



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 53, Number 1

January 2013

You Americans are so gullible. No, you won't accept communism outright, but we'll keep feeding you small doses of socialism until you'll finally wake up and find you already have communism. We won't have to fight you. We'll so weaken your economy until you'll fall like overripe fruit into our hands."—Nikita Khrushchev, 1959

"In a Socialist society the trade unions play a fundamental role. . . . They attend to the protection of the immediate needs of the workers. . . . They are the great schools of Communism." —William Z. Foster, *Toward Soviet America*, New York: International Publishers, 1932, p. 291

"Under Communism the guiding principle will be 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.' That is, the distribution of life necessities—food, clothing, shelter, education, etc. will be free, without let or hinderance." —Foster, p. 129

## Obama's Soviet Mistake

by Xavier Lerma

Putin in 2009 outlined his strategy for economic success. Alas, poor Obama did the opposite but nevertheless was re-elected. Bye, bye Miss American Pie. The Communists have won in America with Obama but failed miserably in Russia with Zyuganov who only received 17% of the vote. Vladimir Putin was re-elected as President keeping the NWO order out of Russia while America continues to repeat the Soviet mistake.

After Obama was elected in his first term as president, the then Prime Minister of Russia, Vladimir Putin, gave a speech at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland in January of 2009. Ignored by the West as usual, Putin gave insightful and helpful advice to help the world economy and saying the world should avoid the Soviet mistake.

Recently, Obama has been re-elected for a 2nd term by an illiterate society, and he is ready to continue his lies of less taxes while he raises them. He gives speeches of peace and love in the world while he promotes wars as he did in Egypt, Libya, and Syria. He plans his next war with Iran as he fires or demotes his generals who get in the way.

Putin said regarding the military, ". . . instead of solving the problem, militarization pushes it to a deeper level. It draws away from the economy immense financial and material resources, which could have been used much more efficiently elsewhere."

Well, any normal individual understands that as true, but liberalism is a psychosis. O'bomber even keeps the war going along the Mexican border with projects like "fast and furious" and there is still no sign of ending it. He is a Communist without question promoting the Communist Manifesto without calling it so. How shrewd he is in America. His cult of personality mesmerizes those who cannot go beyond their ignorance. They will continue to follow him like those fools who still praise Lenin and Stalin in Russia. Obama's fools and Stalin's fools share the same drink of illusion.

Reading Putin's speech without knowing the author, one would think it was written by Reagan or another conservative in America. The speech promotes smaller government and less taxes. It comes as no surprise to those who know Putin as a conservative. Vladimir Putin went on to say: ". . . we are reducing taxes on production, investing money in the economy. We are optimizing state expenses.

“The second possible mistake would be excessive interference into the economic life of the country and the absolute faith into the all-mightiness of the state.

“There are no grounds to suggest that by putting the responsibility over to the state, one can achieve better results.

“Unreasonable expansion of the budget deficit, accumulation of the national debt—are as destructive as an adventurous stock market game.

“During the time of the Soviet Union, the role of the state in economy was made absolute, which eventually lead to the total non-competitiveness of the economy. That lesson cost us very dearly. I am sure no one would want history to repeat itself.”

President Vladimir Putin could never have imagined anyone so ignorant or so willing to destroy their people like Obama, much less seeing millions vote for someone like Obama. They read history in America, don't they? Alas, the schools in the US were conquered by the Communists long ago and history was revised thus paving the way for their Communist presidents. Obama has bailed out those businesses that voted for him and increased the debt to over 16 trillion with an ever increasing unemployment rate especially among blacks and other minorities. All the while promoting his agenda.

“We must seek support in the moral values that have ensured the progress of our civilization. Honesty and hard work, responsibility and faith in our strength are bound to bring us success.”—Vladimir Putin

The red, white, and blue still flies happily but only in Russia. Russia still has St. George defeating the Dragon with the symbol of the cross on its flag. The ACLU and other atheist groups in America would never allow the US flag with such religious symbols. Lawsuits a plenty against religious freedom and expression in the land of the free. Christianity in the US is under attack as it was during the early period of the Soviet Union when religious symbols were against the law.

Let's give American voters the benefit of the doubt and say it was all voter fraud and not ignorance or stupidity in electing a man who does not even know what to do and refuses help from Russia when there was an oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Instead we'll say it's true that the Communists' usage of electronic voting was just a plan to manipulate the vote. Soros and his ownership of the company that counts the US votes in Spain helped put their puppet in power in the White House. According to the Huffington Post, residents in all 50 states have filed petitions to secede from the United States. We'll say that

these Americans are hostages to the Communists in power. How long will their government reign tyranny upon them?

Russia lost its civil war with the Reds and millions suffered torture and death for almost 75 years under the tyranny of the United Soviet Socialist Republic. Russians survived with a new and stronger faith in God and ever growing Christian Church. The question is how long will the once “Land of the Free” remain the United Socialist States of America? Their suffering has only begun. Bye bye Miss American Pie! You know the song, you hippies. Sing it! Don't you remember? The 1971 hit song by American song writer Don McLean:

“And, as I watched him on the stage my hands were clenched in fists of rage.

No angel born in Hell could break that Satan's spell  
And, as the flames climbed high into the night to light  
the sacrificial rite, I saw...

Satan laughing with delight the day the music died  
He was singing, bye bye Miss American Pie  
Drove my Chevy to the levee, but the levee was dry  
Them good ol' boys were drinking whiskey and rye,  
singing. . .

This'll be the day that I die  
This'll be the day that I die.”

So, the question remains:

How long will America suffer and to what depths?

---

## The Easy Way to Destroy Freedom

by Bill Muehlenberg

One need not be a hard-core Communist or anarchist to bring about the end to freedom and democracy—simply push for special rights for homosexuals, and all this happens quite readily. We have heaps of proof of this, and each new day we see more examples of how the militant homosexual agenda is spelling the end of faith, freedom, and family.

One simply has to look at where special rights for homosexuals—including marriage rights—have been in place to see all the destruction and mayhem already being unleashed. Simply consider the situation in just one country—Canada, where special rights for homosexuals have been given for quite some time now, and homosexual

marriage has been legal since 2005.

What is happening there is simply shocking, and we now can see perfectly well just how undemocratic and totalitarian the homosexual agenda really becomes once it is enacted into law. The situation in Canada is very bleak indeed, and getting worse by the day.

Two lengthy articles have recently appeared which document the loss of freedom and the erosion of democracy in Canada thanks to the homosexual militants and their supporters amongst the social and political elites. It makes for scary reading, but it needs to be made widely known.

The first piece by Michael Coren is worth quoting at length. He reports, “It’s estimated that, in less than five years, there have been between 200 and 300 proceedings—in courts, human-rights commissions, and employment boards—against critics and opponents of same-sex marriage. And this estimate doesn’t take into account the casual dismissals that surely have occurred.

“In 2011, for example, a well-known television anchor on a major sports show was fired just hours after he tweeted his support for ‘the traditional and TRUE meaning of marriage.’ He had merely been defending a hockey player’s agent who was receiving numerous death threats and other abuse for refusing to support a pro-gay-marriage campaign. The case is still under appeal, in human-rights commissions and, potentially, the courts.

“The Roman Catholic bishop of Calgary, Alberta, Fred Henry, was threatened with litigation and charged with a human-rights violation after he wrote a letter to local churches outlining standard Catholic teaching on marriage. He is hardly a reactionary—he used to be known as ‘Red Fred’ because of his support for the labor movement—but the archdiocese eventually had to settle with the complainants to avoid an embarrassing and expensive trial.

“In the neighboring province of Saskatchewan, another case illustrates the intolerance that has become so regular since 2005. A number of marriage commissioners (state bureaucrats who administer civil ceremonies) were contacted by a gay man eager to marry his partner under the new legislation. Some officials he telephoned were away from town or already engaged, and the first one to take his call happened to be an evangelical Christian, who explained that he had religious objections to carrying out the ceremony but would find someone who would. He did so, gave the name to the man wanting to get married, and assumed that this would be the end of the story.”

He concludes his eye-opening article this way: “The

Canadian litany of pain, firings, and social and political polarization, and extremism is extraordinary and lamentable, and we haven’t even begun to experience the mid- and long-term results of this mammoth social experiment. I seldom say it, but for goodness’ sake learn something from Canada.”

The second important article on this has just appeared, and it is also a real eye-opener. Law professor Bradley W. Miller assesses the damage which has taken place in Canada during the past decade, and is not optimistic of things turning around any time soon.

He focuses on three key areas: “Anyone interested in assessing the impact of same-sex marriage on public life should investigate the outcomes in three spheres: first, human rights (including impacts on freedom of speech, parental rights in public education, and the autonomy of religious institutions); second, further developments in what sorts of relationships political society will be willing to recognize as a marriage (e.g., polygamy); and third, the social practice of marriage.”

As to human rights, consider the right to freedom of expression: “Many of those who have persisted in voicing their dissent have been subjected to investigations by human rights commissions and (in some cases) proceedings before human rights tribunals. Those who are poor, poorly educated, and without institutional affiliation have been particularly easy targets—anti-discrimination laws are not always applied evenly. Some have been ordered to pay fines, make apologies, and undertake never to speak publicly on such matters again. Targets have included individuals writing letters to the editors of local newspapers, and ministers of small congregations of Christians. A Catholic bishop faced two complaints—both eventually withdrawn—prompted by comments he made in a pastoral letter about marriage.

“Reviewing courts have begun to rein in the commissions and tribunals (particularly since some ill-advised proceedings against Mark Steyn and *Maclean’s* magazine in 2009), and restore a more capacious view of freedom of speech. And in response to the public outcry following the Steyn/*Maclean’s* affair, the Parliament of Canada recently revoked the Canadian Human Rights Commission’s statutory jurisdiction to pursue ‘hate speech.’

“But the financial cost of fighting the human rights machine remains enormous—*Maclean’s* spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees, none of which is recoverable from the commissions, tribunals, or complainants. And these cases can take up to a decade to resolve. An ordinary person with few resources who has drawn

the attention of a human rights commission has no hope of appealing to the courts for relief; such a person can only accept the admonition of the commission, pay a (comparatively) small fine, and then observe the directive to remain forever silent. As long as these tools remain at the disposal of the commissions—for whom the new orthodoxy gives no theoretical basis to tolerate dissent—to engage in public discussion about same-sex marriage is to court ruin.

“Similar pressure can be—and is—brought to bear on dissenters by professional governing bodies (such as bar associations, teachers’ colleges, and the like) that have statutory power to discipline members for conduct unbecoming of the profession. Expressions of disagreement with the reasonableness of institutionalizing same-sex marriage are understood by these bodies to be acts of illegal discrimination, which are matters for professional censure.

“Teachers are particularly at risk for disciplinary action, for even if they only make public statements criticizing same-sex marriage outside the classroom, they are still deemed to create a hostile environment for gay and lesbian students. Other workplaces and voluntary associations have adopted similar policies as a result of their having internalized this new orthodoxy that disagreement with same-sex marriage is illegal discrimination that must not be tolerated.”

And consider the changed nature of relationship recognition: “One prominent polygamist community in British Columbia was greatly emboldened by the creation of same-sex marriage, and publicly proclaimed that there was now no principled basis for the state’s continued criminalization of polygamy. Of all the Canadian courts, only a trial court in British Columbia has addressed whether prohibiting polygamy is constitutional, and provided an advisory opinion to the province’s government. The criminal prohibition of polygamy was upheld, but on a narrow basis that defined polygamy as multiple, concurrent civil marriages. The court did not address the phenomenon of multiple common-law marriages. So, thus far, the dominant forms of polygamy and polyamory practiced in Canada have not gained legal status, but neither have they faced practical impediments.”

The truth is, everything changes when special rights are granted to homosexual couples—especially homosexual marriage and adoption rights. We all pay a heavy price if we dare to disagree, and dare to stand up for heterosexual marriage and the fundamental right of children to be raised by their own biological parents.

The crackdown on faith, freedom, and family is just beginning. It can only get much worse as the homosexual juggernaut rolls along—unless concerned citizens start to make a stink about this and begin to stand up for their fast-diminishing freedoms.

—*Culture Watch*, November 24, 2012

---

## Jane Fonda Finally

### Apologizes

by Ben Shapiro

It only took 40 years. But finally, actress-turned-workout-specialist Jane Fonda has apologized for sitting on a Viet Cong anti-aircraft gun during her 1972 visit to North Vietnam. Fonda, who used her fame to push her radical leftism during her heyday, traveled to Hanoi in 1972 in solidarity with the Viet Cong. While there, she proceeded to blame the US for supposedly bombing a dike system, and did a series of radio broadcasts stating that US leaders were “war criminals.” Those broadcasts were replayed for American POWs being tortured by the Viet Cong. Later, when POWs spoke about their experiences of torture, Fonda would call them “hypocrites and liars,” stating, “These were not men who had been tortured. These were not men who had been starved. These were not men who had been brainwashed.” She explained that these POWs were “careerists and professional killers.”

Now, four decades removed, sitting in the lap of luxury, Fonda has decided that the pictures on the anti-aircraft gun were a mistake. Not the actual visit—she stands by that. “I did not, have not, and will not say that going to North Vietnam was a mistake,” she said. “I have

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.

apologized only for some of the things that I did there, but I am proud that I went.”

But when it comes to those gun photos, then she wishes she'd done something different: “Sitting on that gun in North Vietnam. I'll go to my grave with that one.” Of course, as John Nolte of Big Hollywood points out, that's “a step up from what we learned in Patricia Bosworth's biography, *Jane Fonda* where the star reportedly said: ‘My biggest regret is I never got to f\*\*\* Che Guevara.’”

She's a deep human being, you see.

Back in July 2011, she spelled out why she regretted the anti-aircraft gun photo:

“It happened on my last day in Hanoi. I was exhausted and an emotional wreck after the 2-week visit. It was not unusual for Americans who visited North Vietnam to be taken to see Vietnamese military installations and when they did, they were always required to wear a helmet like the kind I was told to wear during the numerous air raids I had experienced. When we arrived at the site of the anti-aircraft installation (somewhere on the outskirts of Hanoi), there was a group of about a dozen young soldiers in uniform who greeted me. There were also many photographers (and perhaps journalists) gathered about, many more than I had seen all in one place in Hanoi. This should have been a red flag. . . .

“Here is my best, honest recollection of what happened: someone (I don't remember who) led me towards the gun, and I sat down, still laughing, still applauding. It all had nothing to do with where I was sitting. I hardly even thought about where I was sitting. The cameras flashed. I got up, and as I started to walk back to the car with the translator, the implication of what had just happened hit me. ‘Oh my God. It's going to look like I was trying to shoot down US planes.’”

Of course, it never occurs to Fonda that the pain she caused with that photo was a mere sliver of the pain she caused by acting as a propagandist for one of the worst regimes in human history. But that's because in Hollywood, being such a propagandist merely endears you to elites, as Sean Penn can tell you. Tom Lehrer once mocked NASA for working with former Nazi scientist Wernher Von Braun; “‘Once the rockets are up, who cares where they come down,’” Lehrer sang, “‘That's not my department,’ says Wernher von Braun.” But in Hollywood, it's worse than that: you're feted for siding with the world's most evil people.

That's why Hollywood continues to treat the blacklist as one of the worst blots on American history. The truth is somewhat different: the Soviet Union was working with the American Communist Party to infiltrate Hollywood in

the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, and succeeded in infiltrating the Hollywood unions to a large extent. The Communist Party was interested in the overthrow of the American way of government. Not all of those blacklisted were card-carrying communists; that was the tragedy of McCarthyism. But to sympathize for those who treated Stalin as a hero rather than shunning them as moral reprobates is a move only Hollywood could make. Dalton Trumbo, perhaps the most celebrated member of the Hollywood Ten, bragged to his bosses in the Soviet Union that the Communist Party in Hollywood had helped quash anti-Soviet films like an adaptation of Arthur Koestler's masterwork *Darkness at Noon*. Some of the Communist Party's favorite Hollywood movies included *Mission to Moscow* (1943), in which Hollywood gave a clean bill of health to the Stalinist show trials. Meanwhile, when it comes to today's Hollywood blacklist of American conservatives, Hollywood honchos brag that it's a positive development.

Jane Fonda should rightly have been written off by America's most powerful institutions four decades ago. Instead, she's still kicking—and next, she's playing Nancy Reagan, whom she brags she'll prevent from looking “too mean.”

—FrontPage Magazine, November 22, 2012

## Valerie Jarrett's Radical Roots

by John Perazzo

It was recently revealed that for several months, President Obama's closest and most trusted advisor, Valerie Jarrett, has been leading secret negotiations with representatives of Iran's Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei, in an effort to develop normalized relations between the US and Iran. Hallmarks of such a relationship would include the commencement of direct airline flights between American cities and Tehran; the granting of entry permits for citizens of each country to visit the other; and most significantly, high-level diplomatic dialogue regarding Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Jarrett, however, has no experience whatsoever in international negotiations. Her major area of expertise has been to help President Obama “fundamentally transform” the United States into a socialist paradise. Toward that end, for instance, Jarrett helped recruit to the Administration such luminaries as the self-identified communist revo-

lutionary Van Jones (as green jobs czar), the Alinskyite radical Mark Lloyd (as chief diversity officer within the Federal Communications Commission), and the die-hard advocate of wealth redistribution Cass Sunstein (as regulatory czar). But for the task of striking a bargain with the America-hating Islamic supremacists in Iran, it is difficult to identify any qualifications Jarrett possesses apart from the fact that she was born in that country and lived there till age 5. Jarrett's weak resumé in that regard might well explain not only why the Administration tried so hard to keep a lid on her talks with Iranian leaders, but also why Obama refused to back Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu's call for a clearly defined "red line" beyond which Iran's nuclear program would not be permitted to progress.

Like so many Obama appointees, Valerie Jarrett bears the unmistakable imprint of the president's ideology. She is a leftist to her core, with notable personal ties to the communist movement. Jarrett's maternal grandfather, for instance, was a Chicagoan named Robert Taylor, who in the 1940s was involved with such communist fronts as the American Peace Mobilization and the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee. Also a member of these groups was Frank Marshall Davis, the communist journalist who in the 1970s would mentor a young Barack Obama.

Jarrett's mother (and Robert Taylor's daughter) is early-childhood-education author Barbara Taylor Bowman, who co-founded a Chicago-based graduate school in child development known as the Erikson Institute, named after the psychoanalyst Erik Erikson; in 1950 Erikson became a hero to the left by choosing to resign from his professorship at the University of California rather than sign an anti-communist loyalty oath as the school required. Indicative of the Erikson Institute's radical political orientation is the fact that its board of trustees has included, in addition to Bowman, such figures as Tom Ayers (father of the former Weather Underground terrorist and lifelong Marxist Bill Ayers) and Bernardine Dohrn (longtime wife of Bill Ayers).

In 1983 Valerie Jarrett married the son of Vernon Jarrett, a black journalist who formerly wrote for the communist-influenced *Chicago Defender*. In the 1940s, Mr. Jarrett was a leader of the Chicago chapter of American Youth for Democracy—youth wing of the Communist Party USA. He also served on a publicity committee for the Packinghouse Workers Union, a Chicago-based entity dominated by the CPUSA. In each of these endeavors, Mr. Jarrett had close contact with the aforementioned communist, Frank Marshall Davis.

According to *The Washington Post*, Vernon Jarrett was "a key influence" in persuading Harold Washington,

a politician with powerful socialist ties, to run for mayor of Chicago in 1983. Four years later Mr. Jarrett helped his daughter-in-law, Valerie, enter the political arena as an official in Mayor Washington's Administration. After Washington's death in 1987, Ms. Jarrett worked as deputy chief of staff for his successor, Richard Daley.

Valerie Jarrett's ties to Barack and Michelle Obama were first formed in 1991, when Ms. Jarrett recruited Michelle (who at the time was engaged to Barack) to Chicago's City Hall. Jarrett quickly became a trusted confidante of both the Obamas. Thus would she play a key role in then-Senator Obama's 2008 presidential campaign. Following the election, Jarrett was appointed as a senior advisor and assistant to Mr. Obama, who admittedly consults Jarrett on every important political decision he makes. Indeed, the president once told a *New York Times* reporter that he completely trusts Jarrett "to speak for me, particularly when we're dealing with delicate issues." It seems that this trust extends even to Jarrett's handling of such "delicate issues" as whether Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of Islamic terrorism, will develop a nuclear weapon and, in its own way, forever "fundamentally transform" life not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

—FrontPage Magazine, November 14, 2012

## Chicago Teachers Union and Marxism

by Da Tagliare

In September, the Chicago Teachers Union went on strike, shutting down the Windy City's schools for 10 days. Many of those same teachers were in attendance on Nov. 10 at the Midwest Marxism Conference held at Northwestern University in Chicago.

The topics of the conference were:

- Marxism, Crisis, & Resistance
- The Meaning of Marxism
- The Flint Sit-down Strikes & The Founding of the

UAW

- From Apartheid Schools to the New Jim Crow: Racism, USA

• The Democrats: A Critical History

• Russia: A Case Study in Workers Power & Revolution

- Socialists & Trade Unions
- Class, Race, & the Civil Rights movement

- Education & Capitalism
- Lenin's Theory of the Revolutionary Party
- Marxism & Women's Liberation
- Whose City? Labor, the 1%, and the Democratic Party Machine in Chicago
- Imperialism: Why Capitalism Creates War
- Detroit, I Do Mind Dying

Among some of the speakers at the conference was Jesse Sharkey, vice president of the Chicago Teachers Union. Another speaker who kicked off the conference was Becca Barnes, a Chicago teacher, who refers to American capitalists as capitalistic vampires. Barnes told the crowd: "The struggle here in the United States has entered a new phase. Nowhere have we pointed the way forward more clearly than here in Chicago with the teacher's union strike."

One person who attended the conference noted that with the abundance of teachers and their response to the messages and participation in the workshops, it gave a clear message that the Chicago Teachers Union is one with the local Marxists. A number of the workshops were led by members of the local Chicago Teachers Union.

Each of the sessions that this person attended started with congratulating Barack Obama for winning his reelection. After listening to language filled with hate and anger aimed at America it became obvious to this person that the agenda of the Chicago socialists and teachers was to change society to be more like that of the former Soviet Union. He noticed that the philosophy of mass murderers such as Lenin were upheld and embraced by those in attendance. Teachers strategize on what and how to teach the school kids in Chicago to train them up with the Marxist philosophy.

—FrontPage Magazine, November 19, 2012

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)

## Jesus is not a Liberal: Correcting the Christian Left, Part 1

by Dr. Michael Bauman

I have taken Becky Riley's article below from The Christian Left's website ([thechristianleft.org](http://thechristianleft.org)). I chose this article not because it is particularly good or particularly bad. I chose it simply because it was the first to appear when I opened their site. Had some other essay appeared, I would have chosen to refute it. Her words are in boldface type and in quotation marks. Mine are not.

**"Biblical Quotes Supporting the Belief that Jesus Is A Liberal" —by Becky Riley**

Riley does not tell us what she means by the word "liberal," but if she is a conventional leftist, it means she thinks that Jesus was a big-government, collectivist, egalitarian, redistributionist, pacifist, or something very close, which is exactly what emerges from her text subsequently.

**"Peacemaking, not War Making: Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. [Matthew 5:9] Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right. . . cheek, turn to him the other also. [Matthew 5:39] I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; [Matthew 5:44]"**

Although the Biblical text Riley quotes does not mention anything about war making, she herself includes it. By including it on her own authority, she has transgressed the important difference between peacemaking and pacifism. One can make peace without being a pacifist. Thus, Jesus commends the peacemakers here, not the pacifists. He commends those who proceed to peace, not those who proceed by peace. By reading as she does, Riley overlooks several important points:

(1) Peacemaking can be accomplished in many ways, one of them by ending war quickly. If you want to make peace, then you must learn how to end war quickly. In that sense, we have three peace academies in the US: West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs, where they produce military folks who are the best the world has ever seen at ending war swiftly and thereby making peace. But, conversely, if you proceed by means of pacifism toward peace, you will not end war quickly. Rather, you will invite more war because tyrants will move upon you with all speed and purpose. From you they fear nothing.

No nation was ever attacked because it was too strong and could defend itself and its neighbors. But many nations, whether weak or pacifistic, have been attacked because they were unwilling or unprepared to deal strongly and swiftly with tyrannical opponents. Military weakness invites war. Pacifism invites war. If you cannot fight, or if you will not fight, you eventually will have peace, but it will be the peace of surrender, of slavery, and of death, which is not the peace of justice, which alone is the peace of God. Pacifists need to consider not only the qualities of a just war, but of a just peace. Not all peace is just, not remotely.

(2) Jesus Himself is not a pacifist, and neither is His Father. Jesus, we recall, is the One in charge of Armageddon, and Armageddon is no peace march—far from it. Armageddon is so enormous a battle that it brings the entire world to heel. War of this sort wasn't something Jesus Himself cooked up. He got it from His Father. Jesus said that He did what He saw His Father do and He said what He heard His Father say. In the Hebrew Scriptures, He saw his Father tell the Israelites to go into battle frequently. He heard his Father command total war of His people and punish them if they did not do it. Jesus saw, in short, what is obvious to any careful student of Scripture: Yahweh is a warrior. So too is the Son.

(3) Peace is by no means the bottom line for Jesus. That is not why He came. Nor is it the means by which He proceeds: "Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I have not come to bring peace but a sword" (Matt. 10: 34), He said.

(4) The context of the verse Riley quotes is the Sermon on the Mount. That sermon was directed to the disciples of Jesus (Matt. 5: 2), not to congresses, politburos, or parliaments. It deals with personal Christian ethics, not with national defense policy. What is required of government by God and what is required of Christians by God are not the same. While it might be required of Christians to turn the other cheek, governments cannot and must not work that way. If someone hits you, you might do well not to retaliate, and to practice self-sacrifice instead. But the government must not and cannot do that. If your enemy flies jetliners into your skyscrapers in New York, you must not say to them that we have skyscrapers in Chicago too, and that they are free to attack them as well and to do so

without fear of retaliation because we are turning the other cheek. That's because while individuals can practice self-sacrifice, governments cannot. What is being sacrificed when governments turn the other cheek is not themselves but others, perhaps many thousands of others. You cannot self-sacrifice others. Jesus' teaching here is not about national defense, but about his disciples' personal lives and personal obligations.

As before, the command not to resist evil and to love your enemies is directed not at governments but at Christian disciples. Governments cannot love, nor are they directed here to do so. But Christians are. They are the ones whom Jesus addresses in this famous sermon. Further, governments exist precisely in order to resist and restrain evil (Romans 13: 3). Unless Riley wants to pit Jesus against both His Father and His apostles, her reading of these verses is sadly inadequate and distortively imprecise. This is a matter of individual self-sacrifice, not public policy.

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

**"The Death Penalty: Thou shalt not kill [Matthew 5:21]"**

Matthew 5:21 does not say "Thou shalt not kill," but "Thou shalt not murder." While all murder is killing, not all killing is murder. Murder is unjustified killing. Some killing is justified. Some is not. For Jesus to command what Riley asserts that He commands is again to pit the Son against the Father, which the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, as well as the example and explicit teachings of Christ Himself, prohibit. The Son and the Father are not divided on the point. God the Father permits capital punishment and has done so almost from the very beginning (Gen. 9:6).

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

**To be continued . . .**

Be sure to read next month's issue when the following topics are addressed: crime and punishment, justice, corporate greed and the religion of wealth, paying taxes and the separation of church and state, community, equality and social programs, public prayer and displays of faith, strict enforcement of religious laws, and individuality and personal spiritual experience.

## 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.