



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 3



Dr. David Noebel

March 2013

Communism and Guns

by William F. Jasper

It should come as no surprise that the Communist Party USA is on board with President Obama's plan to attack Americans' right to keep and bear arms as a means to "end gun violence." A cardinal feature of communist regimes, like all dictatorships, is the prohibition of private ownership of arms, creating a monopoly of force in the hands of the State.

In a January 18 article, *People's World*, an official publication of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA), declared that "the ability to live free from the fear or threat of gun violence is a fundamental democratic right—one that far supercedes any so-called personal gun rights allegedly contained in the Second Amendment."

The article, entitled, "Fight to end gun violence is key to defending democracy," written by *People's World* labor and politics reporter Rick Nagin, claims that "the right-wing extremists opposing all efforts to curb gun violence are the same forces that rallied behind Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney, hoping to undermine every other democratic right as well as the living standards of workers and ordinary Americans."

"It is for that reason," declares Nagin, "as well as the need to protect public safety, that the same coalition of labor and its allies that worked so hard and effectively to re-elect President Barack Obama must now go all-out to back his common sense proposals for gun law reform."

The Communist Party's "journalist" continued: "As Obama has charged, the extremists recklessly 'gin up fear' that the government is coming to take away hunting rifles and personal weapons owned for legitimate self-defense. Led by the hate-mongering leadership of the National Rifle Association, they use a totally fraudulent and only very recent interpretation of the Second Amendment which they falsely claim as necessary for protecting every other freedom contained in the Bill of Rights."

However, gun rights advocates don't need to "gin up fear" that President Obama's "common sense" proposals will lead to even more onerous infringements than the current calls to ban or restrict so-called "assault weapons"; the gun control zealots have been quite emphatic about intending to severely restrict (and many have called for a total ban on) all privately owned firearms. A December 21 article for the *Daily Kos* is one of the candid admissions against interest by the Left that the real end goal is a total monopoly of gun ownership by the government. Entitled, "How to Ban Guns: A step by step, long term process," the regular *Daily Kos* writer "Sporks" says:

The only way we can truly be safe and prevent further gun violence is to ban civilian ownership of all guns. That means everything. No pistols, no revolvers, no semiautomatic or automatic rifles. No bolt action. No breaking actions or falling blocks. Nothing. This is the only thing that we can possibly do to keep our children safe from both mass murder and common street violence.

The writer then outlines the piecemeal plan by which the federal government can begin with registration and end up with confiscation. The *Daily Kos* article also cites the need to delegitimize hunting as well. "We should also segway [sic] into an anti-hunting campaign, like those in the UK," it says. "By making hunting expensive and unpopular, we can make the transition to a gun free society much less of a headache for us."

Nagin surely must know that it is not merely groundless paranoia exploited by "extremists" inspiring fear that President Obama's multi-part gun control plan is but the opening wedge in a new drive for ever-expanding federal restrictions and infringements of the Second Amendment. And Nagin surely is aware that his comrades ruling China, Cuba, North Korea, Russia, and other communist countries have never stopped at partial restrictions on private ownership of weapons.

As *The New American* reported recently, Communist China's ruling mandarins, sounding very much like our own

media commentators, have blasted the United States for our “rampant gun ownership.” A Chinese government report last year detailing alleged human rights violations in the United States declares:

The United States prioritizes the right to keep and bear arms over the protection of citizens’ lives and personal security and exercises lax firearm possession control, causing rampant gun ownership.

More recently, on December 14, 2012, the Beijing regime’s Xinhua news agency editorialized:

Twenty-eight innocent people, including 20 primary students, have been slaughtered in a mass shooting at an elementary school in the US state of Connecticut. Their blood and tears demand no delay for the US gun control.

“Action speaks louder than words,” concluded the Xinhua editorial. “If Obama wants to take practical measures to control guns, he has to make preparation for a protracted war and considerable political cost.”

Communist China, of course, is no paragon of virtue when it comes to liberty, safety, and human rights. Its total ban on private ownership of guns under Mao Tse-tung (Zedong) guaranteed that the Communist Party would have unchallenged power. And, as Professor R. J. Rummel has pointed out in his several published studies on democide (mass murder by governments): Power kills and absolute power kills absolutely. In the case of Communist China, the mass murder by the communist government under Mao was somewhere in the neighborhood of 38 million souls!

And China remains a rigidly controlled police state to this day, notwithstanding the limited market reforms that the Party has allowed for pragmatic purposes to obtain the capital and technology it needs to modernize. Only Party officials and the police and military (who must be members of, and be vetted by, the Communist Party) are allowed to possess weapons.

Mao’s comrades in Russia, Vladimir Lenin and Josef Stalin, likewise disarmed the civilian population before initiating mass murder. As did Adolf Hitler and every other “successful” mass-murdering tyrant throughout history. Vladimir Gladkov, a radio propagandist on Vladimir Putin’s “Voice of Russia” program, expressed disappointment on December 20 that the Sandy Hook mass shooting probably would not generate the support President Obama needs to implement his desired gun controls. “Unfortunately, there are grounds for very serious doubt that even after this terrible massacre, a ban on selling weapons will be introduced in the US,” said Gladkov.

Again, considering that rigid, absolute, centralized

power is the essence of all totalitarian regimes, those regimes must, therefore, automatically strike down all checks and balances that would limit their central authority. It is not surprising that spokesmen for these totalitarian governments would endorse policies that give the government a monopoly on deadly force.

The American Founding Fathers, on the other hand, recognized that the armed private citizen is the ultimate check and balance against the centralized monopoly of force which invariably turns tyrannical and deadly. Nagin and *People’s World*, not surprisingly, side with communist tyrants and deride American commitment to our natural rights enshrined in our Constitution.

“The Second Amendment is obsolete and now has been twisted to threaten the basic safety and security of all Americans,” says Nagin. Nagin, according to the profile provided on Keywiki by Trevor Loudon, has been a member of the CPUSA for several decades and a writer for the *People’s World* and other communist publications since 1970. He is a member of the Newspaper Guild and the Communications Workers of America as well as a political coordinator for the AFL-CIO in Ohio. In 2012 he was the Democratic Leader in Cleveland Ward 14 and served on the County Democratic Party Executive Committee.

We recognize the totalitarian ideology and objectives of Nagin and other communist propagandists when they advocate disarming of civilians and a total monopoly of force in government. Many of the other people advocating the same gun control policies may not have those totalitarian objectives in mind—but by their support of these policies they would lead us down the same deadly path nonetheless.

—*The New American*, January 25, 2013

FDR, Mussolini, Stalin

by William F. Jasper

From the very start of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s administration, there were unmistakable indications that his “New Deal” would be moving in the statist direction. Frances Perkins, FDR’s secretary of labor, recounted, decades later, a telling occurrence at the first FDR Cabinet meeting. She recalled:

At the first meeting of the Cabinet after the President took office in 1933, the financier and adviser to Roosevelt, Bernard Baruch, and Baruch’s friend General Hugh Johnson, who was to become the head of the National

Recovery Administration, came in with a copy of a book by Gentile, the Italian Fascist theoretician, for each member of the Cabinet, and we all read it with great care.

Perkins related the Cabinet story to George Rawick, a socialist historian and professor, who published the quote above in an essay he wrote in 1969 for *Radical America*, the journal of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

The “Brain Trust” that was guiding FDR’s new experiment in governance was composed of collectivists of various ideologies—fascist, socialist, and communist—who were all afire with zeal to “transform” and “restructure” America. Collectivism was in the air; the intellectuals and political classes were enthralled with the supposed wonders of central planning that were being reported in Italy under the fascist system of Benito Mussolini (Il Duce, “The Leader”) and in Soviet Russia under the Communist Party leadership of Josef Stalin. “Scientific” control and management of all aspects of society by “highly qualified” administrators was all the rage.

Even Adolf Hitler, who had just been installed as Chancellor of Germany a month before Roosevelt’s inauguration, was in vogue with many “liberals” and “progressives.”

Harold Ickes, FDR’s secretary of the interior, admitted years later that “what we were doing in this country were some of the things that were being done in Russia and even some of the things that were being done in Germany. But we were doing them in an orderly way.” Roosevelt himself extolled Mussolini as “that admirable Italian gentleman” and told US Ambassador to Italy Breckenridge Long, “I am much interested and deeply impressed by what he has accomplished and by his evidenced honest purpose of restoring Italy.”

According to the *New York Times*, the general feeling among the ruling class in Washington, D.C., at the outset of the new FDR administration was that America needed a strong autocrat (some even called for a dictator) to deal with the economic crisis. The atmosphere in our nation’s capital was “strangely reminiscent of Rome in the first weeks after the march of the Blackshirts, of Moscow at the beginning of the Five-Year Plan,” the *Times* reported on May 7, 1933. “America today literally asks for orders,” the article averred. And the new administration is responding, reported the *Times*, with a plan that “envisages a federation of industry, labor, and government after the fashion of the corporative State as it exists in Italy.”

“If this country ever needed a Mussolini, it needs one

now,” said Senator David Reed, a Pennsylvania Republican. Walter Lippmann, the “dean of American journalists,” opined that “‘dictatorial powers,’ if that is the name for it—is essential.”

Mussolini summed up his political philosophy in this motto: “All within the state, nothing outside the state, nothing against the state.” Roosevelt magnanimously agreed to follow Il Duce’s example—if necessary for the good of the country. In his Inaugural Address, he said he would work with Congress to tackle the crisis. But if that proved insufficient, he would seek “temporary departure,” requesting “broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.”

If the New Deal failed to reach the totalitarian heights (or depths) of Mussolini’s “total state,” it was not for lack of trying. Team FDR took full advantage of the presidential honeymoon and the bipartisan atmosphere to make the first 100 days of the New Deal a transformative epoch. A compliant Congress rushed through a torrent of “emergency” legislation creating a vast new sea of programs and an alphabet soup of new regulatory agencies: AAA, NRA, CCC, FCC, TVA, SEC, FHA, WPA, NYA, etc.

The regulatory agencies that mushroomed during the New Deal have continued to proliferate and now write more of our “laws” than does our elected Congress.

Roosevelt appointed James Landis, who was dean of the Harvard Law School, to the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Landis’ chief influence, though, may have been through his 1938 Yale Law School lectures, published as *The Administrative Process*, in which he openly declaims against the constitutional separation of powers. According to Landis’ *The Administrative Process*, agencies in the modern state need to have “not merely legislative power or simply executive power, but whatever power might be required to achieve the desired results.”

There were many other similarly inclined apostles of absolutism running rampant in the New Deal regime. In our limited space here, we focus on two who were particularly noteworthy in advancing the destructive processes of the administrative state:

- Stuart Chase: A product of MIT and Harvard, Chase is best known for his 1932 book, *A New Deal*, the title and substance of which were adopted as the program of the Roosevelt administration. In that book, Chase argued for elimination of our free enterprise system “by firing squad if necessary.” He hoped the “whole vicious pecuniary complex would collapse as it has in Russia.”

A member of the Fabian Socialist Society, Chase toured Stalin's Soviet Union in 1927, meeting with and interviewing Stalin and Trotsky. He described the Soviet Five Year Plan as a "courageous and unprecedented experiment." He concluded his New Deal book by asking: "Why should the Russians have all the fun of remaking the world?"

• Rexford Guy Tugwell: An economics professor and Fabian Socialist, Tugwell toured the Soviet Union with Stuart Chase—and returned to rhapsodize about the glories of socialism in the new workers' paradise.

In an address to the American Economic Association in December 1931 Tugwell approvingly invoked Stalin's Russia as a vision for America's future. "There is no denying," he proclaimed, "that the contemporary situation in the United States has explosive possibilities. The future is becoming visible in Russia." Moreover, he remarked:

The first series of changes will have to do with statutes, with constitutions, and with government.... It will require the laying of rough, unholy hands on many a sacred precedent, doubtless calling for an enlarged and nationalized police power for enforcement.... Planning will necessarily become a function of the federal government; either that or the planning agency will supersede that government.... It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant.

"FDR fundamentally expanded the reach and power of the federal government, which most Americans now accept, especially in times of crisis," remarked *US News & World Report* in 2009. "And that marked a monumental change in American life"

—*The New American*, January 21, 2013 p. 25, 26

Christianity, Islam, and Atheism

by Jamie Glazov

Frontpage Interview's guest today is William Kilpatrick, the author of several books, including *Psychological Seduction* and *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong*. His articles about Islam have appeared in *FrontPage Magazine*, *Investor's Business Daily*, *Catholic World Report*, and other publications. His most recent book,

Christianity, Islam, and Atheism: The Struggle for the Soul of the West explores the threat that Islam poses to Christianity and Western civilization. The book also examines the role played by militant secularists in facilitating the expansion of Islam.

FP: William Kilpatrick, welcome to Frontpage Interview.

Let's begin with you telling us what inspired you to write this book.

Kilpatrick: In a way it's a continuation of an earlier book of mine, *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong*. That book looked at the ways in which moral relativism impaired Johnny's ability to tell right from wrong. Part of the new book looks at the ways in which cultural relativism, or multiculturalism, impairs his ability to tell friend from foe. One of the chapters is titled "Why Johnny Can't Read the Writing on the Wall." One of the main reasons Western citizens can't see the obvious about Islam is that they have been subjected to an educational system that insists on the moral equivalency of all cultures and religions, just as it had previously insisted on the equivalency of all value systems. So, the initial impulse for writing the book was my realization that the same people who introduced moral chaos into schools and society were now bent on normalizing an alien ideology. Or, to paraphrase Mark Steyn, the people who brought you *Heather Has Two Mommies* are about to bring you "Heather has four mommies and a great big bearded daddy."

FP: Can you explain the title?

Kilpatrick: I use the word "atheism" in the title as shorthand for both atheists and militant secularists, most of whom tend to be on the left. Many Christians have awakened to the fact that they are in a cultural struggle with secular leftists, but far fewer have come to the realization that they are also in a civilizational struggle with Islam. Fewer, still, are aware that, as you point out in *United in Hate*, the left has formed a tacit alliance with radical Islam against the West.

Of course, Christians aren't the only ones who are threatened by Islamic expansion. All non-Muslims are. But in the West, Christianity has traditionally been the focal point of resistance to Islamization. Unfortunately, Christianity in the West has been weakened both by secular attacks and by self-inflicted wounds. As a result, Christians in the West are failing to stand up for their cultural heritage. In fact, many fail to realize that their culture is under attack.

But without Christianity you are left mainly with philosophies of relativism, skepticism, and materialism—philosophies that have proved themselves incapable

of resisting Islamization and, in fact, serve to enable its spread. You can see this most clearly in Europe where the decline of Christianity has been accompanied not only by the rise of secularism but also by the rise of Islam. With the loss of faith has come a loss of meaning and the loss of a sense among Europeans that they have anything worth defending. The loss of faith is also one of the main factors accounting for Europe's population loss. In other words, the decline of Christian faith in Europe created a spiritual vacuum and a population vacuum, both of which Islam was quick to fill.

While Muslim leaders and radical secularists are fully engaged in the struggle for the soul of the West, many Christians seem unaware that they are under attack from two sides. They need to wake up before it's too late.

FP: In one of your chapters, you spoke of "Christian enablers of Islam." Can you elaborate on that?

Kilpatrick: Many Christian leaders unwittingly act as enablers of Islam's totalitarian agenda by focusing on the surface similarities between Christianity and Islam rather than on the profound and irreconcilable differences. A prime example is the Vatican II document *Nostra Aetate* which includes a short statement of the Church's relation to Muslims. Essentially, it says that Muslims adore the one God, revere Jesus, honor Mary, and value the moral life. Reading it one could easily jump to the conclusion that the Christian faith and the Islamic faith are very much alike. One might also conclude that Islam is indeed a religion of peace that has been hijacked by a handful of terrorists who misunderstand their own religion.

However, before jumping to that conclusion one needs to realize that *Nostra Aetate* was never intended to be the last word on Islam. Rather, the stated purpose of the declaration was to consider "what men have in common." Moreover, it was written at a time—the 1960s—when the Muslim world was far more moderate than it is now—a time when interreligious dialogue seemed to hold great promise. Recently Pope Benedict noted that with the passage of time "a weakness" of *Nostra Aetate* has become apparent: "it speaks of religion solely in a positive way and it disregards the sick and distorted forms of religion." I think it safe to say that he's referring here to Islam or, at least, to some forms of Islam.

This is a hopeful sign of a new realism about Islam. For too long, Catholic and Protestant leaders, alike, have been content to fall back on what I call the "common ground thesis"—the comforting belief that the Christian faith and the Islamic faith share much in common. As a result, a lot of Christians have been lulled into complacency about the threat from Islam. If they want to avoid the fate of

Christians in North Africa, the Middle East, and various other Muslim regions they need to get a better grasp on what Islam really teaches.

FP: What do Christians need to understand about the differences between Islam and Christianity?

Kilpatrick: Islam is built on a rejection of the main tenets of Christianity. It rejects the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. There is a Jesus in the Koran but he seems to be there mainly for the purpose of denying the claims of Jesus of Nazareth. Muhammad seemed to have realized that if the Christian claim about Jesus was true, then there would be no need for a new prophet and a new revelation. Consequently, in order to buttress his own claim to prophethood it was necessary for him to cut Jesus down to size. Thus the Koran tells us that "he was but a mortal" and only one in a long line of prophets culminating in Muhammad.

John the Baptist said of Jesus that "He must increase but I must decrease." Muhammad preferred it the other way around. For him to increase it was necessary for Jesus to decrease. Christians need to realize that Jesus is in the Koran, not because Muhammad thought highly of him but because Muhammad saw him as a rival who needed to be put in his place. The problem is that in using Jesus for his own purposes, Muhammad neglected to give him any personality. The Jesus of the Koran is more like a stick figure than a person. Whether or not one accepts the claims of the Jesus of the Gospels, he is, at least, a recognizable human being who goes fishing with his disciples, attends wedding feasts and gathers children about him. By contrast, the Jesus of the Koran seems to exist neither in time nor space. The Koranic account of him is completely lacking in historical or geographical detail. There is no indication of when he lived, or where he conducted his ministry, or the names of his disciples or his antagonists such as Herod and Pilate. In other words, he seems to be nothing more than an invention of Muhammad's—and not a very convincing invention at that. In this regard it's instructive to note that the Koran rails constantly against those who claim that "he [Muhammad] invented it himself."

In sum, Christians who think that Muslims revere the same Jesus as they do need to better acquaint themselves with the Koran.

FP: Why do you think there is so much ignorance in the West about Islam?

Kilpatrick: Much of the ignorance can be explained in terms of multicultural dogma combined with self-censorship. In the West the multicultural ideology has attained the status of a religion. Christians believe that Jesus saves, but multiculturalists believe that diversity

saves. And to question the dogmas of diversity is tantamount to heresy. Nowadays heretics aren't burnt at the stake, but they are threatened with loss of reputation and loss of employment, and sometimes, as in the cases of Geert Wilders and Elizabeth Sabaditsch-Wolff, they are hauled before courts.

As a result, people learn to engage in self-censorship or what Orwell called "crimestop." They won't allow themselves to think certain thoughts or to explore certain avenues of inquiry. This is particularly true in regard to Islam. By now, just about everyone understands which thoughts about Islam are permissible and which are not. As Andrew McCarthy points out, this results in a kind of "willful blindness" toward Islam. Like the people in *The Emperor's New Clothes* we deny the evidence of our own eyes when it conflicts with the official narrative. In short, we prefer to remain ignorant.

In addition, elites in government, media, and education actively cover up for Islam. The media doesn't report even a hundredth of the negative stories about Islam and it does its best to deny any linkage between Islam and terrorism. At the same time the media does everything it can to normalize Islam and make it seem as American as apple pie. For example, a recent *Huffington Post* article likens Muhammad to George Washington.

The schools are engaged in a similar kind of white-washing. High school and college textbooks routinely define jihad as an "interior spiritual struggle" and describe Muslim conquests in the 7th and 8th centuries simply as "Muslim expansion." Moreover, many of these texts have a distinct bias against the West and in favor of Islam. For example, while the Atlantic slave trade is described at length and in gruesome detail, the Arab slave trade which lasted longer and resulted in more deaths is rarely mentioned. So, insofar as our children are learning anything about Islam, they are learning a Disneyfied version of it.

FP: What must we do to save our civilization?

Kilpatrick: We need to realize that we are in a high-stakes struggle similar in nature to the Cold War with Soviet-bloc communism. In this new cold war, our aim should go beyond simply resisting jihad. Our aim should be the defeat of Islam as an idea, because it's an idea that we are fighting. The driving force behind Islamic aggression is Islamic theology, and if we want to be free of

Islamic aggression, we need to discredit Islam as a total system. I disagree with the notion that the religious part of Islam can be separated from the political part. Although individual Muslims might be able to achieve that separation in their personal lives, in the Islamic faith the religious and the political are inextricably bound together.

So our overall aim should be to cast doubts in the minds of Muslims about the words and example of Muhammad. In other words, we should want Muslims to lose faith in Islam just as Soviet-era communists lost faith in communism.

Of course, that seems a tall order. It might be objected that Islamic beliefs are too deeply rooted to ever change. But "deeply rooted" beliefs are not always as deeply rooted as they seem. Forty years ago, the Catholic faith seemed deeply rooted in Ireland—but not so much today. More to the point, the deeply held beliefs of millions of Muslims began to erode under the regimes of secular strongmen in the Middle East and North Africa during the twentieth century. As Ali A. Allawi, a former Iraqi cabinet minister, observes, "It appeared to be only a matter of time before Islam would lose whatever hold it still had on the Muslim world." The recent reemergence of supremacist Islam is largely a reaction to that loss of faith. We should do what we can to reawaken those doubts.

The other thing to keep in mind is that theologically and intellectually, Islam is a house of cards. It simply can't stand up to the tests of critical reason and historical evidence that we apply to the Judeo-Christian revelation—which is precisely why we should apply them to an examination of Islam. Instead of engaging in non-challenging, non-offensive dialogue—a type of dialogue that only serves to legitimize Islam—Christian leaders ought instead to be challenging and questioning the tenets of Islam, particularly in view of the fact that Islam is built in part on a rejection of Christianity. Christian leaders can't afford to delay taking a harder look at Islam because the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation is rapidly moving ahead with its project of imposing anti-blasphemy laws on the West—laws that are intended to prevent just such legitimate criticism.

FP: William Kilpatrick, thank you for joining *Front-page* Interview.

—*FrontPage Magazine*, January 21, 2013

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 PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is 719-685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at www.schwarzreport.org. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.

Jesus is Not a Liberal:

Conclusion

by Dr. Michael Bauman

Note: This is the final part of a three part article. To view the first two parts, check www.schwarzreport.org.

“Community: Love your neighbor as yourself. [Matthew 22:39] So in everything, do to others as you would have them do to you. [Matthew 7:12] If you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. [Matthew 19:21]”

Riley seems to think that conservatives do not love, and do not do to others what they want done to them, as if liberals were practicing this and conservatives were not. On this point, Riley is flatly wrong. Conservatives are better at it than all others, period. (Please read that sentence again, and keep reading it again until it sinks in.) If Riley thinks that conservatives are not merciful or generous, she simply isn't paying attention. I can do no more to enlighten her on this point than to recommend she read Brooks and Wilson's book, *Who Really Cares*, which demonstrates decisively that the religious and the conservatives in America—not the liberals—give the most both to the poor and to secular charities, not just religious ones. In fact, they are the most generous such group in the history of the world, yet Riley feels compelled to lecture them, not her stingy liberal cohorts, on this point.

When Jesus tells the rich young man in Matt. 19:21 to sell his possessions and give the proceeds to the poor, Jesus is giving specific directions to one man, based upon that man's personal spiritual defects and deficiencies, identifying for that man what he ought to do. Jesus is not addressing Himself to every person everywhere and at all times. Nothing is wrong with being wealthy. Abraham was very wealthy. David the king was very wealthy, as was his son Solomon. Joseph of Arimathea was wealthy. The problem is not having wealth but in wealth having you. Jesus was pointing out this man's great moral failing, which was not this wealth but his self-righteousness and selfishness. He actually told Jesus that he had kept all the commandments (v. 20), which was an impossibility and a lie of self-delusion. In order to point out the young man's self-righteous failings, failings he did not recognize in himself, Jesus told him to give up his wealth. But that commandment was too hard for the young man. He couldn't do it. So he went away sad (v. 22). From this incident the

disciples drew the wrong conclusion. They wondered: If the wealthy, with all their resources, can't succeed, then who can (v. 25)? Jesus corrects them: What that rich young man could not do, God could. God could give him what he and his alleged law keeping and his wealth never could. God could heal his shortcomings. Grace makes it possible (v. 26), not human effort or human possession. The point Jesus makes here about this incident is not about wealth but about God's grace, a lesson He makes explicit to the disciples, but which liberals like Riley overlook.

Put differently, Jesus is not a fool. He does not think that the best way to help the poor is to become poor yourself. That's not what He is advising. To do so would be to place an even greater demand on others, who have more than enough poor to care for already. To create more poor is not how you help the poor. Indeed, to Jesus, the poverty issue has no solution, not in this life: “The poor you will always have with you,” He says (Matt. 26:11). By saying so, He was not suggesting that more wealthy people become poor.

Furthermore, Jesus does not command us to help the poor by means of government-sponsored redistributionism—not once, not ever. He talks about the good Samaritan in this regard, not the good bureaucrat or the good government giveaway. These obligations to the poor are your own, and you must not pawn them off onto government, as if government were a suitable agency of Christian love, or as if the obligations of Christian love could be hired out to political or bureaucratic surrogates. No; you must do it. You must get out into the trenches of poverty and assist real persons in real ways, and not assign this obligation over to government, as if your tax return were your tithe.

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

“Equality & Social Programs: But when you give a feast, invite the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and you will be blessed, because they cannot repay you. You will be repaid at the resurrection of the just. [Luke 14:13 &14]”

As she has done so frequently, Riley mislabels the texts she quotes. Nothing here is about “equality and social programs.” That is not what Jesus mentions; that is not what He has in mind, even if Riley does. Inviting others to your feast is not a matter of “equality” or of “social programs,” but of charity and generosity. Equality is not mentioned or alluded to anywhere in the text. Neither are social programs. We are exhorted here to aid others because they are needy, not because they and we are equal. Riley herself smuggled in the notion of equality. Jesus doesn't mention it at all. The same goes for social

programs, which are utterly absent from the text.

As for equality and income redistribution, one wonders what Riley would make of Jesus' instruction to take from the poor and give to the rich (Matt. 25:28).

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

“Public Prayer & Displays of Faith: And when thou pray, thou shall not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou pray, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.... [Matthew 6:6 & 7]”

Riley seems to think that here Jesus is prohibiting religion in public. He is not. He is prohibiting the sort of self-aggrandizing showboating to which the Pharisees and others were prone. If Jesus were doing what Riley seems to think, then He would fall far short of His own teaching, and so would His disciples. He Himself prayed and preached in public multiple times, even at His crucifixion, where He uttered multiple public prayers. The disciples prayed and preached in public many times as well, beginning at Pentecost. Indeed, the entire Jewish tradition to which Jesus and His disciples adhered required praying and other religious practices in public year round.

Jesus is not renouncing public displays of faith and religion. He is saying that if you do these things to get recognition from people, you have no reward left to you. For such persons, it is far better to go off in secret, where no one but God sees. Someone like Jesus, Who came to fulfill the law, and not to ignore it, or gainsay it, or set it aside, Someone Who belonged to a religion of public prayers and public displays, was not denouncing His own religion or His Father, Who gave these commands to be followed publicly. He is denouncing the self-centered display that brings glory to you as pious and not glory to God as merciful and powerful.

Nor is Jesus saying that governments ought to be secular and that they ought not to declare public days of prayer, of remembrance, or of thanksgiving. Much less is He banning the public mention or invocation of God, for which so many modern liberals seem to yearn.

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

“Strict Enforcement of Religious Laws: If any of you has a son or a sheep and it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will you not take hold of it and lift it out? [Matthew 12:11] The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. [Mark 2:27]”

Jesus here is not forbidding, or even criticizing, Sabbath observance. He observed it all His life. Rather, He

is restoring the Sabbath to its proper use, which is for human benefit. The main benefit involved in the Sabbath is rest. The Sabbath is the day of rest, and is based upon God's own practice in Genesis after creation was complete. Human rest and recuperation, which is the purpose of the Sabbath for us, are very important. Our laws ought to provide for them. But, sometimes situations emerge or needs arise that are more important than rest, things like the well being of one's family or property, which Jesus specifically mentions. In such instances, the Sabbath rest can be suspended. But that suspension is the exception, not the rule. For liberals to take this passage to mean that Jesus opposes public Sabbath laws is simply and fully false.

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

“Individuality & Personal Spiritual Experience: Ye are the light of the world. [Matthew 5:14]”

That we are the light of world is true. But it is not a liberal statement. It means that we have an obligation to let our light shine, something liberals, like Riley above, seem to oppose because they think that we ought not to do such things in public, as if Jesus commanded us to put our light under a bushel and not out in the open (Matt. 5: 15).

By letting our light shine, we are working to “bring every thought captive to Christ,” as Paul admonished us (2 Cor. 10:5). We do so because Christ is Lord. Indeed, He is Lord of all things, not just some. If Christ is Lord of all things, then nothing—nothing—is properly secular. If nothing is properly secular, then anything pursued in a secular fashion is at least partly, if not wholly, mispursued. Yet, liberals like Riley want to make government secular, including public schools and even the Pledge of Allegiance. Christ is Lord of all things. He is Lord of the marketplace, the academy, the laboratory, the arena, and the public square. It is in those places, places that are properly His, even if the world and the liberals do not know it, that we are to be the light of the world. They need light in a dark place, and those places all are now deeply lost in darkness. We conservatives intend to let the light shine because we know that government without God is your worst nightmare, not your dream come true. It seems not to strike Riley as odd, foolish, or undesirable that convicts can read the Bible in prison but that students cannot read the Bible in school. If students were permitted to do so, we might have fewer convicts.

Nothing Jesus says here makes Him a liberal.

“Follow the Truth.....wherever it leads you!?”

Indeed.