not mean we are not male or female, American or Peruvian, Coloradan or Virginian, et cetera. It just means that all lesser identities must yield the key identity at the heart of our being and future.

It is not easy to maintain that kind of perspective, and Christians should be humble about our own failures. But it makes sense for Christian institutions to require students and faculty to follow biblical morality, as that is essential for them to achieve their purposes as Christian colleges and universities.

Christians cannot celebrate sin, and it is difficult to celebrate identities based around sinful dispositions without betraying the Bible's moral demands. Christians should love and respect people who suffer with same-sex attraction and gender dysphoria, but celebrating LGBT identities crosses an important line.

Ultimately, LGBT orthodoxy is at odds with biblical Christianity. There is no escaping it. Christian colleges and universities should have the religious freedom to operate according to their beliefs, and prospective students should make decisions accordingly. If students choose to attend a Christian college with a code of conduct that applies biblical morality, they should not be surprised when the college refuses to kowtow to their sexual identities.

—PJMedia.com, April 30, 2021

OHIO Surrenders

by Tyler O'Neil

Gov. Mike DeWine's (R-Ohio) administration will not appeal a court decision requiring the Ohio Department of Health to alter birth certificates to erase biological sex. The court had ruled that Ohio had discriminated against people who identify as transgender and who sought to change their birth certificates to reflect a transgender identity.

"For more than a year, Ohioans have been told to trust science, and respect basic medical facts. Unfortunately, Governor DeWine has abandoned the science that shows that no one—regardless of the medical procedures they receive, hormones they inject themselves with, or gender stereotypes they conform to—can change their biological sex," Aaron Baer, president of the Center for Christian Virtue (CCV) said in a statement on the decision.

"By dropping this lawsuit, Ohio will now allow falsified birth certificates. This is both medically hazardous, and sets a terrible precedent that legal documents from the State can reject objective realities. You don't need to be a doctor to know that men and women have vastly different medical needs, regardless of how they identify," Baer insisted.

DeWine's administration could easily have appealed the ruling to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Yet on Thursday, the health department told the court it would not appeal the ruling, *The Cincinnati Enquirer* reported. The department is drafting a process for people to request a change of sex on birth certificates and expects to have it in place by June 1.

In December 2020, Judge Michael Watson in the Southern District of Ohio struck down Ohio's policy barring transgender alterations of sex on birth certificates. He cited *Romer v. Evans* (1996), a case in which the Supreme Court struck down a Colorado law preventing homosexual or bisexual people from claiming a protected status, ruling that it violated the Equal Protection Clause.

"This policy resembles the sort of discriminationbased legislation struck down under the equal protection clause in *Romer v. Evans* as nothing more than a policy 'born of animosity toward the class of a person affected' that has 'no relation to a legitimate government purpose," Watson wrote in the ruling.

Ohio had argued that the policy ensured the state would maintain "accurate records." Ohio birth certificates designate a person's "sex," not his or her gender identity.

While gender dysphoria (the condition of identifying with the gender opposite one's biological sex) is a serious condition, males do not become female simply by identifying as feminine. Transgenderism obscures a person's biological sex, which can often determine the kind of medical care he or she requires. Some pharmaceuticals help females but harm males and vice

versa.

Transgender identity in medicine has caused real harm. In one particularly tragic case, a pregnant woman who identified as a man went to a hospital with abdominal pain. Because she identified as male and records listed her as male, doctors discounted the idea that she could be in labor. She did not receive the care she needed and her child died.

The transgender narrative also arguably victimizes people who suffer from gender dysphoria. Children with gender dysphoria are extremely unlikely to continue in that condition after puberty unless they undergo "treatments" that may sterilize them. Doctors have warned that even "puberty-blockers" and cross-sex hormones give healthy people a disease. Research shows that there are significant risks with sex-reassignment surgery, including heart conditions, increased cancer risk, and loss of bone density.

Many people who once identified as transgender realize that they cannot alter their biological sex. Some of them identified as transgender due to confusion about their sexuality, like detransitioner Charlotte Evans, who launched a network for formerly transgender people.

James Shupe, the first person to obtain a legal "non-binary" sex designation, later petitioned the court responsible for his "non-binary" status to restore the sex on his birth certificate to "male." In documents he gave PJ Media, Shupe described his "non-binary" designation as a "psychologically harmful legal fiction." He told PJ Media he hopes this decision will prevent a woman currently seeking "non-binary" recognition from following the same lies.

"The charade of not being male, the legal fiction, it's over," Shupe told PJ Media at the time. "The lies behind my fictitious sex changes, something I shamefully participated in, first to female, and then to non-binary, have been forever exposed. A truthful accounting of events has replaced the deceit that allowed me to become America's first legally non-binary person."

"The legal record has now been corrected and LGBT advocates are no longer able to use my historic non-binary court order to advance their toxic agenda," he added. "I am and have always been male. That is my biological truth, the only thing capable of grounding me to reality."

Men and women who identify as transgender may be able to put a false sex designation on their birth certificates in Ohio, but they cannot alter their biological sex. DNA, not identity, determines if a person is male or female, and his or her development according to that sex begins in the womb and can never be fully reversed. When Ohio fully reverses its policy to embrace transgender identity in June, Tennessee will be the only state to require that birth certificates reflect biology, rather than identity.

—PJMedia.com, April 28, 2021

An Inconvenient Truth by J.M. Mullin

As COVID and, thankfully, Dr. Fauci slowly recede from the US headlines, the left is busily preparing its next freedom- and prosperity-destroying crisis. This one will be climate change (erstwhile global warming), the crisis one can't escape or deny. After all, there's no vaccine against that demonic molecule and destroyer of planets, carbon dioxide (CO2). But is that really true?

What happens when atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2) meets seawater? The answer is enormously important because the atmosphere and our oceans are so enormous. The answer has two parts: 1) it dissolves in the water, and 2) it is transformed into rock—in fact, limestone (think White Cliffs of Dover here).

This answer offers enormous hope and optimism to a world that has been ground down and utterly depressed by a dystopian climatological future brought to us by the progressive, socialist left (and all that depression was *before* COVID).

The actual equation/chemical reaction is shown below:

$$G^{++}, Ca^{++}$$
 CO2+H₂O \rightarrow H₂CO₃+H⁺ \rightarrow CO₃+++MgCO₃+CaCO₃ (precipitate)

The beauty of the process is that the reaction is *driven* to the right by the precipitation of its end products, calcium and magnesium carbonates, AKA limestone. In other words, one titanic chemical sink exists in our oceans to suck and scrub CO2 out of our atmosphere. No one ever told you about this? Surprised?

A woke chemist associate acknowledged the truth of the reaction to me but then said we'd need enormous fountains spraying ocean water into the skies to increase the surface area for CO2 absorption. He apparently felt good about the incalculable cost of such fountains until I mentioned one word: *hurricanes*. It seems God thought of this issue ahead of him. (You go, God.) These goliath storms yearly increase the contact of seawater with the atmosphere by a *trillion* times. Cost free. And natural.

Some may also note that the above reaction generates two hydrogen ions (acid) and, having noted this, would jump to say that this natural process, when augmented by human-generated CO2, will poison our oceans. This mindlessly ignores the gargantuan buffering capacity of our oceans, a capacity that neutralizes acid day after day, year after year, millennium after millennium. All life would have ceased millions of years ago in the incredible vulcanism of the earth's past (now *there's* some CO2 generation) were this true. (Nerd warning here—it *also* ignores the anions left behind by those inconvenient magnesium and calcium cations.)

I often think the Politburo in Beijing (a rather

humorless bunch if ever there was one) goes to bed each night laughing itself to sleep after watching CNN—or, for that matter, PBS. It must be true, side-splitting laughter over the sheer stupidity and myopia of the American and Western academic, media, and political elites, all endlessly clamoring for the West's deindustrialization. I've heard that one official even keeps a framed lithograph in his bedroom of lemmings jumping off a cliff. Lenin must still be chuckling endlessly in his grave over his insightful observation about useful idiots—and he didn't live long enough to see Gore and Kerry.

When I reflect on the sheer lunacy of the woke-ism of some of my neighbors and relatives in these times, I often am tempted to say to them, "You broke it (the West), you own it," and then to just sit back and watch the hell they've called into being. But then I think of my child who will inherit the incalculable mess they would bequeath her to live her life. And that is what generates in me, and millions like me, a ferocity they weren't counting on. Game on.

—American Thinker, April 29, 2021

China's Masterplan

by Michael Ledeen

Red China constantly rethinks how it will become the world's leading superpower, and plans accordingly. *The Epoch Times* has just published a detailed plan delivered in a speech in July, 2016, laying out how the People's Republic can overtake the United States as the world's leading nation. Professor Jin Canrong, from the School of International Studies in Beijing, explained how the PRC, following Xi Jinping's call for a national rejuvenation, could accomplish it.

The speech, kept secret until now, combined four elements: 1) weakening the United States by becoming increasingly involved in American affairs, and 2) infiltrating Chinese agents into the US political system. The object would be to control the outcome of American elections. Jin calculated that it is possible to bring pro-Chinese candidates to power in House elections to ensure pro-Chinese policies. Although difficult, Professor Jin believed it was doable.

The speech made this explicit: "The Chinese Government wants to arrange Chinese investments in every single congressional district to control thousands of voters in each district..." This would give Beijing effective control of the House of Representatives. "If China has thousands of votes on hand, China will be the boss of the candidate."

The Chinese have long pursued control over American politics, and direct control over American corporations was one of the most obvious and attractive routes. Not only were such investments likely to be profitable, they were also a key step to putting Beijing in charge of the US economy. Beijing and Washington worked for more than a decade to arrive at a Bilateral Investment Treaty, but failed to reach agreement. Trump then put an end to the process.

President Biden seems inclined to resume the search for such a treaty.

At the same time, China 3) increased its theft of advanced American technology. Professor Jin made it clear that Beijing had stolen technology for its J-20 fighter jet and DF-41 intercontinental ballistic missile, and that illegal theft was the only way to accomplish it, since the United States did not sell such technology to China. Meanwhile, 4) the Beijing regime expanded its control over nearby real estate, such as by building artificial islands and constructing military outposts on them.

No doubt, the Chinese have paid a great deal of attention to DARPA, the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Pentagon's ambitious and highly successful research development project. Although DARPA developed breakthrough technologies, the really important inventions were not what the agency set out to find. As David Goldman notes, virtually every technological breakthrough in the digital age started with a DARPA mission, and ended with an unimagined something totally unique. We were blessed with political leadership that challenged America across the board, with leaders such as Kennedy and Reagan. In Goldman's words, our political leaders gave us challenges that inspired Americans to create things and ideas that none of us had imagined before.

The Biden administration does not seem to be THAT sort of government. But then, Beijing isn't all that inspirational, either.

-FrontPageMag.com, April 13, 2021

Ernest "Red" Hemingway by Humberto Fontova

"They Are Giving Hemingway Another Look, So You Can, Too...Lynn Novick and Ken Burns consider the seminal writer in all his complexity and controversy in their new PBS documentary series. Could there be anything more subversive than turning a spotlight, in this moment, on Ernest Hemingway?" wrote Gal Beckerman in *The New York Times* this month.

"Subversive?" Ah! At least the term appears in connection with the docuseries. And considering that Ernest Hemingway eagerly joined Stalin's KGB (technically the NKVD at the time), secretly contributed tens of thousands to the Cuban communist party and (literally) drank, as a spectator, to Che Guevara and

Fidel Castros' firing-squad murder marathons, you might think the term "subversive" fits.

Alas! No hint of his communist sympathies and connections come across in this "frank" and "subversive" and "controversial" docuseries, which actually seems like it would be something that might have been produced by Hemingway's mass-murdering chums in Moscow or Havana 40 years ago.

Perhaps some of you weren't aware that declassified Soviet documents proved that Ernest Hemingway officially signed up with the KGB's precursor the NKVD as "Agent Argo" in 1941?

OK. But don't take it from me. After all I'm a "rabidly right-wing-Cuban exile-with-an-axe-to-grind!" Instead take it from the crypto-commie (but well-sourced) UK *Guardian*.

According to KGB defector Alexander Vassiliev in a book published by Yale University Press (not exactly a branch of the John Birch Society), "the 42-year-old Hemingway was recruited (by the KGB) under the cover name 'Argo' in 1941 and cooperated with Soviet agents whom he met in Havana and London."

Turns out that Papa failed pathetically at his KGB assignment. (His assignment and failure are completely absent from the docuseries.) But hey, it's the thought that counts! And the thought was to be a member of the most murderous organization in modern history during its most murderous phase. (Stalin's NKVD under Lavrenti Beria.) A singular honor, surely! Though you'd never guess it from the "subversive" PBS docuseries (i.e. fluff piece.)

"Castro's revolution is very pure and beautiful," gushed Hemingway in March, 1960. "I'm encouraged by it. The Cuban people now have a decent chance for the first time. The Cubans getting shot all deserve it."

Quite fittingly, when Soviet diplomat Anastas Mikoyan finished his courtesy calls on Fidel Castro and Che Guevara in Havana in 1960—this long-time Stalin and Beria confidant made it a point to call on Ernest Hemingway.

Hemingway knew full well what was going on behind the scenes of Castro and Che's "pure and beautiful" revolution. Accounts of "Papa" Hemingway's eager presence at many of the Katyn-like massacres of untried Cubans comes courtesy of Hemingway's own friend, the late George Plimpton (not exactly an "embittered right-wing Cuban exile!") who worked as editor of *The Paris Review*, (not exactly a "McCarthyite scandal sheet.")

In 1958 George Plimpton interviewed Hemingway in Cuba for one of *The Paris Review's* most famous pieces. They became friends and the following year Hemingway again invited Plimpton down to his *Finca Vigia* just outside Havana. James Scott Linville, an editor at *The Paris Review* during the 1990s, while relating how this high-brow publication passed on

serializing the manuscript that became Che Guevara's *Motorcycle Diaries*, reveals "Papa's" unwitting role in the rejection.

"I took the paper-clipped excerpt upstairs to the Boss (Plimpton)," writes Linville, "and said I had something strange and good. As I started to tell him about it, his smile faded. I stopped my pitch and said, 'Boss, what's the matter?""

"James, I'm sorry," Linville recalls Plimpton replying. A sad look came over him, and he said, "Years ago, after we'd done the interview, Papa invited me down again to Cuba. It was right after the revolution. "There's something you should see," Hemingway told Plimpton while preparing a shaker of drinks for the outing.

"They got in the car with a few others and drove some way out of town," continues Linville (who is recalling Plimpton's account.) "They got out, set up chairs and took out the drinks, as if they were going to watch the sunset. Soon, a truck arrived. This, explained George, was what they'd been waiting for. It came, as Hemingway knew the same time each day. It stopped and some men with guns got out of it. In the back were a couple of dozen others who were tied up. Prisoners.

"The men with guns hustled the others out of the back of the truck, and lined them up. Then they shot them. They put the bodies back into the truck."

And so it started. Within a few years 16,000 men and boys (some of them US citizens) would fill mass graves after scenes like the ones that so charmed Papa Hemingway with his thermos of specially-prepared Daiquiris. The figure for the Castroite murder tally is not difficult to find. Simply open *The Black Book of Communism*, written by French scholars and published in English by Harvard University Press (neither exactly an outpost of "embittered-right-wing Cuban-exiles-with an axe-to-grind!")

"Pure and beautiful" indeed, Mr. Hemingway.

Hemingway's friends, while he gallivanted around Red Spain during the Spanish Civil war, included Luis Quintanilla, Gustav Regler, Milton Wolff, Karol Swierezenski, Nicolas Guillen, Ilya Ehrenburg, and Gustavo Duran. Every *single* one was a dedicated member of the communist party at a time Joe Stalin called all the Comintern's shots.

But the Spaniard Gustavo Duran (who Hemingway reputedly used as his model for Robert Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*) went above and beyond the call of typical communist party duty during the Spanish Civil War. Duran also served in the Soviet-run SIM (*Servicio Intelligencia Militar*) that weeded out and murdered "Fascists, Trotskyists" and other such deplorables when Stalin spread his Great Terror and purges to Spain.

It says much about the Roosevelt administration that Duran, thanks to strings pulled by his friend Hemingway, was granted US citizenship and hired by the US State Department to work in the Havana and Buenos Aires Buenos embassies during World War II.

"Tailgunner Joe," McCarthy outed Gustavo Duran in 1951, as one of those famous State Department reds on his famous list. Needless to add, this accusation provoked howls of protest and derision from the Democrat-media complex of the time. When Tailgunner held up a picture (yes, "I hold here in my hand!") of Duran in his Soviet murderer's uniform, the howls subsided—but only slightly. By then Duran had already scooted over to a spot at the UN.

"On the plus side, (Ernest Hemingway) had a tremendous capacity to see the world around him with clarity, to see through bullsh*t and hypocrisy and to cut to the heart of things," gushes Hemingway docuseries co-producer Lynn Novick.

"A writer without a sense of justice and of injustice would be better off editing the yearbook of a school," wrote Hemingway. "The most essential gift for a good writer is a built-in, shockproof, sh*t detector."

So was Hemingway duped by Stalinism and its Cuban clone Castroism? Did his sh*t-detector malfunction? Well, the KGB, while certainly appreciating the work of dupes and useful idiots, was not known to (openly) sign them on.

Considering the quotes above in light of Hemingway's documented history, does he qualify as yet another celebrity "Useful Idiot?"

Hardly. Instead he comes across as a conscious and dedicated communist agent of influence.

Imagine a famous 20th century writer, however gifted at his art, secretly volunteering for Hitler's Abwehr or Gestapo, consorting with Nazis much of his life—and having it all completely ignored by documentarians who bill themselves as "frank," "courageous" and dedicated to documenting "the man in full."

—FrontPageMag.com, April 15, 2021

Kellogg's Leftist Brand by Andrea Widburg

It seems like a lifetime ago, but it was really just a little over four years ago, immediately after Trump's election victory, that Kellogg's pulled all of its ads from *Breitbart News* because its conservative readers were not "aligned with our values as a company." Well, it's 2021, and Kellogg's is back to reminding everyone that they don't just sell sugary breakfast products; they also sell wokeness by the spoonful.

Last week, while our eyes were on the Derek Chauvin trial, Kellogg's announced that, in honor of Gay Pride Month (yes, it's almost that wearisome June again), it has a new rainbow cereal:

All are welcome at the breakfast table with our NEW Together with Pride cereal coming to shelves

soon. For every box sold, Kellogg is donating \$3 to @glaad to support the LGBTQ+ community @KelloggCompany

Needless to say, Yahoo! life, is thrilled:

There are endless ways to celebrate the LGBTQIA+ community, but our favorite way just might be with food. And it looks like we'll be starting with breakfast: Kellogg's is launching an exciting new cereal in honor of Pride Month. Bonus? You won't have to wait until June to try it—the cereal hits shelves in May.

Kellogg's teamed up with GLAAD (aka the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation) to create Together with Pride, a berry-flavored cereal made up of heart-shaped pieces dusted with edible glitter. The pieces come in every color of the rainbow, while the box boasts iconic characters from Tony the Tiger to Toucan Sam. It's an update of Kellogg's and GLAAD's last collab, All Together Cereal, which was only available online. Luckily, this sparkly new iteration will be hitting shelves for a limited time at select major retailers nationwide next month.

(Is it just me or is Kellogg's totally stereotyping the LGBTQ etc. community with that whole glitter thing?)

I believe devoutly in the free market and in freedom of expression. I must admit, though, that I have, for decades now, deeply resented the way the rainbow, once a simple of promises, renewal, and sheer natural beauty, has been co-opted by the LGBTQ etc. crowd, right down to a new cereal. The rainbow is so strongly identified with LGBTQers that any use of the flag implies that one is LGBTQ etc. or an "ally." This marketing and branding success is impressive (again, I like the free market) but I miss the rainbow as something everyone who cherishes beauty could display without any sexual implications.

Speaking of the free market, if Kellogg's wants to distinguish itself from its competitors, it's free to do so. That's true even though I hate that I can no longer buy products based upon their quality and price. Instead, I must determine whether I'm politically aligned with the corporation.

In this case, I am not politically aligned at all with Kellogg's corporate values. This is a company that has dived headlong into wokeism and I despise wokeism. For that reason, I will happily refrain from buying all sorts of things that are unhealthy for me, from sugarladen snacks and cereals to products made from way too many refined carbohydrates. Thankfully, there's a lot more to be had at the grocery store, and eggs or yogurt make the best breakfast of all.

One last thing: Kellogg's woke attitude probably shouldn't surprise us. Its founder, John Harvey Kellogg, was the perfect Progressive of his era:

The sanitarium approached treatment in a

holistic manner, actively promoting vegetarianism, nutrition, the use of enemas to clear "intestinal flora", exercise, sun-bathing, and hydrotherapy, as well as the abstention from smoking tobacco, drinking alcoholic beverages, and sexual activity.

Kellogg dedicated the last 30 years of his life to promoting eugenics. He co-founded the Race Betterment Foundation, co-organized several National Conferences on Race Betterment and attempted to create a 'eugenics registry'. Alongside discouraging 'racial mixing', Kellogg was in favor of sterilizing 'mentally defective persons', promoting a eugenics agenda while working on the Michigan Board of Health and helping to enact authorization to sterilize those deemed 'mentally defective' into state laws during his tenure.

It's likely that old John Kellogg would be proud of his corporate descendants. After all, they actively advance the cause of a modern Democrat party that enthusiastically supports segregation and fights like grim death to keep abortion as a central part of every Black community.

You just keep being you, Kellogg's. And I'll keep not buying your products.

—American Thinker, April 25, 2021

Western Civilization Values by Dennis Prager

In *Why the Jews?* my book on anti-Semitism, there is a chapter on anti-Americanism. My co-author, Rabbi Joseph Telushkin, and I long ago understood that many of the reasons for Jew-hatred and America-hatred were the same.

Among them are envy of success—material, of course, but even more importantly, success in terms of influence. Another is the religious foundation of both peoples: Both America and the Jews are rooted in belief in God, belief they are a Chosen People and belief in the Bible, especially the Old Testament, as the book from which they derive their values.

America-haters and Jew-haters resent the enormous influence both nations have had on the world, have contempt for their belief in being Chosen and dismiss the Bible as irrelevant and even malevolent.

In the premodern age, Christian anti-Semitism was primarily animated by the charge of deicide—the charge that the Jews killed Christ, a charge that does not have a parallel in anti-Americanism. But beginning in the 20th century, the reasons for the two hatreds converged.

In his recent biography of Adolf Hitler, Brendan Simms, a professor of the history of international relations at Cambridge University, identified Hitler's hatred of America and especially of capitalism as central to Hitler's worldview: "Hitler's principal preoccupation throughout his career was Anglo-America and global capitalism. ...Hitler wanted to establish what he considered racial unity in Germany by overcoming the capitalist order and working for the construction of a new classless society."

In other words, another commonality of Americahatred and modern Jew-hatred has been hatred of capitalism. The Nazis hated America and the Jews, both of whom they identified with capitalism. And the left (not the liberal, who traditionally loved America, but who has become the primary enabler of the left) hates America, which it regards as the paragon of capitalism. By becoming the most successful country in history, America, the quintessential capitalist country, remains a living rebuke to everything the left stands for. If America can be brought down, every left-wing egalitarian dream can be realized.

The question for the America-hater, just as for the Jew-hater, has been: How do we destroy them? What has always rendered anti-Semitism unique among ethnic and religious hatreds was its goal of extermination. No other ethnic bigotry is exterminationist. Regarding America, the left does not seek to exterminate Americans; the idea is ludicrous, since most of those on the left who loathe America are themselves American. What the left does very much seek is to destroy America as we have known it—the capitalist and Judeo-Christian enclave of personal freedom.

The Jews created something world-changing by introducing into the world the Hebrew Bible, a universal and judging God, the Ten Commandments, the rejection of the heart as the guide to behavior, the emphasis on justice (not "social justice") and the doctrine of Jewish Chosenness. They were forever hated for this. So, too, is America hated for placing the Bible at the center of its value system, its belief in being a "Second" Chosen People, its freedoms and its capitalism. America is not hated for its slavery. If it were, given the ubiquity of slavery throughout world history, every country and ethnic group on earth would be hated. America is hated for its values and its success.

The fact is that, just as did the ancient Jews, the Americans made something unique: the American experiment in freedom. And it succeeded beyond even its founders' dreams. With all its faults, America did become a shining "city on a hill"—the famous phrase first articulated in 1630 by John Winthrop echoing Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and repeated throughout American history. For example, President Ronald Reagan, in his 1989 Farewell Address, said, "I've spoken of the shining city all my political life."

And who created this unique place of liberty, opportunity and unequalled, widespread affluence? More than any other group, it was the WASP, the White

Anglo-Saxon Protestant. I say this as neither Anglo-Saxon nor Protestant. Catholics, Jews, nonbelievers and members of every faith, ethnicity and race (blacks, in particular) made major contributions; but it was the WASP, more than any other group, who made America. And for that reason, America-hatred is WASP-hatred and, more broadly, white-hatred.

The idea that whites' unique achievements—in making America, in music, art, literature and the sciences—means that white people are intrinsically superior is absurd. Hitler was also white, as was Joseph Stalin, as are most American mass-murderers. Those facts are no more a commentary on whites than Johann Sebastian Bach or Leonardo da Vinci being white is a commentary on whites.

Whites made the country and the greatest civilization—not because they were white, but because of the values they held. Hatred of the white is ultimately hatred of those values.

Given what the WASP has achieved in the West and in America, it takes extraordinary levels of dishonesty and ingratitude to be anti-white. But neither truth nor gratitude is a left-wing value.

—PJMedia.com, April 20, 2021

Richard Dawkins Loses Humanist Award

by Tyler O'Neil

Sometimes, atheists can be downright religious. On Monday, the American Humanist Association (AHA), which advocates for a "nontheistic worldview," turned on one of the most prominent atheists in the world, Richard Dawkins. The AHA rescinded an award it gave Dawkins back in 1996, apparently for the heresy of raising questions about transgender identity.

The AHA awarded Dawkins the Humanist of the Year Award in 1996, recognizing the atheist evolutionary biologist as "an exemplar of humanist values." AHA cited the "communication of scientific concepts to the public" as a vital part of giving that award to Dawkins, who had published the influential atheist book *The Blind Watchmaker* in 1986. (He would go on to publish *The God Delusion*, helping to lead the New Atheist movement in 2006.)

Yet AHA announced that Dawkins had betrayed the organization's values.

"Regrettably, Richard Dawkins has over the past several years accumulated a history of making statements that use the guise of scientific discourse to demean marginalized groups, an approach antithetical to humanist values," the AHA board wrote in an announcement on Monday.

THE SCHWARZ REPORT / JUNE 2021

"His latest statement implies that the identities of transgender individuals are fraudulent, while also simultaneously attacking Black identity as one that can be assumed when convenient. His subsequent attempts at clarification are inadequate and convey neither sensitivity nor sincerity," the board declared.

"Consequently, the AHA Board has concluded that Richard Dawkins is no longer deserving of being honored by the AHA, and has voted to withdraw, effective immediately, the 1996 Humanist of the Year award," the board concluded.

On April 10, Dawkins had posed an interesting question about transgenderism.

"In 2015, Rachel Dolezal, a white chapter president of NAACP, was vilified for identifying as Black," he wrote. "Some men choose to identify as women, and some women choose to identify as men. You will be vilified if you deny that they literally are what they identify as. Discuss."

Two days after the tweet, Dawkins clarified his intentions. "I do not intend to disparage trans people. I see that my academic 'Discuss' question has been misconstrued as such and I deplore this," he wrote. "It was also not my intent to ally in any way with Republican bigots in US now exploiting this issue."

Dawkins isn't exactly a right-wing transphobic bigot. Back in 2018, the Richard Dawkins Foundation for Reason and Science endorsed transgender identity, sharing a *Scientific American* article claiming that "the idea of two sexes is overly simplistic." The foundation used the pro-transgender hashtags "#TransRightsAreHumanRights" and "#WontBeErased."

Yet the AHA was not alone in loudly condemning Dawkins' recent tweet. Allison Gill, the vice president for legal and policy at American Atheists and a male who identifies as female, also condemned the prominent atheist's tweet.

"We need science communicators like Richard Dawkins to put in the time to learn this information and then communicate it clearly and accurately to the public, not reinforce dangerous and harmful narratives put forward by the opponents of equality," Gill wrote. "Trans people are under constant attack across our country. Implying that our identities are somehow fraudulent and questioning whether we even exist dehumanizes us and helps justify this violence."

Contrary to Gill's claim, questioning transgender identity does not "justify" violence against people who identify as transgender. Americans are right to harbor

reservations about allowing biological males to enter women's restrooms and locker rooms or to compete in women's sports.

While gender dysphoria (the condition of identifying with the gender opposite one's biological sex) is real and people with this condition deserve pity and support, that does not mean that society should kowtow to people whose identity contradicts their biology. There is no evidence that transgender surgery improves the mental health outcomes of gender dysphoric people. Men and women who formerly identified as transgender and underwent surgery have grown to reject transgender identity and lament the damage they did to their own bodies.

Even though Americans sympathize with gender dysphoric people, they are rightly skeptical about allowing men into women's spaces and women's sports. Gender dysphoric people likely do not seek to take advantage of transgender policies to get an edge on the competition or to invade women's privacy, but protransgender policies open the door to abuse from people who falsely claim transgender identity—just as Dolezal abused her false black identity. This topic should not be beyond discussion.

Dawkins was not endorsing this skepticism, although he did suggest a parallel. Apparently, even just asking followers to "discuss" such an issue is beyond the pale for the AHA. An atheist group decided to "cancel" one of the world's most prominent atheists just for asking a question. That's how radical transgender activism has become.

The American Humanist Association lists three definitions of Humanism that include the terms "free inquiry" and "critical inquiry." Yet the AHA is stifling free inquiry on the issue of transgenderism in the name of protecting a "marginalized group." Questioning transgenderism is heresy, even if a prominent atheist does not actually endorse any attack on transgender identity.

The AHA board claimed that Dawkins' "subsequent attempts at clarification are inadequate and convey neither sensitivity nor sincerity." In other words, his confession was inadequate—he requires more penance to reverse his excommunication.

Atheists may loudly denounce religion and the demands of a transcendent God, but they still uphold their own form of orthodoxy. Transgenderism mimics a religion in many ways, and it seems the transgender movement has a stranglehold on some of the bastions of "free inquiry." How ironic.

—PJMedia.com, April 20, 2021

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 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.