



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 5



Dr. David Noebel

May 2013

Ted Cruz, Joe McCarthy and Communism 2013

“Once Communists in America lurked in the shadow; now the Communist Party USA is an unabashed presence at the Oct. 2 [2010] ‘One Nation Working Together’ rally.” Andree Seu, *World* magazine, November 6, 2011, p. 79

“John Sweeney [a member of the Democratic Socialist of America] opened the AFL-CIO’s door to Communist Party organizers for the first time since the 1950s, allowing Communists to distribute literature at his conventions and recruit workers to their cause.” David Horowitz and Richard Poe, *The Shadow Party*, p. 166

“Kill all the rich people. Break up their cars and apartments. Bring the revolution home. Kill your parents. . . . I’m a radical, leftist, small ‘c’ communist.” Bill Ayers in Aaron Klein and Brenda J. Elliot, *The Manchurian President: Barack Obama’s Ties to Communists, Socialists and Other Anti-American Extremists*, p. 7, 13

“There were more self-declared communists on the Harvard faculty than there were Republicans.” Ted Cruz, *World* magazine, November 7, 2008, p. 25

“The *New Yorker*’s Jane Mayer asked, ‘Is Senator Ted Cruz Our New McCarthy?’ Mayer dug up a speech from almost three years ago, in which Cruz said of his time at Harvard Law School in the 1990s, ‘There were more self-declared communists on the Harvard faculty than there were Republicans. There was one Republican. But there were 12 who would say they were Marxists who believed in the Communists overthrowing the United States government.’ *The Weekly Standard*, March 11, 2012, p. 2

“I am a leftist and by conviction, as well as by temperament, a revolutionary.” Roberto Mangabeira Unger, Harvard University Law professor and one of Barack Obama’s major professors. Dinesh D’Souza, *The Roots of Obama’s Rage*, p. 98

“Bobby Kennedy worked for [Sen. Joe] McCarthy and held him in such high esteem that he asked McCarthy to be the godfather to his first child, Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, born on the Fourth of July, 1951. This was seventeen months after McCarthy’s famous Wheeling, West Virginia, speech, well into McCarthy’s ‘reign of terror.’ The very year of McCarthy’s censure, John F. Kennedy fiercely defended McCarthy on Soviet territory: Cambridge, Massachusetts.” Ann Coulter, *Treason: Liberal Treachery From the Cold War to the War on Terrorism*, p. 101

“Let’s start with the obvious. China is inching toward capitalism and its attendant freedoms as verifiably as the United States is inching toward a centralized government that is at least socialist in letter and arguably communist in spirit.” Arsneio Orteza, *World* magazine, March 23, 2013, p. 36

Note: For any skeptic who may be reading this and having a difficult time believing that Harvard University has taken a turn toward communism, consider reading the definitive work on the subject: *The Great Deceit: Social Pseudo-Sciences, A Veritas Foundation Staff Study* by former Harvard and Yale professors and Research Director, Zygmund Dobbs.

Of course, the definitive work on Sen. Joe McCarthy is by M. Stanton Evans, *Blacklisted by History: The Untold Story of Senator Joe McCarthy and His Fight Against America’s Enemies*. Ann Coulter’s work *Treason* is no second rate work

either, but then she admits that Mr. Evans shared a great deal of his research with her.

A semi-definitive work on the communist situation in the United States: *You Can Still Trust the Communists . . . (to be Communists)* by Fred C. Schwarz and David A. Noebel. This work may be ordered at www.schwarzreport.org website.

In a column in the *New Republic* last month, John B. Judis laid into newly elected Senator Ted Cruz of Texas for asking Chuck Hagel, during his confirmation hearings to become secretary of defense, about his relationship with Chas Freeman. Hagel was chairman of the Atlantic Council and Freeman served on its board. Hagel brushed aside the question during his Senate hearing but did call Freeman a “respected public servant for this nation.” Freeman, you may recall, was Obama’s pick to chair the National Intelligence Council in 2009 but withdrew his name after controversy ensued over past statements. Freeman later blamed “the Israel lobby”—an unfortunate descriptor Hagel is also fond of—for torpedoing his nomination.

For having the temerity to ask Hagel about his relationship with Freeman, Cruz was reminiscent of Joe McCarthy, Judis declared: “Americans who worry about democracy need to keep on [Cruz]. He is not a dumb drunk [sic] like McCarthy.” Recall that one of the reasons Chas Freeman’s nomination faltered was that he had defended the Chinese government’s slaughter of students and activists in Tiananmen Square in unequivocal terms. To sum up, Cruz is a threat to democracy for daring to ask Hagel about his “respected” colleague who happened to defend a Communist state that has slaughtered its democratic activists. Got it.

Nonetheless, the Cruz-is-the-new-McCarthy meme has taken off on the left. In one particularly repugnant item, Talking Points Memo editor Josh Marshall ran photos of Cruz and McCarthy side by side, commenting on their “strong physical resemblance.” *The New Yorker’s* Jane Mayer asked, “Is Senator Ted Cruz Our New McCarthy?” Mayer dug up a speech from almost three years ago, in which Cruz said of his time at Harvard Law School in the 1990s, “There were fewer declared Republicans in the faculty when we were there than Communists! There was one Republican. But there were 12 who would say they were Marxists who believed in the Communists overthrowing the United States government.”

Of course, Mayer didn’t dispute there are Marxists on the Harvard Law faculty or that Cruz was wrong about their number—but she did try to downplay the matter.

However, in a blog post responding to Mayer, New York attorney Dan McLaughlin, who was a year behind Cruz at Harvard, quotes the course description of one of the “critical legal theory” classes at length and accurately states that it would “fit comfortably on the syllabus at Patrice Lumumba University.”

Mayer also quotes Harvard Law professor Charles Fried saying Cruz was wrong because he could “count four ‘out’ Republicans (including myself)” that were on the faculty. McLaughlin, a former president of the Harvard Law School Republicans, is mystified by this comment. Mayer did not ask Fried to name the other professors, and the “Republican” Fried might be an unreliable narrator—he supported Obama and has been drifting left for some time. McLaughlin even posted a picture of the T-shirts Harvard Law Republicans printed after the ’94 election to make a point about the paucity of Republicans on the faculty. The shirt read: “US House 53% U.S. Senate 54% State Governors 60% Harvard Law School 1%.”

Even accepting Fried’s generous calculation, Cruz would still be warranted in expressing righteous anger that self-identified Marxists would outnumber Republicans three to one on the faculty of America’s most prestigious law school. It seems laughable to call someone a McCarthyite for pointing out that being an avowed Marxist is no impediment to success.

It’s worth noting that McLaughlin rightly concedes Cruz is guilty of “hyperbolic flourish” in characterizing the radicalism of the professors in question. To be scrupulously fair, perhaps what Cruz should have said is that Harvard Law’s Marxists merely bear a “strong physical resemblance” to “Communists overthrowing the United States government.”

—*The Weekly Standard*, March 11, 2013, p. 2-3

Hugo Chavez’ Oil and Fortune

by Humberto Fontova

When it came to thundering against the “Yankee imperialists!” Hugo Chavez sure talked a good one. But despite his bluster and monkeyshines he wasn’t crazy enough to lift a finger against his top customer, or even wish him (genuine) harm. It’s impolitic to reveal, but the US is by far the biggest customer for Venezuelan oil. Hugo Chavez was our fourth largest oil supplier, behind only Canada, Mexico, and Saudi Arabia.

But that's all behind the scenes. Now on stage we had a first-class vaudeville show:

"Yesterday the devil (President George Bush) came here! Right here. And it smells of sulfur still today." [Hugo Chavez at the UN, Sept. 2006]

"You are ignoramus, you are a burro, Mr. Danger . . . You are a donkey, Mr. Danger! You are a donkey, Mr. George W. Bush!"

"You are a coward, Mr. Bush, a killer, a perpetrator of genocide, an alcoholic, a drunk, a liar, an immoral person, Mr. Danger. You are the worst, Mr. Danger. The worst of this planet! A psychologically sick man, I know it!"

"You are a fraud, Obama. . . . Go and ask many people in Africa! . . . You are an Afro-descendant, but you are the shame of all those people!"

"Capitalism is the way of the devil and exploitation!" (Upon his death, by the way, Chavez' fortune was estimated at \$2 billion.)

And the gallery ate it up—though Fidel Castro probably cringed at his protégé's buffooneries. Hugo Chavez, after all, kept Castro's Stalinist regime afloat with \$6 billion a year in subsidies. His protégé (this gladiator against "imperialism!" and "foreign bullying!" this paragon of "national sovereignty!") also allowed 10,000 of Castro's KGB-tutored spies and soldiers to essentially run Venezuela.

Castro's apparatchiks ran Venezuela right down to making up Hugo Chavez' squad of bodyguards. Oh, I know, I know, the media (especially those networks bestowed Havana bureaus) dutifully recited that all 50,000 Cubans in Venezuela were selfless, "doctors and teachers," Castro's Peace Corps, minus only the Peter, Paul, and Mary soundtrack.

Tell it to the Venezuelan demonstrators who for the past few months were burning Cuban flags, burning Castro in effigy while yelling "Cubans Go Home!" (What? You say the US media—especially those outlets bestowed Havana bureaus—didn't report this? They blacked out an item featuring the very type of scenes and soundbites the MSM habitually slobbers over? . . . Hummmm?)

Whatever their titles, the Cubans in Venezuela were essential for Castroite colonization. "So I'll overlook Hugo's public buffooneries," Castro must have reasoned.

Further north Hugo's buffooneries were also overlooked. "American officials say Mr. Chavez, despite his very public denunciations of Washington, worked behind the scenes to keep trade relations between the two countries, especially in the oil sector, strong," recently reported *The New York Times*. "They recalled how Mr. Chavez once picked up the phone and dialed an American diplomat to

talk policy. . . . The United States needs to fix this, Mr. Chavez said during the call, which concerned the ouster of the Honduran president in 2009. "You are the only ones who can."

One of the most insane policies of our State Department recently was their obsession with reinstalling Chavez' narcotrafficking buddy Manuel "Mel" Zelaya as Honduran President. In June 2009 that nation's Supreme Court voted unanimously to oust the serial outlaw Zelaya and replace him with the President of Honduras' National Congress Roberto Micheletti. The Honduran legislature voted 125-5 for the same. The five contrarian legislators belong to Honduras' Communist party.

The US State Department promptly fell in line with the five Honduran Communists. "We don't recognize Roberto Micheletti as the president of Honduras," declared State Dept. spokesman Ian Kelly. "We recognize Manuel Zelaya."

So apparently Hugo's call to his American contact got our state Department jumping—and quickly. Utterly unreported at the time was that one of the US' most important military bases in the Western hemisphere is in Palmerola, Honduras. Hugo Chavez, Fidel Castro, (and especially) Sandinista Daniel Ortega in next-door Nicaragua, found this state of affairs highly discomfiting.

"We're convinced that Zelaya was scheming to turn your military base over to Chavez," disclosed Honduran government officials to this writer during interviews with President Micheletti in Tegucigalpa in June of 2009. "We started getting suspicious when suddenly, out of the blue, (Chavez-buddy) Zelaya declared that Honduras desperately needed another International airport."

"What?!" all us legislators asked ourselves, while looking at each other wide-eyed? Honduras airports are perfectly adequate for our needs—and everyone knew that."

"That US base in Palmerola would make a great location for that airport" Zelaya continued. "And Venezuela has promised to finance the project."

"That's when we really became suspicious and started inquiring more closely," recalled the Honduran legislators. "Zelaya, we finally determined, planned to boot the U.S. military (under that airport pretext) and convert this base, essentially, into a way-station for Chavez-FARC (the terrorist-narcotraffickers known as Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) drug shipments to the US."

Fourteen Venezuelan-registered planes crashed in Honduras during Zelaya's last 18 months of rule. All carried cocaine, or traces of the substance when located. During Roberto Micheletti's interim Honduran Presidency

not one such plane was discovered. (Note: these are just the planes that crashed. Imagine the overall traffic Zelaya was facilitating through Honduras for his friend Hugo Chavez.) After Zelaya's ouster Honduran authorities also discovered 9 clandestine airstrips in remote portions of the nation.

The Hondurans held tough against the Yankee Imperialist/Hugo Chavez bullying, however, and Mel Zelaya was not reinstated. Obama's State department never forgave Roberto Micheletti for his defense of Honduran democracy and US security. In June of 2009 they revoked his US visa. This probably served as a conciliation prize for our State Department's chum Hugo Chavez.

—Townhall.com, March 15, 2013

Hugo and Fidel

by Humberto Fontova

Events this week showed that in the pantheon of heroes for America's liberal elite, Hugo Chavez, was a pathetic D-lister. The Venezuelan buffoon never amassed even a small fraction of Fidel Castro's US celebrity, tycoon, and politician fan-base. So Sean Penn, Oliver Stone, Michael Moore, Joe Kennedy, Rep. Jose Serrano all expressed admiration for Chavez upon his passing. Big deal.

Listing Fidel Castro's A-list celebrity, tycoon, and politician fan-base would waste half of Frontpage's bandwidth on something easily found here.

The Republican National Committee scolded Democratic Rep. Serrano for his affectionate tweet to the dead Chavez. Good for them. But if the RNC applied the same standard to scolding Democratic affection for a live Fidel Castro they'd have time for nothing else. In fact, the RNC could start with some Republicans themselves, such as notorious Castro water-carrier Senator Jeff Flake.

Hugo Chavez was an authoritarian bully, a narcotrafficker, a thief, and a buffoon. He wasn't a totalitarian mass-murderer, a mass-jailer, and a mass-torturer who outlawed all political opposition under penalty of torture-chamber and firing squad and came within a hair of igniting a worldwide nuclear war, aimed first at destroying the US.

Despite his bluster and monkeyshines, this last point was never on Hugo Chavez' bucket list. Indeed it was the last thing he wanted. Keep this under your hat, but: the US is—by far—the biggest customer for Venezuelan oil. Hugo Chavez was our fourth largest oil supplier.

Three years into power Castro had already murdered more political prisoners (out of a population of 6.5 million) than Hitler murdered (out of a population of 65 million) in his first six years. Ten years into power Castro had jailed and tortured at a higher rate than Stalin during his Great Terror. Fidel Castro's lifelong dream was to destroy the US—and he came within a hair of it.

So given his tiny attainments (by Castroite standards) in mass-murder, mass-torture, mass-terror, and anti-Americanism, it's small surprise that Hugo Chavez amassed only a fraction of Castro's affection from American liberals.

“VIVA FIDEL!”—“VIVA CHE GUEVARA!” yelled a beaming nominee for America's dominant political party, Democrat Jesse Jackson, in 1984, while arm in arm with the man who craved to nuke his nation.

“VIVAL FIDEL!” yelled ultra-influential Democratic US Congressman Charles Rangel right before rushing up and suffocating in a bear hug the man who had craved to nuke him. The scene was Harlem's Abyssinian Baptist Church in October 1995, where the very rafters shook from the thundering chants of “VIVA FIDEL!—VIVA FIDEL!” issuing from a crowd that also included Maxine Waters.

“Castro is very shy and sensitive,” revealed US Senator (and “conscience” of America's dominant political party) George McGovern upon first meeting the man who craved to nuke the nation McGovern sought to run as president. “I frankly liked him [Fidel Castro] . . . I consider him a friend.”

“Fidel Castro could have been Cuba's Elvis.” (Dan Rather.)

“Fidel Castro is one hell of a guy. You people would like him.” (Ted Turner to a beaming crowd at Harvard Law School.)

“Fidel Castro is old-fashioned, courtly—even paternal, a thoroughly fascinating figure.” (Andrea Mitchell.)

“It was quite a moment to behold. Fidel Castro was very engaging and very energetic,” said a hyperventilating Rep. Barbara Lee (D-CA).

“Fidel Castro has brought very high literacy and great health-care to his country. His personal magnetism is powerful.” (Barbara Walters.)

And on, and on, and on. . . .

When Hugo Chavez visited the United Nations in 2006 and bad-mouthed President George Bush as “the devil,” “a cowboy,” etc., he was roundly denounced by President Bush's most vocal Democratic opponents.

“You don't come into my country; you don't come into my congressional district and you don't condemn my

president,” shot back a scowling Charles Rangel.

“He [Chavez] is an everyday thug,” added the angry House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi.

Chavez started his UN rant on the right foot. He held up a book by Noam Chomsky while blasting the US. His mentor Castro was undoubtedly nodding at the time: “Nice . . . very nice.”

But Hugo quickly got carried away and went off the rails, blasting Bush himself. “No, no, no, Hugo!” Castro probably moaned with his face in his hands. “The beauty of this thing, Hugo, is that so many American leftists are so eager to echo our ravings that there’s absolutely no need for us to mouth them ourselves, you idiot! It’s practically impossible to get Democrats riled up against a Latin Marxist—and here you’ve managed it, you idiot! Now look what you’ve done! Prominent Democrats—my historic allies—from Rangel to Pelosi, are speaking against you! I’ve relied on such people to mouth or echo my ravings for decades, Hugo!”

For simply saying the UN “smelt of sulfur,” Chavez was censured by prominent New Yorkers. After twice trying to make the entire city smell of charred flesh, his mentor, Fidel Castro, got a reception to shame Simon and Garfunkel’s in Central Park.

When Fidel Castro visited New York in 1995 he was “The Toast of Manhattan!” wined and dined from the Council on Foreign Relations to *The Wall Street Journal* with dozens of The Beautiful People lining up for his autograph. The jailer and torturer of the longest suffering black political prisoners in modern history was bear-hugged by Charles Rangel. The jailer and torturer of the most female political prisoners in the modern history of the western hemisphere was hugged and smooched by feminist Diane Sawyer. The jailer and torturer of the most journalists in the modern history of the western hemisphere found everyone from Dan Rather to Mike Wallace to Tina Brown lining up for his autograph. The jailer and torturer who abolished private property within his Stalinist fiefdom found David Rockefeller and Mort Zuckerman crowding around him for a handshake.

The mass-murderer was not only the man “to see” but the one to be seen with.

Chavez was a cheap chump and clown. Maybe if he’d twice come within a hair of incinerating New York, he’d have been bestowed the proper cachet—and the city’s elite would now be paying him the proper respect.

—FrontPage Magazine, March 12, 2013

Chavez “The Redeemer”

by Mary Anastasia O’Grady

Barack Obama’s first term was not kind to many Americans. Yet when a presidential-election exit poll in November asked voters which candidate “cares about people like me,” President Obama beat Mitt Romney by a staggering 81% to 18%.

You can blame that on Mr. Romney, but I think it has mostly to do with the cult of personality. And it was something to bear in mind last week as tens of thousands of Venezuelans in the streets of Caracas tearfully mourned the death of Hugo Chavez. Many of the poor may authentically believe that the dictator cared for them. But that doesn’t mean that he made them better off. He didn’t.

The results of the U.S. exit poll seemed highly illogical. Americans had endured four years of stubbornly high unemployment, stagnant wage growth, and rising gas and food prices. Yet Mr. Obama remained connected with the voters, as the exit poll and election outcome demonstrated.

Many Venezuelans seem to experience a similar disconnect between their idealism and reality. I suspect that the hysteria witnessed last week on the part of poor Venezuelans has to do with what psychologists call cognitive dissonance, the frustration and anxiety that one feels when holding two conflicting beliefs.

On the one hand, Chavez connected with the down-trodden in ways that previous presidents haven’t, starting with the fact that, like many of them, he is a mixed-race Venezuelan from humble origins. He first came on the political scene as an outsider promising to put an end to corruption, and to channel the country’s vast oil wealth to the disenfranchised.

This paternalism and his personal story struck a chord. He became a father figure in a country where many children grow up fatherless.

Chavez was a skilled orator with keen Machiavellian instincts. He mastered both the art of propaganda and the science of censorship. Most Venezuelans lost access to objective news reporting over his 14-year rule and were forced to absorb nothing but his indoctrination. He gave handouts to the poor, which, though meager, were better than anything they had received from earlier governments. Little wonder that by the time he died he had become a symbol of revenge for the marginalized, a champion of their cause.

On the other hand, they live in the real world, and it is likely on some level that most Venezuelans—rich, middle class, or poor—understand that they are worse off

today. Living standards are deteriorating, and the future is even less promising than it was in 1998 when Chavez was first elected.

Prices are the key signal. The government's February 2003 price controls, designed to combat inflation, have completely failed. The central bank admits that over the past 10 years inflation in food and nonalcoholic beverages is 1,284%, and that food shortages are increasingly prevalent.

One of Chavez's more destructive economic schemes was the transfer of central-bank reserves to an off-budget government fund for infrastructure investments. He started in 2003 by arguing that he only wanted "a little billion." Total transfers have now reached \$49 billion, and the fund has no independent supervision.

The central bank has also been bailing out the state-owned oil company PdVSA and the state-owned mining and industrial conglomerate known as CVG. All these transfers are destroying the value of the bolívar. Some economists are forecasting a consumer-price inflation rate for 2013 of more than 30% and zero gross-domestic-product growth.

In 2012, according to Venezuelan economist Pedro Palma, the government's fiscal deficit (which is never easy to calculate because of the many government enterprises) was 16%-18% of GDP. With oil prices at the upper end of historical levels, this can only mean that government spending is spinning out of control and that without a reconciliation of the budget Venezuela will go broke.

Economic hardship isn't the only heavy burden that Chavez's constituents bear. The official murder rate in 2012 was 73 per 100,000 inhabitants and the killing is happening mostly in low-income neighborhoods. Families of crime victims have no hope of getting justice for their loved ones.

Will any of this tarnish Chavez's memory? Probably not. In his 2011 book *Redeemers*, Mexican historian Enrique Krauze traces the history of "ideas and power in Latin America" over the course of the 20th century through the biographies of some of the region's most well-known messianic figures. Most of his subjects enjoyed the adulation of the masses, even as their utopian promises went bust. Those in power often employed brutal repression to keep it. Fittingly, Chávez is the final profile in that book.

The military government also has good reason to deify the late comandante. If his memory is sacred, so too must be the system he built. Last week interim President Nicolas Maduro announced that Chavez will be embalmed "so he can be eternally open" for public viewing: "Just like Ho Chi Minh, like Lenin, how Mao Zedong is."

—*The Wall Street Journal*, March 11, 2013, p. A 15

Killing Free Speech in the West

by Paul Gottfried

Last week a ruling by the Canadian Supreme Court upheld a very broad hate speech law in the province of Saskatchewan, a law that exists in even more extreme forms in other Canadian provinces and perhaps in the most extreme form in the Canadian Human Rights Act, which makes it a criminal offense to preach something called "hate." The Saskatchewan resident who was found guilty of this outrage was a religious Christian who had distributed pamphlets declaring homosexuality to be a sin. If this gentleman, William Whatcott, had expressed the same view over the Internet, he could have been arrested under a federal law prohibiting "homophobic" speech. In 2008 in the Canadian province of Alberta a Protestant minister was arrested for delivering a sermon that was critical of gay marriage; and the same fate befell an Evangelical printer in Ontario two years ago who refused to produce invitations to a gay wedding. In Ontario it is now a punishable offense to put up a billboard that "discriminates," a grievous offense that courts have been left to define and decide.

I could easily provide multiple cases of the suppression of politically incorrect speech in other "liberal democracies" throughout Western and Central Europe, having already published several books on this depressing subject. And this problem is particularly disheartening because Freedom House and other agencies that are supposed to monitor the status of liberty throughout the world don't seem to care about these PC assaults on intellectual and religious freedom in countries they consider to be democracies. For example, Freedom House ignores a rigorously enforced French law making "Armenian-genocide denial" a crime while railing against Turkey for prohibiting the view that Frenchmen are required to embrace. Moreover, the suppression of free speech that we notice in Canada is proceeding even more dramatically in France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, and Sweden. In all these and other European countries, EU requirements and national laws impose strict speech and writing codes in order to prevent (what else?) unauthorized hate. Needless to say, Muslim extremists are hardly ever touched by this draconian legislation and are usually quite free to rage against Christians and Jews.

The most extreme restrictions seem to be in Germany, which reveals an especially egregious degree of thought control. There the present problem started in the postwar period with the misguided reeducation of the Germans un-

dertaken by their Western conquerors. The reeducation that the Allies, starting in 1945, imposed on the post-Nazism country stressed antifascism and antinationalism. Unfortunately it totally neglected other more important values such as free inquiry and the right of dissent. A war that commenced under the Occupation against such presumed evils as “Prussianism” and even simple German patriotism goes on today in an accelerated fashion, and it has contributed to the painfully narrow limits in Germany concerning what its citizens may say about politics, morals, or history. Those who go outside those limits will be investigated by special agencies as a threat to Germany’s “democratic constitutional order.” As an added disincentive for politically incorrect non-conformists, those who land up on a widely available government list of suspected anti-democrats are typically dismissed from their professional positions as “extremists.” The German “center right” chancellor has openly congratulated her people for not having a rightwing party. The German political spectrum starts somewhere on the American left-center and then moves further to the left than either of our two national parties.

This relates in some ways to a more general European political problem, which has been the wholesale transfer of communist cadres from sinking or collapsing communist parties into what used to be the democratic Left. In Germany, onetime communist dignitaries were treated with remarkable leniency by the government and by the generally far leftist press after the fall of the communist state, and even longtime secret police agents, like the leader of the German Party of the Left (or, what is officially called the Party of Democratic Socialists) Gregor Gysi, went from being a Stasi-informer to one of the German Republic’s rising political stars overnight. Even the Christian Democratic Chancellor Angela Merkel had been a supporter of the German communist regime (like her still ardently communist parents) almost up to the moment of the fall of the Berlin Wall. In Merkel’s continued praise of Stalin and the Red Army for “liberating the Germans from fascism,” one can still easily catch the echoes of her intense communist upbringing and education.

Communists who wanted to stay in politics once their formerly powerful parties in France, Italy, and Germany lost their working class base and especially after the Soviet

Empire imploded, had to make adjustments. Reinvented communists continued to represent “antifascism” and to call for punishing their traditional “fascist” foes. But the enemy went from being the capitalist owners of productive forces to those who expressed reactionary attitudes. One of the first steps in this transformation was getting out ahead of the crowd in tightening up or pushing through Holocaust denial prohibitions in France, Italy, and other European countries. The communists or former communists invariably took the lead here, as in the Loi Gayssot, passed in France in July 1990, which made it a criminal offense to deny any part of the Nuremberg Court’s judgment concerning Nazi crimes, which was handed down in 1947. This, quite conveniently for the law’s sponsors, had the stamp of approval of Stalin’s judges, who had been involved in the trials of Nazi war criminals, and was based on evidence and testimonies that would merit historical reexamination, even from non-Holocaust-deniers.

The French Jewish scholar Elisabeth Levy (who at considerable social and financial cost has sustained the crusade against governmentally enforced PC in her country, mostly through her website Causeur) and before her, the genuinely disillusioned former communist and historian of the French Communist Party, Annie Kriegel, warned against criminalizing assumed Holocaust deniers. Such critics interpreted this move as the first step for French communists and their socialist allies in a campaign against free speech in France. After the criminalization of Holocaust-denial, the French Left demanded other restrictions on unacceptable speech, for example, making the denial of the “Armenian genocide” into a criminal offense, and then pressing (quite successfully) to punish other forms of “fascist” self-expression. (Antifascism in Europe is the equivalent of antiracism or anti-homophobia in the US or Canada.)

Lest I forget, I should mention another elephant that landed up in the European parlor and continues to cause havoc there: the Sixty-Eighters who turned into middle-aged European politicians without losing their taste for intimidating the bourgeois. Not only are most Western European governments full of these types, but they have also ominously gone into the European media and European education. In Germany these antifascist activists

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.

have not kept the same major enemy over the decades, despite their continued disinclination for liberty for anyone but themselves. They turned their fury first against the Americans and the anti-communist side in the Cold War and then just as ferociously against their own country.

Indeed they have turned national masochism into a German state religion. German politicians in the Green and Socialist parties are perpetually expressing the wish that the area between France and Poland would cease to exist as a state. The new head of the Green Party, Jürgen Trittin, a onetime violent socialist revolutionary, expresses impatience that Germany has taken so long to disappear, given its evil past. Personally I have no idea why Germans vote for such creeps, but, remarkably enough, millions do. Their strength lies primarily in the support of a public sector class that is much larger than ours.

German-hating, aging Sixty-Eighters do bring up periodically the Holocaust as a national disgrace, and indeed the former Socialist Foreign Minister and another, onetime murderous revolutionary, Joschka Fischer, who was involved in assassinations before his conversion to a quieter march through the institutions, averred in 1999 that “Auschwitz is [he meant, should be] the founding myth of the German Republic.” But state-supported remorse for Hitler’s crimes against the Jews was only a brief stopping point on the journey on which Fischer and his fellow Sixty-Eighters would take their country, and they would do so unfortunately with a democratic mandate. The imperative never to forget Auschwitz has led the all-powerful German Left in a number of dubious directions, including banning more and more politically incorrect speech, whitewashing communist crimes against their own people and against other nations, and favoring the creation of a “parallel society” for Muslims who are busily occupying German inner cities.

One might also note that the banning of “rightwing” hate speech in every form has allowed communists and their sympathizers to remove from public discussion any mention of communist mass murder. In France, Germany, and Italy any awkward attempt to bring up this matter, particularly after the publication of the *Black Book of Communism* in 1997 detailing the grisly killings committed by communist governments, elicits charges from the entire left, and not just communists, about diverting attention from pressing fascist threats. In November 1997 French Socialist Premier Lionel Jospin rose in the French Assembly to commit a legally permissible genocide-denial. Jospin attacked those who would dare suggest “equivalence” between Hitler’s and Stalin’s crime. As a man of the left, the premier regarded Stalin as a true “antifascist

ally in the war against Nazism,” and he refused to allow right-wingers to insult his communist coalition partners.

Three concluding points may be appropriate here. One, the current war against politically incorrect speech throughout the Western world is ultimately far more destructive than the attempts to quiet dissenters that are pursued under authoritarian governments like China. Authoritarian states wish to shut up those who seem eager to overthrow their rule. These governments sometimes behave stupidly and even brutally, but they are understandably interested in surviving in the face of growing opposition. What we see in Western countries is an organized totalitarian force attempting through repression and state-supported social engineering to restructure human nature. And this force moves along and conquers less violently than those overt dictatorships that may be sitting on a volcano of discontent. Those warnings about the cumulative effects of “soft despotism,” which extend from the social and political critic Tocqueville in the 1830s down to Robert Nisbet in the 1950s and 1960s, apply fully to the aberrant course now being pursued by Western governments.

Two, almost all political attacks on intellectual and religious freedom that I’ve recorded are directed against what is perceived as the “far right.” There is no other presumed threat that the government and leftist establishments in Canada and Europe are interested in silencing. But more significantly, this allegedly rightist enemy has come to embrace anyone who dissents from the left’s program of control or imposed ideology. “Fascists” now include victims of communist regimes who depict their former captors unfavorably, those “extremists” who protest Islamicist tirades too loudly, and those who voice religious objections to the projects of the cultural left. Although there are similar forms of intolerance that are evident in our universities and media, the American government, at least for the time being, has done less than other “liberal democracies” to impose PC with a jackboot. This of course may change, despite the First Amendment.

Three, there is no one-to-one relation any longer between governments that permit some degree of economic freedom and those that refrain from throttling politically insensitive opinion. According to the Index of Economic Freedom, Canada and Sweden rate higher than the US (Germany is just a bit lower) in their willingness to practice fiscal discipline and to keep the tax rate for corporate profits low or non-existent. Some societies with higher ratings for economic liberty have also, not incidentally, become models or cesspools of governmentally controlled Political Correctness.

—FrontPage Magazine, March 5, 2013