



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 52, Number 11

November 2012

Crony Capitalism

by Charles G. Koch

“We didn’t build this business—somebody else did.”

So reads a sign outside a small roadside craft store in Utah. The message is clearly tongue-in-cheek. But if it hung next to the corporate offices of some of our nation’s big financial institutions or auto makers, there would be no irony in the message at all.

It shouldn’t surprise us that the role of American business is increasingly vilified or viewed with skepticism. In a Rasmussen poll conducted this year, 68% of voters said they “believe government and big business work together against the rest of us.”

Businesses have failed to make the case that government policy—not business greed—has caused many of our current problems. To understand the dreadful condition of our economy, look no further than mandates such as the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac “affordable housing” quotas, directives such as the Community Reinvestment Act, and the Federal Reserve’s artificial, below-market interest-rate policy.

Far too many businesses have been all too eager to lobby for maintaining and increasing subsidies and mandates paid by taxpayers and consumers. This growing partnership between business and government is a destructive force, undermining not just our economy and our political system, but the very foundations of our culture.

With partisan rhetoric on the rise this election season, it’s important to remind ourselves of what the role of business in a free society really is—and even more important, what it is not.

The role of business is to provide products and services that make people’s lives better—while using fewer resources—and to act lawfully and with integrity. Businesses that do this through voluntary exchanges not only benefit through increased profits, they bring better and more competitively priced goods and services to market. This creates a win-win situation for customers and companies alike.

Only societies with a system of economic freedom create widespread prosperity. Studies show that the poorest people in the most-free societies are 10 times better off than the poorest in the least-free. Free societies also bring about greatly improved outcomes in life expectancy, literacy, health, the environment, and other important dimensions.

So why isn’t economic freedom the “default setting” for our economy? What upsets this productive state of affairs? Trouble begins whenever businesses take their eyes off the needs and wants of consumers—and instead cast longing glances on government and the favors it can bestow. When currying favor with Washington is seen as a much easier way to make money, businesses inevitably begin to compete with rivals in securing government largess, rather than in winning customers.

We have a term for this kind of collusion between business and government. It used to be known as rent-seeking. Now we call it cronyism. Rampant cronyism threatens the economic foundations that have made this the most prosperous country in the world.

We are on dangerous terrain when government picks winners and losers in the economy by subsidizing favored products and industries. There are now businesses and entire industries that exist solely as a result of federal patronage. Profiting from government instead of earning profits in the economy, such businesses can continue to succeed even if they are squandering resources and making products that people wouldn’t ordinarily buy.

Because they have the advantage of an uneven playing field, crony businesses can drive their legitimate competitors out of business. But in the longer run, they are unsustainable and unable to compete internationally (unless, of course,

the government handouts are big enough). At least the Solyndra boondoggle ended when it went out of business.

By subsidizing and mandating politically favored products in the energy sector (solar, wind, and biofuels, some of which benefit Koch Industries), the government is pushing up energy prices for all of us—five times as much in the case of wind-generated electricity. And by putting resources to less-efficient use, cronyism actually kills jobs rather than creating them. Put simply, cronyism is remaking American business to be more like government. It is taking our most productive sectors and making them some of our least.

The effects on government are equally distorting—and corrupting. Instead of protecting our liberty and property, government officials are determining where to send resources based on the political influence of their cronies. In the process, government gains even more power and the ranks of bureaucrats continue to swell.

Subsidies and mandates are just two of the privileges that government can bestow on politically connected friends. Others include grants, loans, tax credits, favorable regulations, bailouts, loan guarantees, targeted tax breaks, and no-bid contracts. Government can also grant monopoly status, barriers to entry, and protection from foreign competition.

Whatever form these privileges take, Americans are rightly suspicious of the cronyism that substitutes political influence for free markets. According to Rasmussen, two-thirds of the electorate are convinced that crony connections explain most government contracts—and that federal money will be wasted “if the government provides funding for a project that private investors refuse to back.” Some 71% think “private sector companies and investors are better than government officials at determining the long-term benefits and potential of new technologies.” Only 11% believe “government officials have a better eye for future value.”

To end cronyism we must end government’s ability to dole out favors and rig the market. Far too many well-connected businesses are feeding at the federal trough. By addressing corporate welfare as well as other forms of welfare, we would add a whole new level of understanding to the notion of entitlement reform.

If America re-establishes the proper role of business in society, all kinds of benefits will accrue. Our economy will rebound. Our liberties will be restored. And when President Obama tells an entrepreneur “You didn’t build that,” everyone will know better.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, September 10, 2012, p. A19

Liberals, Progressives, and Socialists

by Walter E. Williams

In Europe, especially in Germany, hoisting a swastika-emblazoned Nazi flag is a crime. For decades after World War II, people have hunted down and sought punishment for Nazi murderers, who were responsible for the deaths of more than 20 million people.

Here’s my question: Why are the horrors of Nazism so well-known and widely condemned but not those of socialism and communism? What goes untaught—and possibly is covered up—is that socialist and communist ideas have produced the greatest evil in mankind’s history. You say, “Williams, what in the world are you talking about? Socialists, communists, and their fellow travelers, such as the Wall Street occupiers supported by our president, care about the little guy in his struggle for a fair shake! They’re trying to promote social justice.” Let’s look at some of the history of socialism and communism.

What’s not appreciated is that Nazism is a form of socialism. In fact, the term Nazi stands for the National Socialist German Workers’ Party. The unspeakable acts of Adolf Hitler’s Nazis pale in comparison to the horrors committed by the communists in the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People’s Republic of China. Between 1917 and 1987, Vladimir Lenin, Josef Stalin, and their successors murdered and were otherwise responsible for the deaths of 62 million of their own people. Between 1949 and 1987, China’s communists, led by Mao Zedong and his successors, murdered and were otherwise responsible for the deaths of 76 million Chinese. The most authoritative tally of history’s most murderous regimes is documented on University of Hawaii Professor Rudolph J. Rummel’s website here, and in his book *Death by Government*.

How much hunting down and punishment have there been for these communist murderers? To the contrary, it’s acceptable both in Europe and in the U.S. to hoist and march under the former USSR’s red flag emblazoned with a hammer and sickle. Mao Zedong has long been admired by academics and leftists across our country, as they often marched around singing the praises of Mao and waving his little red book, *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung*. President Barack Obama’s communications director, Anita Dunn, in her June 2009 commencement address to St. Andrews Episcopal High School at Washington National Cathedral, said Mao was one of her heroes.

Whether it's the academic community, the media elite, stalwarts of the Democratic Party, or organizations such as the NAACP, the National Council of La Raza, Green for All, the Sierra Club, and the Children's Defense Fund, there is a great tolerance for the ideas of socialism—a system that has caused more deaths and human misery than all other systems combined.

Today's leftists, socialists, and progressives would bristle at the suggestion that their agenda differs little from those of Nazi, Soviet, and Maoist mass murderers. One does not have to be in favor of death camps or wars of conquest to be a tyrant. The only requirement is that one has to believe in the primacy of the state over individual rights.

The unspeakable horrors of Nazism didn't happen overnight. They were simply the end result of a long evolution of ideas leading to consolidation of power in central government in the quest for "social justice." It was decent but misguided earlier generations of Germans—who would have cringed at the thought of genocide—who created the Trojan horse for Hitler's ascendancy. Today's Americans are similarly accepting the massive consolidation of power in Washington in the name of social justice.

If you don't believe it, just ask yourself: Which way are we headed tiny steps at a time—toward greater liberty or toward more government control over our lives?

Perhaps we think that we are better human beings than the German people who created the conditions that brought Hitler to power. I say, don't count on it.

—townhall.com, August 8, 2012

Obama's College Classmate

by Wayne Allyn Root

Barack Hussein Obama is no fool. He is not incompetent. To the contrary, he is brilliant. He knows exactly what he's doing. He is purposely overwhelming the US economy to create systemic failure. Economic crisis and social chaos—thereby destroying capitalism and our country from within. Barack Hussein Obama was my college classmate—Columbia University, class of '83. He is a devout Muslim do not be fooled. Look at his Czars—anti-business, anti-American. As Glenn Beck correctly predicted from day one, Barack Hussein Obama is following the plan of Cloward & Piven, two professors at Columbia University. They outlined a plan to socialize America by overwhelming the system with government spending and entitlement demands. Add up the clues

below. Taken individually they're alarming. Taken as a whole, it is a brilliant, Machiavellian game plan to turn the United States into a Socialist/Marxist state with a permanent majority that desperately needs government for survival . . . and can be counted on to always vote for bigger government. Why not? They have no responsibility to pay for it.

Universal Health Care. The health care bill had very little to do with health care. It had everything to do with unionizing millions of hospital and health care workers, as well as adding 15,000 to 20,000 new IRS agents (who will join government employee unions). Obama doesn't care that giving free health care to 30 million Americans will add trillions to the national debt. What he does care about is that it cements the dependence of those 30 million voters to Democrats and big government. Who, but a socialist revolutionary, would pass this reckless spending bill in the middle of a depression?

Cap & Trade. Like health care legislation having nothing to do with health care, Cap & Trade has nothing to do with global warming. It has everything to do with redistribution of income, with government in control of the economy and a criminal payoff to Obama's biggest contributors. Those powerful and wealthy unions and contributors (like GE, which owns NBC, MSNBC, and CNBC) can then be counted on to support everything Obama wants. They will kick-back hundreds of millions of dollars in contributions to Obama and the Democratic Party to keep them in power. The bonus is that all the new taxes on Americans with bigger cars, bigger homes, and businesses helps Obama "spread the wealth around."

Make Puerto Rico a state. Why? Who's asking for a 51st state? Who's asking for millions of new welfare recipients and government entitlement addicts in the middle of a depression? Certainly not American taxpayers. But this has been Barack Hussein Obama's plan all along. His goal is to add two new Democrat senators, five Democrat congressman and a million loyal Democratic voters who are dependent on big government.

Legalize 12 million illegal Mexican immigrants. Just giving these 12 million potential new citizens free health care alone could overwhelm the system and bankrupt America. But it adds 12 million reliable new Democrat voters who can be counted on to support big government. Add another few trillion dollars in welfare, aid to dependent children, food stamps, free medical, education, tax credits for the poor, and eventually Social Security.

Stimulus and bailouts. Where did all that money go? It went to Democrat contributors, organizations (ACORN),

and unions—including billions of dollars to save or create jobs of government employees across the country. It went to save GM and Chrysler so that their employees could keep paying union dues. It went to AIG so that Goldman Sachs could be bailed out (after giving Obama almost \$1 million in contributions). A staggering \$125 billion went to teachers (thereby protecting their union dues). All those public employees (unions) will vote loyally Democrat to protect their bloated salaries and pensions that are bankrupting America.

The country goes broke, future generations face a bleak future, but Obama, the Democrat Party, government, and the unions grow more powerful. The ends justify the means.

Raise taxes on small business owners, high-income earners, and job creators. Put the entire burden on only the top 20 percent of taxpayers, redistribute the income, punish success, and reward those who did nothing to deserve it (except vote for Obama).

Reagan wanted to dramatically cut taxes in order to starve the government. Barack Obama wants to dramatically raise taxes to starve his political opposition. With the acts outlined above, Barack Hussein Obama and his regime have created a vast and rapidly expanding constituency of voters dependent on big government; a vast privileged class of public employees (unions) who work for big government; and a government dedicated to destroying capitalism and installing themselves as socialist rulers by overwhelming the system. Add it up and you've got the perfect Marxist scheme—all devised by my Columbia University college classmate Barack Hussein Obama using the Cloward and Piven Plan.

—conservativedailynews.com, February 10, 2012

Don't miss a minute of the news and
analysis by David Noebel.
Check out our blog at:

www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com

“Abortion? The more the merrier. Bring it on. Half the speakers onstage at the Democratic convention would gladly have performed partial-brith abortion on audience volunteers, of whom there would have been no shortage.” —Mark Steyn, *National Review*, October 1, 2012, p. 52

Abortion and the Bogus Arguments from Gender Entitlement and Body

Autonomy

by Dr. Michael Bauman

I begin with the obvious:

Gender is not a qualification for having an opinion or for making a valid argument. Whether or not you have a vagina (or a penis) does not make your view either insightful or erroneous. The quality of your case, not the nature of your genitalia, determines whether or not what you say is valid and true. There is no gender entitlement regarding reason or morality. Women have been known sometimes to be right and sometimes to be wrong. So, exactly, have men. The validity and truthfulness of their views was not determined by their gender, but by the quality of their case. Gender entitlement to morality and to logic is a fallacy, as is gender disqualification.

No responsible textbook in logic teaches you to check the gender of the arguer in order to determine the validity of the argument. If two persons make the same argument, it is equally valid or equally true in both cases, regardless if, in the first instance, a male made it and if, in the second, a female did so. The arguer is not the point; the argument is.

Yet, in the face of all reason, some pro-abortionists say that only a woman is entitled to determine if abortion is right or wrong, even though gender is no guarantee of validity, truth, or goodness. Just because you are a woman,

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.

it does not mean you are right. That view is indefensible. After all, if being a woman means that you are right, and if one woman says that abortion is an issue to be decided only by a woman and another woman says it is an issue to be decided by males as well, they both cannot be right. Reason precludes it. One woman, or both, made a mistake. Neither being correct nor being moral is a function of having the right chromosomes or gender.

And don't say that you can do whatever you want with your body or to your body, and that merely because it is your body that your choices regarding it are right. The fact that you make a choice regarding your body does not grant morality to your action or validity to your case, especially if your choice is to use your body to kill another body, as is always—always—the case in abortion. In abortion another body dies. Autonomy is not morality, and body autonomy is an awful error. You cannot do whatever you wish either to your body or by your body and then assume, simply because it was yours, that you were right.

An action can be self-chosen and evil, just as it can be coerced and good. The fact that your body is involved does not alter that point in the least. For example, that the government compels you to drive slowly in a school zone does not make driving slowly in a school zone wrong, even though it is your body doing the driving and you say that what you do with your body is solely up to you and is therefore right because it is your body. The fact that you freely choose to drive 70 mph in a school zone does not make it moral, even though your own body did the driving and even if the government permits it.

Morality does not depend upon your gender, freedom, or body autonomy, but on the character of your action and the reason, if any, for your choice. And it does your case no good to claim that body autonomy is not the controlling factor in school zone speed limits because other bodies are involved. As a pro-choicer, you rejected that very notion regarding abortion and the other living bodies that are always involved. Regarding speed limits in school zones, you suspended invoking body autonomy when another living human body is involved, but now, in the face of all logical consistency, you invoke body autonomy with regard to abortion. If body autonomy is suspended when the life and safety of other human bodies is involved, then that is the case both with school zone speed limits and with abortion. In both cases, other human bodies, not just your own, are involved.

Further, even if no other body's health and safety were involved, it would not mean that your choice or your action were correct. In the case of suicide, killing your own body is to deprive your parents of a son or daughter, your

spouse of a husband or wife, your children of a mother or father, your neighbors of a friend, or your co-workers of an ally and an aid. You are not entitled to kill other folks' children, spouse, parent, neighbor, friend, or ally, even if it is you. Suicide is immoral, alleged body autonomy notwithstanding. Just because you claim it is your body, it does not mean you can do with it or to it whatever you wish.

Not only is the body autonomy crowd illogical and inconsistent, they also are question beggars. They simply assume that the body they have is theirs. Regarding who owns the body, they just assume that they do. But that is not how they operate in the rest of life. In the rest of life, regarding property rights, they think like this: If a woman makes something, say, a little red wagon, it is hers. She made it. It is hers by creation, and no one is entitled to take it from her. They also think that if a woman purchased an item, again, a little red wagon, it is hers. It is hers by purchase. Once she has paid for it, others must not take it. They think as well that we must not needlessly bespoil a woman of her domicile, even if she is a squatter or a pioneer. It's hers by occupation. She occupies it; she made it a home.

Like that woman, God too has property prerogatives. He made your body. It is His by creation. He bought you back from your bondage to sin and evil at the high price of the death of his own Son so that the body can participate in the Resurrection. You are His both by creation and purchase. Further, the Holy Spirit lives within you. You are His domicile. You are triply God's—by creation, by purchase, and by occupation. You are not your own, neither is "your" body. You and it are God's, and you cannot do with God's things whatever you wish, even if human law permits it. As a justification for abortion, body autonomy is out of court because neither you nor what you call your body are really yours.

On the fundamentally important question of "Is God relevant to ownership of this body?" the body autonomy crowd simply assumes He is not. They beg the question. They begin by assuming the body in question is theirs. If it is not, and I have just argued here that it is not, then the entire body autonomy presupposition upon which pro-choicers base their right to an abortion falls to the ground. If you want to discover if God has prerogatives over the things He made, purchased, and occupies, then you might wish to read carefully (1) both Testaments, (2) the history of apologetics regarding those Testaments, and (3) academically responsible theological essays on the body, like that from the late pope, John Paul II, and those by others.

High School Band Celebrates Communist Revolution

by Arnold Ahlert

A Pennsylvania high school has put together a rather startling halftime show for the school's football games. The New Oxford High School marching band has performed "St. Petersburg 1917," commemorating the Bolshevik Revolution that brought the communists to power and led to the formation of the Soviet Union. The band, which performed the piece at the Friday night football game on September 14th, wore olive-colored military-style uniforms, and carried red flags—along with giant hammers and sickles. "There is no reason for Americans to celebrate the Russian revolution," said an irate parent who alerted Fox News to the debacle. "I am sure the millions who died under Communism would not see the joy of celebrating the Russian revolution by a school 10 miles from Gettysburg."

The parent, who asked not to be identified, attended the game with his children. He was stunned by the halftime performance. "It was Glee meets the Russian Revolution," he told Fox. "I'm not kidding you. They had giant hammers and sickles and they were waving them around. Who thought this was a good idea?" he added.

Apparently the judges at the Cavalcade of Bands Association Inc. show at Manheim Township High School on Saturday, September 22nd did. They awarded the band first place in their category, according to District superintendent Rebecca Harbaugh, who spoke with Front Page regarding the controversy. She defended the band and the performance, emphasizing that it was not a "celebration" of communism, as some media outlets characterized it. Instead the performance was intended to "present the musical importance and the struggle during this turbulent time of world history," she insisted. "It was never intended to be a celebration," she added.

In an earlier story Harbaugh addressed the parent who complained, noting that she was "truly sorry that somebody took the performance in that manner, I am," she said. "If anything is being celebrated it's the music," she added. "It is what it is. I understand people look at something and choose how to interpret that and I'm just very sorry that it wasn't looked at as just a history lesson."

Paul Kengor, executive director for the Center for Vision & Values at Pennsylvania's Grove City College,

and author of *The Communist*, put that so-called history lesson in perspective. "The Bolshevik Revolution launched a global Communist revolution that, from 1917 through the 1990s, was responsible for the deaths of over a hundred million people . . . What the Russian revolution unleashed was a nightmare—a historical human catastrophe. This is something that should be condemned and not in any way commemorated or laughed at," he said.

Harbaugh told Front Page that the Conawago Valley School District was addressing the controversy. Part of that effort included removing the picture of band members posing with a large hammer and sickle from the band's website. That picture had been linked to many of the previous stories on this controversy. "The district decided to remove the picture to protect the students," said Harbaugh. "They're being caught in the cross-fire, and they've worked way too hard to put them in this position." When asked if the band would continue to perform the piece in its original format, Harbaugh said no. "The hammer and sickle will be replaced with traditional color guard band equipment," she said. As for the olive-green uniforms, "they will likely stay" she added.

So will the music of Soviet composer Dmitri Shostakovich.

Critics of the program were quick to point out the obvious parallels that could be drawn, ones virtually assured of garnering unanimous condemnation. "It would be tantamount to celebrating the music of 1935 Berlin," an offended parent said. "If I was Lithuanian, Estonian, or Ukrainian, I'd be a little hot. I'd be really hot. It's insulting to glorify something that doesn't need to be glorified in America." Another local expressed his opinion on Facebook. "I think the question is whether it is appropriate for a high school band to commemorate an event that led to unimaginable brutality of millions of Russian citizens. Stalin was just not a very nice guy. The tie to socialism is also a sore subject in this day and age," Brian Albin wrote.

Gerson Moreno-Riano, dean of Regent University's College of Arts & Sciences, addressed that brutality. "The Russian revolution was one of the most violent episodes of the 20th Century," he said. "Lenin put into place a doctrine of mass terror to crush the opposition and thousands and thousands of people were murdered. It's full of violence, terror, destruction and in some weeks thousands of people were executed—some thrown with rocks around their necks into the river to drown," he added.

The group photograph of the band posing with the hammer and sickle rankled him equally as much. "To raise the emblems of the hammer and sickle—the emblems of so much violence, destruction, and terror—is a lack of

knowledge of history,” he said. Or is it? “The worst case scenario is someone who is trying to celebrate something they know about—and they’re trying to insert this into their educational agenda,” he speculated.

It is unlikely that the adults involved here are ignorant of history. Yet it is quite likely the students are. A 2010 study done by National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reveals that American students’ knowledge of history is limited at best. “It’s worth noting that of the seven school subjects tested by NAEP, history has the smallest proportion of students who score Proficient or above in the most recent assessment available,” said Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch in a statement released in 2011. “The results of this assessment tell us that we as a nation must pay more attention to the teaching of US history.”

Make that history, period. Superintendent Harbaugh revealed that this program had been planned for a while. In fact, the band’s website, under the heading of “Band Camp 2012 Wrap-Up,” noted a performance of “St. Petersburg: 1917” took place before the football season began, and that “everyone is excited about the possibilities for the coming season. We hope to see you at a football game or competition sometime soon!” Yet somehow no one even anticipated the possibility that a bunch of high school kids marching in olive-green uniforms, and carrying hammers and sickles, would be offensive.

Unfortunately, that lack of anticipation is eminently plausible. Despite being one of the most brutal and oppressive ideologies ever inflicted upon mankind, communism has never provoked the same level of disgust that other oppressive ideologies, most notably Nazism, have. This pernicious double-standard is easily illuminated: is there any doubt whatsoever that a high school band, playing German music to express a “turbulent time in history”—even as they carried swastikas to represent that particular period of history—would be universally condemned?

It is a badly kept secret that communism, despite the fact that it is responsible for the deaths of ten times as many people as Nazism, retains a certain level of “chic” within the precincts of the American left. That attraction is motivated by leftist visions of a socialist utopian society,

despite the abject failure to achieve such a society time and time again throughout the course of history. It is also motivated by a gargantuan level of hubris: leftists remain convinced those failures can be primarily attributed to the idea that the “wrong people were in charge.” As a result, the American left was determined to pursue “detente” with the Soviet Union right up to its collapse.

Thus, it remains completely unsurprising that there are people who believe a marching band commemorating communism is indeed a “good idea.” And while such an effort ought to offend most Americans, it should also act as a reminder of something critically important: the battle for this nation’s heart and soul is not taking place in Washington, D.C. It is taking place in public school classrooms across this nation, and it is a battle the American left is determined to win—even if America’s children are given their “marching orders” in the process.

—frontpagemag.com, September 26, 2012

Bury Lenin

by Jeffrey Kuhner

Finally, Russians are considering burying Vladimir Lenin. Since his death in 1924, the Bolshevik leader’s embalmed body has been lying in a glass coffin in a mausoleum on Moscow’s Red Square. For many, he is the shining symbol of Soviet communism—a martyr to the utopian cause of socialist revolution. But he is the opposite—the embodiment of a murderous, totalitarian ideology responsible for the deaths of tens of millions. The issue is not whether he should be buried, but what has taken so long. This is Russia’s shame.

Russian authorities may finally be taking action. A story in *The Washington Times* by Marc Bennetts reported that Russia’s Culture Minister Vladimir Medinsky is contemplating whether to lay Lenin’s body to rest.

“I have always believed that a body should be entrusted to the earth,” Mr. Medinsky said. “And Lenin’s relatives begged the authorities not to place him in the mausoleum.”

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.

Lenin was not simply a prominent leader of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. He was its founder and driving political and intellectual force. Without him, the communist seizure of power would have been impossible. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Lenin's body should have been buried along with his failed communist regime.

Instead, as Mr. Bennetts points out, Lenin's tomb has become a shrine for many Russians still nostalgic about the Soviet empire. From Moscow to the Urals, the Bolshevik dictator is still revered. Rock bands, subway stations, libraries, regional administrations, statues, monuments—Lenin's name and image adorn them, signifying his continued prestige. The USSR is dead, but Lenin's cult of personality is alive and well.

This is why numerous Russians continue to oppose burying him. According to Andrei Vorobyov, a senior official in the ruling United Russia party, the issue is a "hot one." Even Mr. Medinsky thinks Lenin should be buried with "full state honors" and the Red Square mausoleum converted into a giant museum commemorating the Soviet past. Russian strongman Vladimir Putin uncharacteristically claims to be neutral on the issue, arguing the "people should decide."

The Russians should be ashamed of themselves. Lenin's shrine must go. But burying him with the pomp and ceremony accorded a state hero would be an insult to his countless victims. The idea reflects a profound moral sickness in modern Russia, an inability to confront the Soviet past.

Lenin was the architect of the greatest system of mass murder in history. He belongs alongside genocidal tyrants such as Josef Stalin, Mao Zedong, and Adolf Hitler. In fact, Lenin gave birth to both 20th-century communism and Nazism. Contrary to myth, he was not some misguided compassionate socialist whose ideals exceeded the reach of humanity. Rather, he was a ruthless despot who engineered one singular, malevolent, totalitarian state.

Lenin grabbed and maintained power by waging relentless war upon his domestic opponents, both real and imagined. He fused state terror with one-party rule in an unprecedented bid to completely transform every aspect of society. His goal was not just a proletarian revolution. It was to remake human nature itself—to create what he called the "new Soviet man." The socialist dream of human equality and liberation—of a new order without capitalism, nation-states, and religion—required omnipotent state control and wholesale social destruction.

The result was genocide—the deliberate extermination

of tens of millions of people. From 1917 until his death in 1924, Lenin established the Soviet empire through absolute brutality—the creation of the Cheka (the Bolshevik secret police and predecessor to the KGB), the confiscation and nationalization of all private property, the slaughter of millions of White Russians, and other enemies of the regime, a terror famine that systematically starved to death more than 5 million "kulaks" (small peasant landowners), the annihilation of countless Christian churches and priests, the savage repression of basic freedoms, the building of a vast network of gulags, and the imperial subjugation of numerous peoples yearning for their national independence. In short, Lenin erected the one-party totalitarian model later followed by Stalin, Hitler, and Mao.

Lenin's great sin—inherited from the Enlightenment—was that he viewed individuals as a means to an end, he never recognized or cared for their innate worth and dignity. He believed that a small ruling class of experts could reorder society to fit his ideological, socialist ambitions. For him, people were nothing more than pieces of clay to be molded into a futuristic, post-capitalist, post-Christian world. He was a revolutionary fanatic.

His Marxist offspring eventually would butcher nearly 100 million people in an insane attempt to fulfill Lenin's twisted goals. Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Romanians, Croats, Serbs, Chinese, Cubans, Nicaraguans, Cambodians, and Vietnamese—if one could pile up all the corpses killed by communism, they would reach the sky.

It is high time that Russians confront the dark reality of their Soviet past. Like Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia was more than an iron-fisted dictatorship. It was a totalitarian police state and expansionist empire based upon almost unspeakable atrocities. The Soviet hammer and sickle is the equivalent of the Nazi swastika.

Could anyone imagine Hitler's name being used—and revered—across Germany today? Or that a mausoleum with his embalmed body could lie at a major square in Berlin as a shrine for neo-Nazis? The very thought is disgusting, even unfathomable. Fascism's crimes rightly have been condemned. Those of communism, however, remain unredeemed, confined to the deep recesses of our collective historical memory. This must end.

Lenin was a dictator, a genocidal killer, and a war criminal. Bury this man—once and for all. And skip the state honors. He doesn't deserve them.

—*The Washington Times*, July 12, 2012