



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 47, Number 1

January 2007

Inside

The Black Book of the Sandinistas

by Jamie Glazov, Page 4

With Daniel Ortega's return to the presidency, will we see a return to Sandinista practices?



Will Evangelicals Buckle?

by Don Feder, Page 6

The left wants the election results to push conservative Christians out of the fight.



The Collapse of Western Civilization?

by Thomas Sowell, Page 8

Like Rome, has Western civilization lost its "internal cohesion, patriotism, and fighting spirit?"

Dawkins, Dennett, and Darwin

by David A. Noebel

With the publication of Richard Dawkins' *The God Delusion* and Daniel C. Dennett's *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, the atheists are putting their collective foot down, saying "Enough is enough." Enough of this foolish talk about God! Enough about believing in the existence of God. God is a myth, a figment of the imagination that only the ignorant and foolish believe, and it's about time that God-believers grow up and smell the coffee.

And because the very idea of God is itself contemptible, to conceal one's contempt is dishonest. Dawkins and Dennett do not conceal their contempt for God, Christianity, or for that matter all religions except the religion of Secular Humanism. Both would undoubtedly proudly display the Darwinian fish on their bumpers.

Indeed, Dawkins and Dennett remind me of V.I. Lenin, who insists that "every idea of God, even flirting with the idea of God, is unutterable vileness—vileness of the most dangerous kind" (1913 letter to Maxim Gorky). Lenin also exhorts that "we must combat religion, that is the ABC of all materialism." Lenin advised his followers to distribute the atheistic literature of the French Encyclopaedists. They did, and the results can be read in Harvard University's publication *The Black Book of Communism*. Every reader toying with atheism or thinking that Dawkins and Dennett are clever and smart needs to read this 850-page book before proceeding to the abyss.

The fact that over 90 percent of Americans claim some belief in God simply staggers Dawkins and Dennett, who describe this state of affairs as "the surrounding gloom of America's obsession with religion." They wonder how so many can be so ignorant, especially when they are products of an atheistically saturated educational system, when 94 percent of the hierarchy of the National Academy of Sciences are atheists, and when even mentioning God or His creation is disallowed in professional scientific journals. As a matter of fact, when one professional journal (related to the Smithsonian) challenged Darwin's theory of natural selection and the neo-Darwinian mutations spoof the whole roof fell in and the editor (with two PhDs in science) was dismissed posthaste. This is an example of atheistic liberalism at its darkest hour, shattering the shibboleth of tolerance, academic freedom, and fair-mindedness once and for all.

Both Dawkins and Dennett insist that Darwin's theory of natural selection makes belief in God unnecessary, irrelevant, and perhaps dangerous although Dennett does admit there is some kind of relationship between religion and health (it seems that those who practice religion are healthier than those who don't).

Both see Darwinism as a firm foundation for morality. However, Dennett seems troubled knowing that Pol Pot, Mao, and Stalin (to say nothing of Hitler) believed essentially what he believes regarding God and Darwin, and they represent the moral mon-

And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. Ephesians 5:11

"Dwell on the past and you'll lose an eye; forget the past and you'll lose both eyes." Old Russian Proverb

sters of the twentieth century.

While those who claim belief in God have indeed committed some horrendous acts (the St. Bartholomew massacre, for example) those who shout their disbelief in God have committed literally millions more. Jung Chang and her husband, in a recent book on Mao, estimate his tortures and killings at 70 million. And Mao believed in Darwin's evolution and Dawkins' atheism. Most Americans have forgotten that after the 1949 Communist takeover of China, Darwinism preceded Marx and Lenin in the classroom. Most have forgotten that those Americans in the U.S. State Department, Treasury Department, Agricultural Department, and the White House itself who betrayed China into the hands of Mao were also steeped in atheism and evolution.

Ann Coulter wonders why throughout her 12 years of grade school and high school, 4 years of college (Cornell University), and three years of law school (University of Michigan) she never learned about the relationship between Darwin and Hitler. Unfortunately, we won't learn of that relationship from the works of Dawkins and Dennett either because it may be too embarrassing for these intellectual elites to contemplate.

We can hope that the ethical argument (whether it is necessary to believe in God to be moral) may well sound the death rattle for atheism and Darwinism. In the February/March 2006 issue of *Free Inquiry* magazine, a humanist publication to which Dawkins contributes, two writers (Mario Bunge and Stuart Jordan) argue that the solution to the world's multitude of problems is an "atheistic, naturalistic, humanistic, evolutionary worldview of science." This is Dawkins' and Dennett's position as well.

But in this same issue of *Free Inquiry* Bill Cooke reviews Jung Chang's work on Mao Zedong in an article entitled "The Madness of Mao." What Cooke, Dawkins, and Dennett don't tell their readers, however, is that Mao (responsible for the slaughter of 70 million human beings) put into practice everything that atheistic, naturalistic, humanistic, evolutionistic science represents! Mao was an atheistic, naturalistic, humanistic, evolutionistic practicing Marxist/Leninist.

Let's admit that the twentieth century was a century of putting into practice "atheistic, naturalistic, humanistic, evolutionistic science." The Communist and Nazi movements operated with such "science" at the top of their "to do" lists. The "science" of eugen-

ics, for example, had connections with humanism (Margaret Sanger), Nazism (Rudin), and Communism (Lewontin). Indeed, the *Journal of Eugenics* became the *Journal of Social Biology* (see Pamela R. Winnick, *A Jealous God: Science's Crusade Against Religion* and Edwin Black's *War Against The Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create A Master Race*).

What Dawkins, Dennett, and Secular Humanists in general will not admit publicly is that the original scientific method was actually founded upon a Christian worldview, not an atheistic, naturalistic, humanistic, evolutionistic worldview. Sir Francis Bacon possessed a Christian worldview, not an atheistic worldview. None of the early founding fathers of the sciences was an atheist; all believed that the heavens declared the glory of God.

Rather than portraying believers in God as the ignorant of the world, living beyond the black stump, we should instead acknowledge that the very foundations of science reflect the Christian worldview and that the scientific method is not a weapon of mass destruction against the very existence of God (see Stanley L. Jaki's works on Pierre Duhem for some enlightenment on the subject).

What intrigues me is Richard Dawkins' ridiculing Antony Flew for relinquishing his atheism for some type of deism (a form of theism). Speaking before a body of students and faculty in Lynchburg, Virginia, (not Liberty University) Dawkins asserted that Flew was foolish to rest his deism on *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael Behe's work on the cell. Dawkins claims Flew would have been better served to rest his case for deism on the constants of nature (e.g., if the strength of gravity, the percentage of oxygen in the atmosphere, the length of the rotation of the earth, the centrifugal force of planetary movement, the charge of an electron, or the mass of a proton were the tiniest bit different, none of us would be here to discuss atheism or evolution) rather than the teleology of the cell. In truth, both sources make a powerful case for the existence of God!

(Incidentally, Flew says his conversion to deism from atheism resulted from reason and science, not revelation or irrationalism. It must surely strike rational human beings as rather strange that as an atheist, Flew was considered one of the brightest stars in the universe, but once he left his atheism, he suddenly became one of the dwarf stars in a far off galaxy, if not in

some black hole.)

The love fest between Dawkins and Dennett, however, may be short lived because neither they nor atheism can explain the origin of life from inorganic matter, nor can they find the fossils before the Cambrian period to prove their evolutionary scenario—something Darwin believed essential to prove that his theory was true.

Nor can Dawkins and Dennett explain away the slaughter of the twentieth century (the bloodiest in all recorded human history—170 million deaths, according to R. J. Rummel). No Christian idea was responsible for this terrible slaughter. All the ideas responsible are found in the camp of Dawkins' and Dennett's atheism, naturalism, humanism, socialism, and evolutionism. No human being was shot, drowned, starved, quartered, hanged, poisoned, or otherwise dispatched in the twentieth century because of the ideas of theism, supernaturalism, or creationism in the public square!

Who in Colorado can ever forget the names Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold? They were responsible for the murders of 12 of their fellow students at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. "You know what I love?" asked Harris. "Natural Selection. It's the best thing that ever happened on this earth. Getting rid of all the stupid and ignorant organisms." On the day he killed his fellow students (deliberately seeking out Christians) and wounded 24 others, he was wearing a T-shirt bearing Darwin's motto: "Natural Selection." Again, is there any rational human being who believes that if his T-shirt had said "Jesus Loves You" he would have committed such horrendous crimes? I don't think so!

Dennett admits at the end of his book that he is somewhat motivated by a political agenda. No doubt his political agenda mirrors the agenda of the culture of death—promoters of abortion, partial birth abortion, embryonic stem cell laboratory experimentation, death education, sex education, radical feminism, euthanasia, dead-end gay marriage, etc.

The testimony of Scripture, of course, speaks directly against Dawkins and Dennett: "The fool says in

his heart, God does not exist" (Psalm 14: 1). "The wicked arrogantly thinks: there is no accountability, since God does not exist" (Psalm 10:4). "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky proclaims the works of His hands. Day after day they pour out speech; night after night they communicate knowledge [power and wisdom]" (Psalm 19:1-2). "From the creation of the world His invisible attributes, that is His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what He has made" (Romans 1:20). "Where is the philosopher? Where is the scholar? Where is the debater of this age? Hasn't God made the world's wisdom foolish?" (I Corinthians 1:20).

Logic, too, counters Dawkins and Dennett, in that everything that comes into existence must have a sufficient cause. Even the skeptic David Hume says, "I never asserted so absurd a proposition as that anything might arise without a cause." Only God fills this model of cause and effect. Belief in chance or accident is simply not logical. As Paul Amos Moody explains, "The more I study science the more I am impressed with the thought that this world and universe have a definite design—and a design suggests a designer."

Not only do Scripture and logic defy atheism, the hard sciences also challenge it (especially physics and astronomy), forcing some to reconsider their atheistic premises. The existence of mathematical principles and order in the physical universe cannot be ignored. These mathematical representations turn out to be "elegant, surprisingly simple, and even beautiful." $E=MC^2$ is simple, yet beautiful. Einstein notes, "The harmony of natural law . . . reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection."

May our loving, wise, powerful and patient God, who created the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1:1) and who laughs at the Dawkinses, Dennetts and Darwins of the world (Psalm 2), convict all of us about the seriousness of these matters and help us be fit evangelists to the high and mighty as well as to the poor and miserable. Amen!

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, please check out our website at www.schwarzreport.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

Daniel Ortega returns to Nicaragua's presidency a shadow of the fiery revolutionary who vowed an endless fight against a U.S. government determined to overthrow him during the Cold War.

Balding, weakened by heart trouble and often appearing almost docile, he now preaches reconciliation and stability, and promises to maintain close ties with the United States and the veterans of the Contra army it trained and armed against him.

He has traded his wartime military fatigues for a white shirt and jeans. His guide, he says, is God, not Karl Marx.

The United States and his rivals worry that the Sandinista revolutionary in him will resurface as Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and Cuban leader Fidel Castro welcome him into a club of leftist leaders fighting American dominance in the region.

But Mr. Ortega, who was president from 1985 to 1990, the height of the Contra insurgency, says he has traded war for peace, love and consensus.

His victory speech on Wednesday was tinged with some of his old fire. Raising his arms, he led thousands in a rendition of an old revolutionary song: "The people united will never be divided." He promoted socialist ideas such as free education and medical care, lambasted Republicans in the United States for the war in Iraq, and thanked other leftist Latin American leaders for their support. But most of his speech was dedicated to praising democracy and reaching out to opponents.

—*The Washington Times*, November 14, 2006, p. A 15

The Black Book of the Sandinistas

by Jamie Glazov

Daniel Ortega, the former leader of Nicaragua's Sandinista Marxist regime (1979-1990), has regained power after winning his country's presidential election last Tuesday.

Fears abound in Washington that Ortega will join the anti-U.S. bloc in Latin America being manufactured by Hugo Chavez.

Many questions remain. One of them: why was this ruthless dictator voted into office by a people who once threw him out? There are no simple answers, but a peoples' support for their own tormentors is, obviously, no new phenomenon. Russia, for instance, is currently experiencing a resurgence of nostalgia for Joseph Stalin—as new monuments are being erected in several Russian communities to honor the former genocidal dictator.

Aside from the economic and political frustrations facing Nicaraguans, another factor clearly played a key role in the election drama: young Nicaraguan voters had no real memory of who the Sandinistas were and what crimes they perpetrated against their own people.

A trip down memory lane is in order:

Upon capturing power in Nicaragua in July, 1979, the Sandinistas immediately Stalinized the country and aligned themselves with Castro and the Soviet Empire, making their country a base for the export of Marxist revolution throughout Central America.

Like all of its communist role models, the new regime constructed a fascistic apparatus to maintain rigid control. Fol-

lowing in the footsteps of Castro's Cuba, it set up neighborhood associations as local spy networks for the government. Each neighborhood had a *Comité de Defensa Sandinista* (CDS - Sandinista Defense Committee) that served the same totalitarian purpose as the Cuban CDR and the Nazi regime's block overseers—although the power of the CDS extended far beyond the Nazis' model.

In emulating Castro and their other communist heroes such as Stalin and Mao, the Sandinistas took control of everything in the country: mass organizations, the army, police, labor unions, and the media. They censored all freedom of speech, suspended the right of association and ruthlessly crushed the freedom of trade unions. Faithful to their Marxist ideology, the new tyrants seized the means of production. State controls and nationalization spread, aid to the private sector and incentives for foreign investment disappeared. To put it plainly, another 20th-century experiment with socialism annihilated a nation's economy along with a peoples' prospects for a better life.

Thousands of Nicaraguans who attempted to protect their property—or who simply committed the crime of owning private property—were imprisoned, tortured, or executed by the new despots.

Unlike the previous regime of Anastasio Somoza, the Sandinistas did not leave the native populations on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua in peace. In Khmer Rouge style, they inflicted a ruthless, forcible relocation of thousands of Indians from their land. Like Stalin and Mao, the new regime used state-created famine as a weapon against these "enemies of the people." The Sandinista army committed myriad atrocities against the Indian population, killing and imprisoning approximately 15,000 innocent people. The Sandinista crimes included not only mass murders of innocent natives themselves,

but a calculated liquidation of their entire leadership—as the Soviets had perpetrated against the Poles in the Katyn Forest Massacre, when the Soviet secret police executed approximately 15,000 Polish officers in the spring of 1940.

The Sandinistas quickly distinguished themselves as one of the worst human rights abusers in Latin America, carrying out approximately 8,000 political executions within three years of the revolution. The number of “anti-revolutionary” Nicaraguans who disappeared while in Sandinista hands numbered in the thousands. By 1983, the number of political prisoners inside the new Marxist regime’s jails was estimated at 20,000. This was the highest number of political prisoners in any nation in the hemisphere—except, of course, in Castro’s Cuba. By 1986, a vicious and violent Sandinista “resettlement program” forced some 200,000 Nicaraguans into 145 “settlements” throughout the country. This monstrous social engineering program entailed the designation of “free-fire” zones in which Sandinista government troops shot and killed any peasant of their choosing.

The Sandinista Gulag also institutionalized torture. Political prisoners in Sandinista jails, such as *Las Tejas*, were consistently beaten, deprived of sleep and given electric shocks. They were routinely denied food and water and kept in dark cubicles known as *chiquitas* (little ones), that had a surface area of less than one square meter. These cubicles were too small to sit up in, were completely dark, and had no sanitation and almost no ventilation. Prisoners were also forced to stand for long periods without bending their arms or legs; they were locked into steel hot boxes exposed to the full force of the tropical sun; their daughters or wives were sexually assaulted in front of them; and some prisoners were mutilated and skinned alive before being executed. One sadistic Sandinista practice was known as *corte de cruz*; this was a drawing-and-quartering technique in which the prisoner’s limbs were severed from the body, leaving him to bleed to death.

The result of all of these horrifying cruelties and barbarisms was yet another mass exodus from a country enslaved by communism with tens of thousands of Nicaraguans escaping and settling in Honduras, Costa Rica and the United States.

As most Marxist regimes, the Sandinista despotism accompanied its internal repression with external aggression. With Soviet and Cuban aid, Sandinista Nicaragua became the biggest and best armed force in Central America. In attempting to export its Marxist revolution, it posed a serious threat to the U.S. and to stability and democracy in the whole region. It was in response to this threat that the Reagan administration backed rebels in Nicaragua, the “contras,” who sought to bring democracy to their homeland. The contras were mostly peasants led primarily by former Sandinistas who felt betrayed by the totalitarian turn of the revolution.

In the end, the contras played a vital role in helping Nicaraguans oust their oppressors. On February 25, 1990, under massive pressure, and intoxicated by their own propaganda in regards to their popularity, the Sandinistas staged an election in an attempt to prove their “democratic” stripes. But the dictators fundamentally misjudged the mindset of the Nicaraguan people, revealing a pathetic inability to gauge what the people were really feeling. As a result, the Ortega-led Sandinistas were embarrassingly ousted from power by the victory of the Coalition of Nicaraguan Opposition Parties, headed by Violeta Chamorro.

While Nicaragua obviously did not heal overnight, the Sandinistas could no longer torture their own people with the vicious power made available by a monstrous regime. They made sure, of course, to fulfill their Marxist legacy by swiftly “privatizing” the huge property holdings they had confiscated in the revolution and making themselves the sole recipients. As the Sandinistas clamoured to ensure that they remained multimillionaires with swollen bank accounts, their reign of terror was cut short; democratization spread within the nation and the lives of Nicaraguans became freer and more prosperous.

It was no surprise, of course, that the Sandinistas served as models of veneration for the Western Left throughout their tyranny. Their despotic policies and adversarial disposition toward the U.S. won them high marks among leftists, for whom adversarial regimes are always the symbols that merit unadulterated worship and adulation. Just as previous fellow travelers had journeyed to the Soviet Union, communist China, North Vietnam, and Cuba to pay homage to their totalitarian idols, leftists of all stripes flocked to Sandinista Nicaragua to pay homage to their new totalitarian deities. The Hollywood likes of Ed Asner, Michael Douglas and Susan Anspach served as the perfect examples of these new political pilgrimages.

Despite the Left’s lies about the Sandinistas and its attempt to impose historical amnesia on their crimes, their unholy alliances, and the dire threat that they posed, the historical record stands for all to see.

As the former despot now grabs power through elections that U.S. policies helped create, the ball lies in his court in terms of what kind of Nicaragua he hopes to build: the anti-American and despotic Nicaragua of the past—or a new and improved Nicaragua that seeks to be a member of the community of free and civilized nations.

If Ortega chooses the Castroite-Chavez road, the U.S. will by necessity have to protect the liberty, security and prosperity of the region.

It is Nicaraguans themselves that lie in the balance—for they have the biggest stake in whether there will be new dark and terrifying chapters in the black book of the Sandinistas.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, November 21, 2006

Will Evangelicals Buckle?

by Don Feder

After decades of excoriating evangelical Christians as bigoted morons, foaming-at-the-mouth fanatics, and vile hypocrites—both sexually-obsessed and sexually-repressed (part Elmer Gantry, part Elmer Fudd)—the media has hit on a new tactic.

The cover story (“America’s God Complex—Like George W. Bush, The Religious Right Is At The Crossroads”) in the November 13th *Newsweek* explains that evangelicals aren’t really that bad—it’s just that the poor fools have been duped by the Republican Party, their energies (which should be devoted to more worthwhile endeavors) diverted to sordid politics.

But there’s hope that the Bible Belt will come to its senses and abandon Values Voter activism for bake sales—*Newsweek* discloses.

The publication contrasts such movement icons as Focus on The Family’s Dr. James Dobson, with a reputed new breed of evangelical leaders.

One of these young Turks, Adam Hamilton, tells the members of his Leawood, Kansas church, “Our task is not to go around judging people—Jesus didn’t do that.” Apparently, Pastor Hamilton missed the incident with the woman accused of adultery, described in the Gospel of John. Jesus saved her from stoning, then told her to “Go and sin no more.” Sin no more?—rather judgmental, wouldn’t you say?

Leaders like Dobson, Falwell, and Robertson have “lost their focus on the spirit of Jesus and have separated the world into black and white,” Hamilton declares. “I can’t see Jesus standing with signs at an anti-gay rally.”

Nor can one picture Jesus standing with a sign at a pro-life demonstration, an anti-pornography rally or a rally against global warming.

There weren’t many leather bars in Jesus’ day. In 1st century Judea, “gay rights” was a non-issue. There also weren’t rallies against child sacrifice or ritual prostitution—which the Bible puts in the same category as conduct of the San Fran persuasion.

By the way, only *Newsweek* could compare a Kansas pastor nobody has ever heard of with a radio psychologist whose voice reaches an estimated 220 million worldwide, as if they represented contending currents within the evangelical movement.

But the (quote, unquote) news magazine moves

doggedly forward with its thesis. The “new generation of evangelical believers” is “pressing beyond the religious right of Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, trying to broaden the movement’s focus from the familiar wars about sex to include issues of *social and economic justice*.”

Feed the homeless and shelter the hungry? Now that’s the stuff! *Newsweek* doesn’t understand that it’s not a choice of caring for the needy or fighting to save marriage and stop the slaughter in the womb. All are integral aspects of the same ethic.

Since their political awakening in the mid-1970s, while evangelicals worked to end the scourge of abortion and stay the steady march of social decay (the Sodomizing of American culture), they have simultaneously raised billions to fight famine in Africa, build homes for the poor, rehabilitate addicts and provide aid to the most destitute among us.

The religious right’s crusade to save the family—opposition to abortion and so-called same-sex marriage—might itself be seen as charity. The family is the first and most important social welfare agency.

Functional families raise children who won’t end up living on the streets or pregnant and on welfare at age 16. If the left succeeds at destroying the American family, there will be homeless shelters, soup kitchens and rehab centers as far as they eye can see—assuming there’s anyone left to man them.

Still, *Newsweek* rhetorically asks if conservative Christians can “move beyond the apparent confines of the religious right as popularly understood, or are they destined to seem *harsh and intolerant*—the opposite of what their own faith would have them be?” And, if the latter, will they still beat their wives with worn-out clichés?

According to *Newsweek*, evangelicals can continue their obsession with abortion and homosexuality, their “God complex” (and thus “seem harsh and intolerant”) or repent and adopt an agenda more pleasing to the media elite—“social and economic justice,” the Gospel of Gore.

There’s a major flaw in this line of reasoning: Even if evangelicals are prepared to leave politics alone, politics won’t leave them alone.

The left is on a mission against God. It correctly

perceives Christianity (more broadly, the Judeo-Christian ethic) as the principal obstacle to the attainment of its utopian vision. Thus, it is determined to stigmatize, marginalize and ghettoize Christians—to increasingly circumscribe their influence and to confine their values to a designated building on a chosen day of the week.

The left has declared war on Christians. Even if evangelicals laid down their arms, the fighting would continue. Besides 1.3 million abortions a year in this country, and the relentless push for gay marriage (mandated by an imperial judiciary) the left is:

- Sexualizing children (including those from Christian families) in the guise of sex education—teaching teen-aged girls to put condoms on bananas and offering how-to training on acts the average prostitute would refuse to perform
- Teaching kids (starting in kindergarten) that homosexuality is a normal, healthy and perfectly acceptable lifestyle. Try it; you'll like it
 - Distributing condoms to adolescents
 - Working to ensure that 14-year-old girls can get an abortion without the knowledge—let alone the consent—of their parents
 - Pushing taxpayer-funded embryonic stem-cell research—cloning-to-kill
 - Moving toward assisted suicide and euthanasia
 - Fighting any attempt to counter the torrent of filth and graphic violence pouring out of Hollywood to inundate the nation in visual sewage
 - Using the news and entertainment media to demonize Christians—hence movies like “V for Vendetta,” “Saved” and “The DaVinci Code”—ergo smears like talk-show host Rosie O'Donnell's recent charge that “Radical (*Bible-believing*) Christianity is just as threatening as radical Islam in a country like the United States.”
 - Passing hate crimes laws which will criminalize speech—especially speech that's critical of homosexuality
 - Getting Christian groups thrown off college campuses because they're “non-inclusive”—i.e., won't allow homosexuals in leadership positions
 - Laboring diligently to keep our borders open and pass another amnesty—thus facilitating new waves of illegal immigration with the ultimate goal of deconstructing America
 - Purging the public sector of religious manifes-

tations, including banning stand-alone Ten Commandments displays and removing “One nation under God” from the Pledge of Allegiance

- Working to adopt an anti-terrorism policy which will consist of sensitivity training, multiculturalism and inculcating an appreciation for the religion of peace
- Assuring the eventual destruction of Israel with a Palestinian state
- Undermining democracy. Replacing popular sovereignty with judicial autocracy—making elections irrelevant. Having civilizational issues like the definition of marriage decided by unelected officials, answerable to no one—a law (pardon the pun) unto themselves.

A November 17th *Associated Press* story (“Liberals Aim To Ram Measures Past Congress”) is coming attractions for a horror movie of epic proportions—“Nightmare On Capitol Hill.”

AP reports: “After years of playing defense, liberal advocacy groups see the Democrats' takeover of Congress as a long-awaited chance to convert some of their broader goals into law. Their wish list includes workplace protections for gays, a broader hate-crimes law, and a multi-pronged push to reduce unplanned pregnancies”—that is to say: forcing religious employers to hire flaming homosexuals (and provide benefits for their same-sex partners), repealing the First Amendment (at least as far as criticism of buggery is concerned) and eliminating the modest restrictions on abortion we've worked so hard to achieve (like the federal ban of partial-birth abortion and Unborn Victims of Violence Act).

Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council summed it up nicely in a *National Review* piece, “Anticipate the fiercest assault of our time against abstinence, marriage, life, good judges, and religious freedom.”

Is this a fight evangelical Christians want to abandon? Is it a fight they can afford to abandon?

Here, the left-wing media is playing the part of Tokyo Rose (“Go home, evangelical Christians. This isn't your fight. You can't win,” etc., etc.).

Conservative Christians aren't buying it. As much as anyone, they know what's at stake here—only everything.

—*GrassTops USA*, November 23, 2006

The Collapse of Western Civilization?

by Thomas Sowell

European nations protesting Saddam Hussein's death sentence, as they protested against forcing secrets out of captured terrorists, should tell us all we need to know about the internal degeneration of Western society, where so many confuse squeamishness with morality.

Two generations of being insulated from the reality of the international jungle, of not having to defend their own survival because they have been living under the protection of the American nuclear umbrella, have allowed too many Europeans to grow soft and indulge themselves in illusions about brutal realities and dangers.

The very means of their salvation have been demonized for decades in anti-nuclear movements and protesters calling themselves "antiwar." But there is a huge difference between being antiwar in words and being antiwar in deeds.

How many times, in its thousands of years of history, has Europe gone 60 years without a major war, as it has since World War II? That peace has been due to American nuclear weapons, which was all that could deter the Soviet Union's armies from marching right across Europe to the Atlantic Ocean.

Having overwhelming military force on your side, and letting your enemies know you have the guts to use it, is being genuinely antiwar. British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's appeasement brought on World War II and Ronald Reagan's military buildup ended the Cold War.

The famous Roman peace of ancient times did not come from negotiations, cease-fires or pretty talk. It came from the Roman Empire's crushing defeat and annihilation of Carthage, which served as a warning to anyone else who might have had any bright ideas about messing with Rome.

Only after the Roman Empire began to lose its own internal cohesion, patriotism and fighting spirit over the centuries did it begin to succumb to its external enemies and finally collapse. That seems to be where Western civilization is heading today.

Internal cohesion? Not only does much of today's generation in Western societies have a "do your own thing" attitude but defying rules and flouting authority are glorified and Balkanization through "multiculturalism" has become dogma.

Patriotism? Not only is patriotism disdained, the very basis for pride in one's country and culture is systematically undermined in our educational institutions at all levels. The achievements of Western civilization are buried in histories that portray every human sin found here as if they were peculiarities of the West.

The classic example is slavery, which existed all over the world for thousands of years and yet is incessantly depicted as if it was a peculiarity of Europeans enslaving Africans. Barbary pirates alone brought twice as many enslaved Europeans to North Africa as there were Africans brought in bondage to the United States and the American Colonies from which it was formed.

How many schools and colleges are going to teach that, going against political correctness and undermining white guilt? How many people have any inkling it was precisely Western civilization that eventually turned against slavery and began stamping it out when non-Western societies still saw nothing wrong with it?

How can a generation be expected to fight for the survival of a culture or a civilization that has been trashed in its own institutions, taught to tolerate even the intolerance of other cultures brought into its own midst, and conditioned to regard any instinct to fight for its own survival as being a "cowboy"?

Western nations that show any signs of standing up for self-preservation are rare exceptions. The United States and Israel are the only Western nations that have no choice but to rely on self-defense—and both are demonized, not only by our enemies but also by many in other Western nations.

Australia recently told its Muslim population that, if they want to live under Islamic law, they should leave Australia. That makes three Western nations that have not yet completely succumbed to the corrosive and suicidal trends of our times.

If and when we all succumb, will the epitaph of Western civilization say we had the power to annihilate our enemies but were so paralyzed by confusion we ended up being annihilated ourselves?

—*The Washington Times*, November, 16, 2006