



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

July 2012

## The New Communism: Resurrecting the Utopian Delusion

by Alan Johnson

A specter is haunting the academy—the specter of “new communism.” A worldview recently the source of immense suffering and misery, and responsible for more deaths than fascism and Nazism, is mounting a comeback; a new form of left-wing totalitarianism that enjoys intellectual celebrity, but aspires to political power.

The Slovenian cultural theorist Slavoj Žižek and the French philosopher and ex-Maoist Alain Badiou have become the leading proponents of this new school. Others associated with the project are the authors of the influential trilogy *Empire, Multitude, Commonwealth*, the American, Michael Hardt of Duke University and the Italian Marxist Toni Negri; the Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo (who recently declared that he has positively “reevaluated” *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*); Bologna University professor and ex-Maoist Alessandro Russo; and the professor of poetry at the European Graduate School (and another ex-Maoist) Judith Balso. Other leading voices include Alberto Toscano, translator of Alain Badiou, a sociology lecturer at Goldsmiths in London, and a member of the editorial board of *Historical Materialism*; the literary critic and essayist Terry Eagleton; and Bruno Bosteels from Cornell University. Most spoke at “The Idea of Communism,” a three-day conference held in London in 2009 that, to the astonishment of the organizers, attracted nearly a thousand people willing to pay more than one hundred pounds each. After that event, a companion publishing industry, powered by Verso Books, has grown up to accompany the movement, making it respectable on campuses. Among new communism’s most important English-language texts, all published in the last few years, are *The Idea of Communism*, edited by Costas Douzinas and Žižek, Badiou’s *The Communist Hypothesis*, and Bosteels’s *The Actuality of Communism*.

Badiou’s recent volume in particular, which Verso has designed as a little red book complete with a golden communist star on its cover, gives a flavor of the movement’s thinking and aims. Co-founder of the militant French group *Organisation Politique* and now in his mid-seventies, Badiou reads the presence of communism in human history as the ongoing struggle for human emancipation rather than the series of disastrous detours it mostly was. From the French Republic of 1792 to the massacre of the Paris communards in 1871, and from 1917 to the collapse of Mao’s Cultural Revolution in 1976—these are but two “sequences” of the communist “idea” in modern history, the first a time for the “setting in place of the communist hypothesis,” the second an era of “preliminary attempts” at its “realization.” The gaps between these “sequences” (including the last three and a half decades) Badiou classifies as time when the communist hypothesis is “declared to be untenable” and capital all-powerful. The “thrilling task” to which Badiou calls his readers, and to which a layer of intellectuals have rallied, is to “usher in the third era” of the communist idea.

So, why this new interest in communism, of all things? After all, the leading new communists have refused to plumb the gist of the historic failures of the past and freely admit that they have almost no idea how to proceed in the future. And in the present they are politically irrelevant. The appeal rests on one fact above all: only the new communists argue that the crises of contemporary liberal capitalist societies—ecological degradation, financial turmoil, the loss of trust in the political class, exploding inequality—are systemic; interlinked, not amenable to legislative reform, and requiring “revolutionary” solutions.

Why does this idea appeal today? What can it actually mean, both theoretically and as a new form of radical politics in the twenty-first century? Do its evasions (of the communist record) and its repetitions (of the anti-democratic, authoritarian, and elitist assumptions of the old communism) define the new communism as yet another form of leftist totalitarianism?

The rehabilitation of communism has been “overdetermined,” as the late French Marxist Louis Althusser would have put it. In other words, there has been a convergence of a series of apparently disparate but, in the eyes of the new commu-

nists, systemically related factors that has created a social emergency and the need for a kind of intellectual crisis management. First, and most obviously, the international financial crisis, the failure of the capitalist utopia after 1989, and the triumph of what Badiou calls an “utterly cynical capitalism.” Second, the “return of history” after 2001 in the form of the failure of the so-called new world order and the emergence of seemingly viable authoritarian and collectivist alternatives to liberal democratic capitalism. Third, the post-1980s growth, especially in the US and UK, of what Robert Reich calls supercapitalism (intense competition, deregulation, globalization, financialization, the disappearance of job security, decline of labor unions, the erosion of the welfare state, and the attendant growth of extreme social inequalities, or what Zizek calls “new forms of apartheid, new walls, and slums”). Fourth, a growing external crisis in the form of ecological emergency. Fifth, a growing internal crisis in the form of “new enclosures”—i.e., the privatization and marketization of personal existence through the growth of biogenetics and new intellectual property norms. Sixth, a “hollowing out,” as Badiou puts it, of representative democracy until all notions of government “for the people” let alone “by the people” become a poor joke.

Badiou establishes a systemic critique in *The Communist Hypothesis*, arguing that “political power, as the current economic crisis with its one single slogan of ‘rescue the banks’ clearly proves, is merely an agent of capitalism.” Similarly, for Slavoj Zizek, “the link between democracy and capitalism has been broken” and this rupture is the expression of “an inner necessity . . . in the very logic of today’s capitalism.”

If the financial crisis has cast doubt on an entire economic system, it is the crisis of the left that has created a political space for the new communism. Social democratic reformism is exhausted; across Europe and the Anglosphere, national versions of “Blairism” have everywhere turned the old people’s parties into ideological rationalizers of a system that now mostly works only as a wrecking ball. These parties no longer take care of their own, argue the new communists. The only other form of leftism that has flourished after 1989 has also been revealed to be politically ineffectual: postmodern, theoreticist, and obsessed with oppression in culture, language, identity, and representation; uninterested in exploitation and political economy, in thrall to Foucauldian (often tenured) forms of “resistance,” this literary and cultural “speculative leftism,” it turns out, is no threat to capitalism. Indeed, much of the attraction to new communism comes from a yearn-

ing for a politics that is genuinely oppositional, positioned wholly outside the capitalist market and liberal democracy. Zizek sums up the pitch: “Do not be afraid, join us, come back! You’ve had your anti-communist fun, and you are pardoned for it—time to get serious once again.”

But this is no mere exercise in nostalgia. The new communists dream of working out a new mode of existence of the communist “hypothesis” in the twenty-first century. They hope a new communist movement can grow out of the system’s antagonisms. Zizek identifies four: “the looming threat of ecological catastrophe, the inappropriateness of the notion of private property for so-called ‘intellectual property,’ the socio-ethical implications of new technological developments (especially in biogenetics), and, last but not least, new forms of apartheid, new Walls [sic] and slums.” The new communism is distinguished by refusing to treat these antagonisms in isolation, as technical problems amenable to parliamentary reform. For example, it rejects the idea that the ecological emergency is solvable by sustainable (capitalist) development, or that the hollowing out of representative democracy can be fixed by campaign finance reform. According to Zizek, it is because these antagonisms are expressions of the very structure of contemporary capitalism that they lend to the communist idea “a practical urgency.”

Zizek argues that while the first three antagonisms are a “triple threat to our entire being,” it is the fourth, the antagonism between the “excluded” and the “included,” that is (quoting Marx) “the real movement that abolishes the present state of things.” As the commons—of culture, of external nature, of internal nature—are privatized and enclosed, a process of near-limitless proletarianization sets in: the vast majority of people become “excluded from their own substance.” Zizek thinks the new revolutionary agent will be grounded in the “revolutionary antagonism of the commons.” The new communists did not coin the slogan “we are the ninety-nine percent,” but when the Occupy activists are ready to listen, they’ll find a theory that can generalize their practice.

Zizek told the protesters at Zuccotti Park in New York City that “the only way we are communist is that we care about the commons.” The new communists seek to rehabilitate communism by treating it not as a historical movement with a record of labor camps and enormity but as a beautiful Platonic “Idea.” The catastrophe of actually existing communism is acknowledged, but only as the first failed approximation to an obvious good. As Zizek puts it, “Try again, Fail again, Fail better.”

As a capitalized “Idea” or an eternal “hypothesis,”

the new communism turns out to be a simple repetition of the old. The goal is the old dream of a leap into the kingdom of freedom—a society wholly beyond the market and representative democracy; a perfectly equal stateless society. For Badiou, class divisions, along with “capitalo-parliamentarism” will be “overcome,” the division of labor “eliminated,” the private appropriation of great wealth and its transmittance by inheritance will “disappear,” and a coercive state, separate from civil society, will “wither away.” New communism, then, is a kind of grand negation of all that is—for Bruno Bosteels, it is “an egalitarian discipline of anti-property, anti-hierarchy, and anti-authority principles,” while Badiou’s desire is “a world that has been freed from the law of profit and private interest.” And so on.

The communist idea or “hypothesis” is then placed beyond empirical refutation. “The eternal idea of the [Chinese] Cultural revolution survives its defeat in socio-historical reality,” insists Zizek, while for Badiou, “failure is nothing more than the history of the proof of the hypothesis.” Under scrutiny, it becomes clear that we are not dealing with a communist “hypothesis” at all—that would involve testing and the possibility of falsification—but rather a communist dogma, and the relation of the new communists to that dogma is fundamentally religious, marked by piety and faith, and not at all critical.

The duty of the new communist is to “help a new modality of existence of the [communist] hypothesis to come into being,” says Badiou. Likewise, uninterested in the purely theoretical, Alberto Toscano’s desire is to “connect the prospects of communism to a partisan knowledge of the real and its tendencies.” But they do not deliver. In fact they rarely rise above the merely gestural. For example, Jacques Rancière defines communism as “the autonomous growth of the space of the common created by the free association of men and women implementing the egalitarian principle.”

Badiou at least tries to explain this failure. He believes that communists, like everyone else on the left, remain the contemporaries of a fundamental strategic impasse revealed in May of 1968, when “the classical figure of the politics of emancipation was ineffective.” And despite all the experimentation since with organizational forms, agents, and strategies, it is no clearer “what new forms of political organization are needed to handle political antagonisms.” In response to this strategic impasse, some new communists seek to “begin again at the beginning” by playing the role of underlaborer to the new practices of the new proletarians struggling against the new antagonisms:

“As soon as mass action opposes state coercion in the name of egalitarian justice, rudiments or fragments of the hypothesis start to appear,” writes Badiou, who also talks of “organizing new types of political processes among the poor and working masses.” Others do not even reach the level of vagueness. Instead, they resolve the strategic impasse by mere rhetoric. Gianni Vattimo sees a communist future in “an undisciplined social practice which shares with anarchism the refusal to formulate a system, a constitution, [or] a positive ‘realistic’ model according to traditional political methods.” Instead, Vattimo thinks that “communism must have the courage to be a ‘ghost’” . . . whatever that means. And what sense can we make of these effusions of Jean-Luc Nancy?: “The common means space, spacing, distance and proximity, separation and encounter. But this ‘meaning’ is not a meaning. It opens precisely beyond any meaning. To that extent, it is allowed to say that ‘communism’ has no meaning, goes beyond meaning: here, where we are.”

Finally, the refusal to face up to the criminal record of actually existing communism as a social system, let alone stare into that abyss until one’s politics and theory are utterly reshaped by it, tells us that the new communism remains within the orbit of leftist totalitarianism. These evasions take several forms.

First, for all the talk of new beginnings, new communists often deploy what Louis Althusser mockingly called “quotes from famous people” as a substitute for serious social science. For example, Zizek argues that “one should shamelessly repeat the lesson of Lenin’s *State and Revolution*” (as if the book holds the lessons, not the history). And Toscano makes the case for “communist equality” by simply repeating phrases from Marx’s 1875 *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. Second, a bleaching language is employed to redescribe mass murder. Thus, there were “many restrictions on freedom” under Stalin, mumbles Gianni Vattimo. Third, a hollow rhetoric of resurrection is deployed to market the idea of leftist revival: “communism is rising from its grave once again,” celebrates Zizek. Fourth, the new communists like to change the subject—from the crimes of communist regimes to the “long history of struggles, dreams, and aspirations that are tied to [communism].” So, Jacques Rancière is able to write that “communism is thinkable for us as the tradition created around a number of moments . . . when simple workers and ordinary men and women . . . struggle.” For its millions of victims, of course, it is thinkable as something else. Fifth, there is a brazen promotion of evasion as a virtue. The “culture of memory” is right-wing, accord-

ing to Bruno Bosteels, so it must be combated by “active forgetfulness;” Badiou declares that “the period of guilt is over”—as if it ever started. About criticism of Stalin and other communist leaders, he warns that it is “vital not to give any ground in the context of criminalization and hair-raising anecdotes in which the forces of reaction have tried to wall them up and invalidate them.” Sixth, definitional fiat is used to ward off criticism. Thus Zizek: “There can be a socialist anti-Semitism, there cannot be a communist one. (If it appears otherwise, as in Stalin’s last years, it is only as an indicator of a lack of fidelity to the revolutionary event.)”

As for the extraordinarily rich tradition of liberal and left-wing antitotalitarian thought, it is simply evaded in toto. From Claude Lefort, Pierre Rosanvallon, and François Furet to Norberto Bobbio, Max Shachtman, and Irving Howe, it is never seriously engaged. Zizek mockingly titled one of his books *Did Someone Say Totalitarianism?* Typically, Badiou abused Jon Halliday and Jung Chang’s magnificent biography of his hero Mao in the language of the thug-commissar: “a piece of propaganda, completely mendacious, perfidious, and devoid of all interest.”

Indeed, new communism seems to repeat every theoretical disaster of old communism. It is profoundly elitist, rehabilitating the Jacobin notion of the educational dictatorship. Zizek argues that the mistake of the left was to accept “the basic coordinates of liberal democracy (‘democracy’ versus ‘totalitarianism’)” and suggests that we “fearlessly . . . violate these liberal taboos,” adding, “So what if one is accused of being ‘anti-democratic,’ ‘totalitarian’ . . . ?”

When it tries to make the turn from ethereal philosophy to practical politics, the new communism is mostly a cult of force committed to magical thinking about the transformational power of revolutionary violence and expropriation. The late Italian socialist Sebastiano Timpanaro once called this the “brutal ethics of force.” Thus Badiou: “Oh, we ought to be able to say once more what Aragon, with the encouragement of Stalin, once said: ‘Open fire on the dancing bears of Social Democracy!’” Thus Zizek: “Revolutionary politics is not a matter of

opinions but of the truth on behalf of which one often is compelled to disregard the ‘opinion of the majority’ and to impose the revolutionary will against it.”

The democratic socialist Eduard Bernstein issued a warning at the turn of the nineteenth century to his fellow Marxists. The danger of a “truly miraculous belief in the creative power of force,” he prophesied, is that you begin by doing violence to reality in theory, and end by doing violence to people in practice. What distinguishes the new communism is that its leading partisans are fully aware of that potential. . . . and embrace it as a strategy. As Zizek puts it:

The only “realistic” prospect is to ground a new political universality by opting for the impossible, fully assuming the place of the exception, with no taboos, no a priori norms (“human rights,” “democracy”), respect for which would prevent us from “resignifying” terror, the ruthless exercise of power, the spirit of sacrifice . . . if this radical choice is decried by some bleeding-heart liberals as Linksfaschismus [left-wing fascism], so be it!

This flirtation with the notion of left-fascism helps explain why the new communism needs to be taken seriously. Communism itself, of course, is dead. But when Zizek recommends the “insight” of the 1970s Baader-Meinhof gang that “in an epoch in which the masses are totally immersed in capitalist ideological torpor . . . only a resort to the raw Real of direct violence . . . can awaken them,” we should be concerned. Recent history tells us that authoritarian philosophical and political ideas can still find their way to the streets in advanced capitalist societies. The new communist ideas might yet connect with the young, the angry, and the idealistic who are confronted by a profound economic crisis in the context of an exhausted social democracy and a self-loathing intellectual culture. Tempting as it is, we can’t afford to just shake our heads at the new communism and pass on by.

—*World Affairs Journal*, May/June 2012

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 P.O. 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. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.

# Obama State Department Grants Visa to Castro's Daughter

by Humberto Fontova

A top apparatchik of the only regime in the Western Hemisphere to herd thousands of men and boys into forced labor camps at Soviet-bayonet point for the crime of fluttering their eyelashes, flapping their hands, and talking with a lisp was just granted a US visa to lecture Americans on “Gay Rights.”

“Work Will Make Men Out of You” read the sign at the Cuban prison-camp’s gate, right over the barbed wire and next to the machine gunners posted on the watchtowers. The initials for these camps were UMAP, not GULAG, but the conditions were quite similar.

The venue for her sermon on freedom and civil rights by Raul Castro’s Stalinist daughter Mariela to Americans will be a panel on “sexual diversity” at a conference organized by the Latin American Studies Association in San Francisco running from May 23-26.

From San Francisco this apparatchik for the only regime in the Western Hemisphere to fuel bonfires with Orwell’s *Animal Farm* and jail librarians for stocking it travels to the New York Public Library to lecture Americans on artistic freedom. “I plead with Fidel Castro (Mariela’s uncle) and his government (today headed by Mariela’s father) to immediately take their hands off the independent librarians and release all those librarians in prison, and to send them back into Cuban culture to inform the people.” This was a public plea during the keynote speech at the American Library Association’s annual convention in 2005 by Fahrenheit 451 author Ray Bradbury, no less.

Instead of heeding Bradbury, for the crime of stocking some of the world’s bestselling books, the regime Mariela Castro represents condemned Cuban librarians to prison terms similar to the one a South African judge handed Nelson Mandela for planting bombs in public places. “As to the disposition of the books, magazines, and pamphlets they are to be destroyed by means of incineration because they lack usefulness,” ruled the Castroite “judge.” In addition to Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, the flames were fueled by titles from Martin Luther King and Jose Marti, Cuba’s George Washington.

As soon as she became of age, Mariela Castro became a faithful apparatchik of the regime that jailed political

prisoners at a higher rate than Stalin during the Great Terror, murdered more Cubans than Hitler murdered Germans during the Night of Long Knives, craved to incite a worldwide Nuclear war, and in the process converted a nation with a higher per-capita income than half of Europe into one that repels Haitians.

Many will say: “get with the program you Republican Cuban-American crackpots! Let Castroite by-gones be by-gones!”

This saying will issue mostly from people who also say that the grandchildren of folks born in Poland, Italy, and Ireland after slavery was abolished in the US must be legally-bound to pay reparations to the victims of US slavery. The great-great-great grandchildren of folks who came to these shores as indentured servants from Scotland and England must also pay reparations, according to many prominent American Castrophiles, take Charles Rangel and Jesse Jackson (please!).

In fact, it was only a little over a year ago that the oldest gay-rights organization in Latin America took the Castro regime to the International Court of Justice in The Hague for “crimes against humanity.”

We wonder if this will come up in San Francisco or New York?

As usual the venue for this State Sponsor of Terrorism (as designated by the US State Department) to insult and damage the US is being challenged mostly by a tiny portion of Americans.

Here’s a high official of the regime that denounces the US as “the great enemy of mankind!” that (twice) tried to nuke the US, that tried to incinerate and entomb thousands of New York Holiday shoppers, whose spies managed the deepest penetration of the US Defense Department in modern history, and on and on—and as usual, the venue given this official to further damage America is being challenged mostly by Americans of Cuban heritage. And these point not only to the ethical problems with the visa—but also the legal ones. To wit:

From Congressman David Rivera: “It is a cause for great concern that the US State Department has granted a visa that allows Mariela Castro to visit the United States. The State Department’s decision sends a message that is contradictory to established US policy—specifically Presidential Proclamation 5377—which suspends the entry of officers and employees of the Cuban dictatorship and the Cuban Communist Party into the United States. The State Department should not be putting out the welcome mat for officials from countries that have officially been designated as state sponsors of terrorism.”

From Senator Marco Rubio: “(Mariela) Castro rep-

resents an arm of the Castro regime . . . I think the US government's decision to grant the daughter of Raul Castro a visa to come to the United States and spread the propaganda of her father's regime is outrageous and an enormous mistake. It is shameful that they would grant that visa."

From Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen: "I would like to focus . . . on the appalling open-door policy that the Administration appears to have adopted for (Cuban) regime officials and operatives. We're talking agents of a regime that seeks to destabilize our democratic partners in our Hemisphere, and agents of a dictatorship that has a long-standing alliance with the Iranian regime."

From Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart: "The administration's appalling decision to allow regime agents into the US directly contradicts Congressional intent and longstanding US foreign policy,"

As usual, it's apparently "a Cuban thing." One of those "you had to be there" things. Meaning: if you or your parents had "been there," as subjects of Castro-Stalinism or freedom-fighter against it. Then "been there" as the US granted you freedom . . . well, there's just something about the experience that makes one recognize "American exceptionalism" as a throat-lumping truism rather than as a phrase for liberals to snicker at.

There's also something about it that provokes an instinctive protest against granting a Stalinist regime's apparatus a visa for the purpose of insulting and damaging your adopted country.

—Townhall.com, May 20, 2012

---

## Raul Castro's Daughter Endorses Obama

by Humberto Fontova

"If I were a US citizen I'd vote for Obama for president," boasted Mariela Castro during her San Francisco conference last week. "I think he is sincere, I think he speaks from the heart." To cheers and applause from the San Franciscan crowd, Raul Castro's daughter also proclaimed that "what we want is the power of emancipation through socialism."

Last year, former Democratic president Jimmy Carter thoroughly charmed Mariela's father and uncle in Havana.

"We greeted each other as old friends," gushed Carter regarding his meeting with Fidel Castro.

"In 2002, we received him warmly," reciprocated Castro. "Now, I reiterated to him our respect and esteem."

"Jimmy Carter was the best of all US Presidents," gushed Raul Castro while seeing his American guest off personally and jovially.

In fact, for many prominent Democrats, Castro's Cuba resembles the very Land of Oz, with Cubans laughing the days away. If this sounds hyperbolic, here's "Conscience of the Democratic Party" George McGovern after a visit to Cuba in 1975: "Everywhere we were surrounded by laughing children who obviously loved Fidel."

Here's the late Frank Mankiewics, a lifelong Democratic factotum, who served as campaign chairman for presidential candidate George McGovern, press secretary for Senator Robert Kennedy, and as head of NPR from 1977-1983. Mankiewics was greatly impressed by "the enthusiasm and unity of the Cuban people . . . they are proud of their accomplishments and sing songs about themselves and their country that reflect this self-pride."

Mariela's uncle Fidel ringingly endorsed Obama the first time around, while greatly fearing for the Democratic candidate's life. "A profound racism exists in the US," Fidel revealed in an essay dated October 2008. "It's a miracle that the Democratic candidate (Obama) has not suffered the fate of other Americans who dreamed of equality and justice like Malcolm X and Martin Luther King."

For the record: Fidel Castro, forcibly overthrew a black Cuban head of state (Fulgencio Batista) and replaced his government with one where only nine percent of the ruling Stalinist party is black and where the prison population is 80-90 percent black. He jailed the longest suffering black political prisoner of modern history (Eusebio Penalver who suffered longer in Castro's dungeon than Nelson Mandela suffered in South Africa's). He sentenced other blacks (Dr. Elias Biscet, Jorge Antunez) to 20 year sentences essentially for quoting Martin Luther King Jr. in a public square.

And Chris Matthews isn't alone in swooning over Obama's charisma, verbal agility, and smarts. Fidel's leg also tingles: "(Obama) has a habit of looking at his adversary with serenity and laughing at the verbal gaffes of an opponent who looks blankly into space," continued Castro's endorsement, where he also denounced McCain as "a habitual liar, who lacks an ethical code and is an instrument of the 'Miami Mafia'" (i.e. overwhelmingly Republican Cuban-Americans.)

Castro lamented the "brutal measures" the Bush administration had adopted during "the capitalist crisis" of that time, because these, he said, would "provoke more

inflation, more devaluation, and more loss of markets.” A McCain victory would be “economically disastrous” because “he knows nothing about economic complications.”

For the record: Fidel Castro converted a nation with a higher per capita income than half of Europe, the lowest inflation rate in the Western hemisphere, and a huge influx of immigrants into one that provoked an exodus of 20 percent of her population against enormous odds and at the cost of their every possession. And this after Castro’s fiefdom was lavished with Soviet subsidies that totaled almost ten Marshall Plans (into a nation of 6.5 million). This economic feat defies not only the laws of economics but seemingly the very laws of physics.

Actually, Castroites have been associates of Obama’s associates for decades. “I have been affiliated with the Cuba Council of Churches since the 1980s,” boasted Rev. Jeremiah Wright in a sermon on July 16, 2006. “I have several close Cuban friends who work with the Cuba Council of Churches and you have heard me preach about our affiliation and the Black Theology Project’s trips to Cuba. The Cuban Council of Churches has been a non-partisan global mission partner for decades. I have worked with them for two decades.”

“Non-partisan,” Reverend Wright? Not according to Cuban intelligence defector Juan Vives, who from hands-on experience reports that the Cuba Council of Churches is in fact an arm of Cuba’s ICAP (Instituto Cubano de Amistad con los Pueblos), itself an arm of Cuba’s DGI, Cuba’s secret police, founded and mentored by the KGB and East German STASI. The ICAP’s long-time chieftain was Rene Cruz Rodriguez, perhaps one of Reverend Jeremiah Wright’s “friends.”

Rodriguez’ meteoric rise through Cuba’s Stalinist bureaucracy was facilitated by his diligence as an early executioner, often beating out Che Guevara and Raul Castro themselves in his zeal to shatter the firing-squad victims’ skulls with a coup d’ grace from his .45. Here’s dramatic proof of Rene Cruz Rodriguez’s zeal as a Castroite officer.

—FrontPageMagazine.com, May 30, 2012

## Obama Lunges Toward Global Government

by Phyllis Schlafly

One of the biggest issues in the November election is whether we will continue or stop President Obama’s move toward restricting US sovereignty and rushing down the road to global governance. One would think that the obvious failure of the European Union and disdain for the euro would put the skids on global integration, but no such luck.

Obama has such delusions of his own power that he thinks he can do by executive order whatever he cannot get Congress to approve, even Harry Reid’s Democratic Senate. Obama’s most recent executive order starts off with the extravagant claim that it is issued “by the authority vested in me as president by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America.”

On the contrary, the president is not vested with the authority asserted in Executive Order 13563, which locks us into a worldwide regulatory system and thereby gives up a huge slice of US economic and environmental sovereignty. The proclaimed purpose is to globally harmonize regulations on environmental, trade, and even legislative processes.

This executive order is larded with globalist gobble-dygook about the obligation of our regulatory system to “protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.” Those pie-in-the-sky goodies are designed to benefit “an increasingly global economy,” rather than the United States.

The executive order specifies that this new “international regulatory cooperation” will function “particularly in emerging technology areas.” That’s an open door for dangerous mischief in sensitive areas that the new global busybodies might get into, and it will probably give Communist China the opportunity to steal more of our technology.

### 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](http://www.schwarzreport.org). This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

The crux of the purpose for this tremendous assumption of presidential power is to establish a “regulatory plan” and “reforms” of “significant regulations that address unnecessary differences in regulatory requirements between the United States and its major trading partners.” Wow! Will we be harmonizing US regulations with Communist China, one of our biggest trading partners?

Do you remember Cass Sunstein, Obama’s regulatory czar who became famous for saying that the government “owns the rights to body parts of people who are dead or in certain hopeless conditions, and it can remove their organs without asking anyone’s permission,” and bow wow, that dogs are entitled to have lawyers to sue humans in court? He has recently emerged to publish an op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal* enthusiastically supporting Obama’s global regulatory harmonization.

Maybe Sunstein will try to harmonize our dog-food regulations with China, whose dog food just sickened 1,000 US dogs. Maybe Sunstein will find a way to harmonize US production of electronic parts for our military aircraft with the 1,800 cases of counterfeit parts Communist China sold to our military.

Obama’s executive order creates a “working group” to issue a “regulatory plan” and “guidelines” that will “operate on consensus.” That’s the favorite United Nations procedure of reducing the power of the United States in international confabs.

Former President George W. Bush had dreams of harmonizing our regulations with those of Canada and Mexico as a stepping stone to creating a North American Union. He set up a bunch of working groups in the Commerce Department under the name Security and Prosperity Partnership.

But Bush’s three-country plan was not acceptable to Americans who value our independence and not global enough for Obama, who is eager to turn us into world citizens under global governance. After Obama was elected, SPP closed down and deleted its website.

The next step of the global governance lobby is likely to be a push for US acceptance of the United Nations’ demand for a global tax on all financial transactions “to offset the costs of the enduring economic, financial, fuel, climate, and food crises and to protect basic human rights.” That’s on the agenda for the U.N. Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro this month known as Rio-plus 20.

Don’t expect any benefit to the United States. The real purpose is to reduce our standard of living by transferring US wealth to dictators all around the world.

In one of Obama’s most revealing moments, he was caught on an open mike in Seoul, South Korea, telling Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, “This is my last election. After my election I have more flexibility.”

Obama’s clear meaning was that he is prepared to cave in to Russian demands on missile defense after his re-election but needs more “space” until then. Medvedev responded, “I understand. I will transmit this information to Vladimir (Putin).”

If you think Obama has already gotten away with unconstitutional actions, his second term can take us over the cliff and make us targets for countries that threaten us with nuclear missiles.

—Townhall.com, June 9, 2012

## Time is Running Out . . .

to register for Summit Ministries Student Conferences.

There is limited space for the last 2 Colorado sessions, but plenty of space for the Tennessee session. Visit [www.summit.org/conferences/student](http://www.summit.org/conferences/student) or call 719-685-9103 to secure your spot today.

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

Check out our blog at:

[www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com](http://www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com)