



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 6



Dr. David Noebel

June 2013

The Dark Side of Same-sex ‘Marriage’

by David A. Noebel

“In a decade, gay marriage has gone from joke to dogma.” Christopher Caldwell, “Gay Rites,” *Claremont Review of Books*, Winter 2012/13, p. 26

“The American Civil Liberties Union was not interested in defending gay rights at all in 1957, when it called homosexuals ‘socially heretical or deviant’.” Caldwell, p. 23

“26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy, and promiscuity as ‘normal, natural, healthy.’ 40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.” W. Cleon Skousen, “Current Communist Goals,” *The Naked Communist*, p. 261, 262

On March 21, 2013 there was a fundraiser held in New York for the National Lesbian & Gay Journalist Association (NLGJA). It was sponsored by all the major news organizations, and then some, including: Fox News, CBS News, NBCUniversal, CNN, jetBlue, Bloomberg, *The New York Times*, General Motors, and Eli Lilly and Company.

Natalie Morales of NBC’s “Today Show” was the host for the occasion.

Jenna Wolfe, of NBC’s “Today Show,” used the occasion to announce that she and her lesbian partner, Stephanie Gosk, an NBC News correspondent, were getting married, and that she was already pregnant.

The homosexual movement is presently being financed by the Gay Mafia which includes such heavy hitters as Timothy Gill of Denver and, of course, George Soros. *Time* magazine’s “The Gay Mogul Changing US Politics” was referring to Tim Gill. While Gill is financing “OutGiving” Soros is funding “New Beginning Initiative.”

Most of the sexual antics performed by homosexuals upon each other are too disgusting to describe in a family-oriented publication, but on March 31, 2013 we are informed that “the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, the kabuki-inspired cross-dressing nuns-of-fun, hosted their 34th Easter Sunday at Dolores Park.” They sponsored a “Hunky Jesus” contest and *Time* magazine added to the desensitizing agenda by featuring a cover story showing two white homosexual couples kissing.

How the United States of America could twice elect a pro-homosexual president and even think of marriage for his GLBTQAI (gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, questioning/queer, allied/asexual and intersexed) family needs to be set in historical perspective. The following is a 4,000 year look on how we arrived at the 2013 moral, legal, and political fiasco, and proves once again that there is nothing new under the sun (Ecclesiastes 1:9).

Genesis 19:4, 5 (2,000 B.C.)

“Before they went to bed, the men of the city of Sodom, both young and old, the whole population surrounded the house. They called out to Lot and said, ‘Where are the men who came to you tonight? Send them out to us so we can have sex with them!’”

Jude 1: 7

“In the same way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them committed sexual immorality and practiced perversions.”

Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.)

“Alexander had many of the qualities of a homosexual, and loved Hephaestion to madness. . . . When the [Greek] army was in Ecbatana his dearest companion fell sick and died. The two often shared one tent, and drank from one cup; in battle they fought side by side. Now the King, feeling that half of him had been torn away, broke down in uncontrolled grief. He lay for hours upon the corpse, weeping; he cut off his hair in mourning, and for days refused to take food. He sentenced to death the physician who had left the sick youth’s side to attend the public games. He ordered a gigantic funeral pile to be erected in Hephaestion’s memory, at a cost; we are told, of ten thousand talents (\$60,000,000), and sent to inquire of the oracle of Ammon whether it was permitted to worship Hephaestion as a god. In his next campaign, a whole tribe was slain, at his orders, as a sacrifice to Hephaestion’s ghost” (Will Durant, *The Life of Greece*, p. 540, 551).

Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.)

“Back again in Rome, he [Caius Julius Caesar] divided his energies between politics and love. He was handsome, though already worried about his thinning hair. When Cornelia died (68) he married Pompeia, granddaughter of Sulla. As this was a purely political marriage, he did not scruple to carry on liaisons in the fashion of his time, but in such number and with such ambigendered diversity that Curio (father of his later general) called him ‘the husband of every woman and the wife of every man.’ He would continue these habits in his campaigns. . . . After conquering Gaul they sang a coupler warning all husbands to keep their wives under lock and key as long as Caesar was in town. The aristocracy hated him double—for undermining their privileges and seducing their wives” (Will Durant, *Caesar and Christ*, p. 168).

Before proceeding further into the A.D. era let me mention two commentaries on the Greek and Roman period via St. Paul and Will & Ariel Durant.

“This is why God delivered them over to degrading passions. For even their females exchanged natural sexual intercourse for what is unnatural. The males in the same way also left natural sexual intercourse with females and were inflamed in their lust for one another. Males committed shameless acts [sodomy, S&M, fisting, etc.] with males and received in their own persons the appropriate penalty for their perversion” (Romans 1:26, 27).

“History offers some consolation by reminding us that sin has flourished in every age. Even our generation has not yet rivaled the popularity of homosexuality in ancient

Greece or Rome or Renaissance Italy. ‘The humanists wrote about it with a kind of scholarly affection [exactly as Harvard and Yale do today—see *Keynes at Harvard* by Veritas Foundation] and Ariosto judged that they were all addicted to it’; Aretino asked the Duke of Mantua to send him an attractive boy” (Will & Ariel Durant, *The Lessons of History*, p. 40).

Marquis de Sade (1740-1814 A.D.)

“If anyone can make the claim that he fired the first shot in the sexual revolution, it is the Marquis de Sade” (E. Michael Jones, *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, p. 20).

“In creating texts like *Justine*, Sade set the pattern for all subsequent versions of sexual liberation and sexual revolution” (Jones, p. 23).

“Taken on the literal level, texts like *Justine* celebrate characters like Dolmance and Rodin, who have liberated themselves from religion and morals, and, as a result, engage in any and all sexual activity free from guilt” (Jones, p. 27).

“de Sade seethed and fermented with sexual imagery and desires. . . . After an affair involving four girls, he was sentenced to death at Aix-en-Provence (1772) for ‘crimes of poisoning and sodomy.’ He escaped, was captured, escaped, committed further enormities, fled to Italy, returned to France, was arrested in Paris, was imprisoned in Vincennes (1778-84), in the Bastille, and at Charenton (1789)” (Will and Ariel Durant, *The Age of Napoleon*, p. 132).

“These were novels [*Justine* and *Juliette*] of sexual experience, normal and abnormal; the author preferred the abnormal, even to deriving erotic pleasure from the infliction of pain; in this last sense he became immortal with a word [sodomasochism]. He spent the last years of his life in various prisons, wrote clever plays, and died in the insane asylum at Charenton” (Durant, p. 132).

Michel Foucault (1926-1984)

“Foucault, who died of AIDS in June 1984 at the age of fifty-seven, has long been a darling of the same upper-chic academic crowd that fell for deconstruction” (Roger Kimball, *Experiments Against Reality*, 238).

“At the time of his death Foucault was ‘perhaps the single most famous intellectual in the world’—famous, at least, in American universities, where arguments about sex and power are pursued with risible fecklessness by the [shaggy] and untidy” (Kimball, p. 238).

“Self-destruction, in fact, was another of Foucault’s obsessions, and [James] Miller [author of *The Passion of*

Michel Foucault] is right to underscore Foucault's fascination with death. In this, as in so much else, he followed the lead of the Marquis de Sade, who had long been one of his prime intellectual and moral heroes" (Kimball, p. 240).

"But his great innovation in this book is to seize what was most vicious and perverted about Foucault—his addiction to sadomasochistic sexual practices—and to glorify it as a courageous new form of virtue" (Kimball, p. 240, 241).

Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979)

"Among the many articulations of false [sexual] freedom that were published in those years [1960s], none was more influential than Herbert Marcuse's *Marxist-Freudian Tract, Eros and Civilization* (1966). Eagerly embraced by countercultural enthusiasts who wanted to believe that heating up their sex lives would hasten the demise of capitalism and bring forth the millennium, it outlines a portentous struggle between 'the logic of domination' and the 'will to gratification,' attacks 'the established reality in the name of the pleasure principle,' and fulminated against 'the repressive order of procreative sexuality'" (Roger Kimball, *Experiments Against Reality*, p. 242, 243).

"If procreation was the purpose of sex, we must now, according to radicals from Herbert Marcuse on down, foster a sexuality that has emancipated itself from the 'tyranny of procreative eros' in order to champion what Marcuse called 'polymorphous perversity'" (Kimball, p. 298, 299).

"It was nonsense, Erich Fromm suggested, to think that certain sexual perversions included in Marcuse's advocacy of 'polymorphous perversity' could be reconciled with any real civilization. Sadism and coprophilia, to name two homosexual practices, were sick under any circumstances" (Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination*, p. 111).

From Sodom and Gomorrah in Old Testament times to Sodom-on-the-Hudson and Gomorrah-on-the-Potomac in recent times, nothing has changed for the homosexual family. The homosexual revolution is seeking to capture another morally-weak victim—the United States of America. All who stand in its way are already labeled bigots, homophobic, and enemies of science and progress.

For anyone thinking this is too improbable, I close with this challenge: read the following two works carefully—Michael L. Brown, *A Queer Thing Happened to America* and Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*, and then ponder the wisdom of the Durants in their *The Lessons of History*—"Out of every hundred new ideas [e.g., legalizing same-sex marriage] ninety-nine or more

will probably be inferior to the traditional responses [e.g., one man, one woman marriages] which they propose to replace. No one man, however brilliant or well-informed, can come in one lifetime to such fullness of understanding as to safely judge and dismiss the customs or institutions of his society, for these are the wisdom of generations after centuries of experiment in the laboratory of history" (p. 35).

A Non-Religious Case Against Same Sex Marriage

by Dr. Michael Bauman

Part One: The Argument

You might recall the awful option faced by the title character in "Sophie's Choice:" Pick one child or the other. It's not a choice any mother wants to make. No matter what she chooses, her loss is unutterable.

Nor would any child want to make the same choice in reverse: "Mommy or Daddy, Sally. Pick one."

But that is the ugly position into which same-sex marriage plunges children, except that the children themselves do not get to choose. Someone else chooses for them.

No matter what you might think about same-sex marriage, we know this: Any child raised under a same-sex union faces a tremendous loss—either no Mommy or no Daddy. In a union where two men or two women are involved, that's always the outcome. When Mommy picks a woman or Daddy picks a man as a life partner, the children always lose something enormously valuable and irreplaceable: a mother or a father.

That loss often has tragic consequences for a child. If, for example, you are raised in a home with no father around, the odds that you will drop out of school, that you will take or sell drugs, that you will go to prison, that you will be poor, and that your children will suffer the same fate you did all skyrocket. That same cycle of hopelessness and crime follows upon the absence of a mother.

When Mommy has sex with another woman, it doesn't make that other woman a Daddy. Having sex with Mommy doesn't make you a Daddy any more than drinking milk makes you a calf.

The point here is not remotely homophobic. The point here is not that Mommy and her lover, or Daddy and his, are to be shunned, much less hated. The point here is that mothers and fathers are fundamentally important to the development of children, and therefore to the future

of the nation, which depends upon the development and maturation of the next generation. That works best when children have both a father and a mother.

I say so because, according to a recent groundbreaking study by University of Texas scholar Mark Regnerus, we discover this (as summarized by the Family Research Council):

Compared to children who were raised in intact homes with both the biological father and mother present to raise them, the children of homosexual parents grow up to:

- Be much more likely to receive welfare
- Have lower educational attainment
- Report more ongoing “negative impact” from their family of origin
- Be more likely to suffer from depression
- Have been arrested more often
- (If they are female) Have had more sexual partners—both male and female

If they were the children of lesbian mothers, they are:

- More likely to be currently cohabiting
- Almost 4 times more likely to be currently on public assistance
- Less likely to be currently employed full-time
- More than 3 times more likely to be unemployed
- Nearly 4 times more likely to identify as something other than entirely heterosexual
- Three times as likely to have had an affair while married or cohabiting
- An astonishing 10 times more likely to have been “touched sexually by a parent or other adult caregiver.”
- Nearly 4 times as likely to have been “physically forced” to have sex against their will
- More likely to have “attachment” problems related to the ability to depend on others
- Use marijuana more frequently
- Smoke more frequently
- Have more often pled guilty to a non-minor offense

None of these dire results seem to have much weight with the same sex marriage crowd. Rather, they argue that marriage equality is rooted in human equality. But that bogus argument does not work. It moves illogically from one kind of equality to another. The equality of all persons does not equal the equality of all lifestyles or all relationships. For example, the mere fact that all persons are created equal does not mean that polygamy or incestual marriage ought therefore to be made legal. You cannot move logically from the equality of persons to the equality of actions, choices, lifestyles, or relationships. It simply does not follow.

Same sex marriage advocates also argue that it is

wrong to make value judgment about marriage. Yet they allow *themselves* to make value judgments about who should get to marry. Here again they fail logically. By insisting that same sex unions ought to be considered marriages on a par with heterosexual marriages, they make a value judgment about marriages, both their own marriages and those of others. If they are against making value judgments about marriage, then they have to stop saying what they say. But of course they won't. Rather, they press their judgments on others while, at the same time, refusing to permit others to make judgments.

Let me clarify a point often misunderstood: I am not saying that marriages without children are not marriages. I never once said that or meant that. I am saying that marriage and family usually go together. I am talking about a common connection between marriage and family, not a necessary pre-condition for marriage. Marriage and family are simply the usual mechanism of creating and nurturing the next generation. But in the case of a homosexual union, that is naturally impossible. And if you try to grant them by some other means the children nature denies them, then the children are statistically more likely to suffer bad consequences as a result, which is not the case with a heterosexual marriage. Or, put differently, my wife and I have no children as yet. I obviously do not argue that we have no marriage. If we had children, it wouldn't as likely damage the children involved as would being raised by two men or two women, a situation that entails the significant loss of either mommy or daddy. In short, wise governments and wise citizens do well always to remember that important and basic fact of life and to avoid making laws that undermine the traditional family and traditional family roles, which serve us and our offspring best.

The next time you consider the propriety and wisdom of same sex marriage, ask yourself this question: Which parent don't children need, mommy or daddy?

Part Two: The Explanation

First, definitions: One can define “mommy” and “daddy” in more ways than one, biologically or functionally, for example. These two ways are not interchangeable. That is, one can be a biological but not a well functioning mother, and one can be a well functioning though not biological mother. Ideally, they are the same—ideally one's biological mother is also a well-functioning mother. But in reality they are not, reality rarely being ideal. Sometimes death, divorce, and personal failings of various sorts intrude themselves upon the family.

Second, prudential governance: Because a govern-

ment cannot, and ought not, intrude itself *ad hoc* into the details of every troubled or dysfunctional family, it must operate on a more general level. Therefore, we need to ask ourselves, at that more general level, what sorts of things ought government to do, to endorse, or to recognize as law? That is the question at issue here. Generally speaking, the most prudential choice for government, it seems to me, is to endorse and protect what nature, not the most recent outburst of political correctness, provides—namely, heterosexually parented families, which seem more likely to produce healthy, emotionally stable, and productive citizens than other arrangements generally do.

We know what oftens happens when either one of the parents is missing—and in same-sex marriage one of them is always missing. Regnerus has shown what that missing parent means to children. He shows too, that mommy's girlfriend and daddy's boyfriend are not suitably functioning opposite sex role models. Seeing mommy or daddy relate to someone of the same sex is not as helpful a role model for future natural families as is watching a man and a woman relate well to each other in the give and take of human existence, and in the predictably unpredictable chaos of daily married life.

Third, methodology: If you expect social science research to be beyond dispute, then you live in a fantasy world. For various reasons, social science is not, and cannot be, beyond dispute. Yes, I know that some social scientists dispute Regnerus. Of course they do. They dispute practically anyone who reaches politically incorrect conclusions. I also know that other social scientists dispute Regnerus' disputers.

Neither a social scientist's research nor the disputes raised against the social scientist's work can be beyond dispute. Social science does not yield that kind of result, period. If you depend for your proof upon indisputability, then you will wait forever. That's why I prefer to argue philosophically and historically, not statistically. I can imagine almost no argument of any sort from any discipline that would be finally compelling on this issue. Disputes will arise across the board, meaning that while some position or another is right, we likely will find it difficult to prove compellingly which one that is. The infinitely varied complications of human life do not normally conform to such academically unanimous conclusions.

To be more specific: For various reasons, I believe that the social sciences are deeply and irreparably flawed. (That is the subject of a different essay.) I take that irreparable flaw to be part of why so many in the Austrian school of economics prefer to think of economics rather more philosophically than numerically. They think in terms of

axioms and deductions, not sophisticated computations. In that light, I am saying that prudence and history are a more useful guide than statistics in determining what government ought to do about marriage, and prudence is more philosophical (and its evidence is of a different sort) than mere statistics. The wisdom of the ages, hard won as it was in the crucible of life in a fallen world, is a better guide to prudent living and prudent government than the latest social scientist's mathematical computations. Tradition shows that some things work better than others, and that over the centuries our ancestors slowly figured out what they were in many cases. In other words, do not discard the wisdom of the ages for the latest social scientist's calculations.

If you think that humans and their actions are understood best by reducing them to integers and then massaging those integers via elaborate mathematical calculations, then you do not yet understand human beings or human nature. Human beings cannot be reduced to numbers without (literally) incalculable loss.

But to satisfy the lust some have for sociological number crunching, I have included Regnerus' research in the argument above, though that will not, as you can easily predict, convince the unconvinced. Nor will quoting calculations opposed to Regnerus.

We must use the best lights available to us, and in this case, history seems best to me. I see no substantial or compelling historical case for same-sex marriage. Because human nature is the same across the ages and the places, the lack of historical indicators supporting same-sex marriage seems to me enormously relevant and important. Precisely what are the historical and cultural indicators that same-sex marriage works as well as heterosexual marriage and ought to be legalized? I know of none. Perhaps you do. I am interested to hear them. And if you say there are no such indicators because almost everywhere such arrangements were discouraged and rejected, then please explain why that was, and please do so without insulting our ancestors, who were at least as wise, virtuous, and intelligent as we are, though not as technologically advanced.

Fourth, divorced parents are not an exception to the rule. We know that, generally speaking, divorce is tough on children and that it is generally not as good for them as a well and harmoniously functioning father and mother. Sometimes, and we cannot tell for certain when those times are, it might be better for parents to divorce than to remain together. In such cases, we do the best we can for the children: Because a mommy and a daddy are both so important in the development of stable persons,

we try to keep access to mommy and daddy open to the children via visitation rights and other means. With whom, if anyone, the divorced parents live after divorce is not a small issue because it helps shape the next generation. That influence, malignant or benign as it might be, is a proper concern for the state, so the state needs to employ the same prudence in this case as it does with marriage. So, in some cases, it decides that a parent can, and sometimes a parent ought, to lose visitation rights. These cases are complicated and can never be adjudicated perfectly, especially not within the shrunken confines of a brief essay like this. The most we can do here, and in government, is to deal common-sensically on a general level. We always can find exceptions that contradict the general rule. But anecdotal arguments like that are not telling arguments. If they were, I'd bring in the seven marriages and divorces of my mother and the four of my father. But that series of sad anecdotes would get us precisely nowhere.

Should a divorced person remarry? That is an anecdotal question, and there is no way, in advance, or without all the facts, to say for certain in each case. It would depend upon many factors, such as whom they married and what relationship, if any, still exists with the children's natural parent. The possible complications cannot be numbered or forestalled. But, if you wish to think of it statistically, the incidence of molestation goes up dramatically when a second husband or a boy friend enters the home. I suspect that virtually none of the divorced parents who permitted the new partner into the home either expected or condoned such activity from the person they now love. But there it is. According to Regnerus, a raised incidence of molestation also attends to same-sex marriage.

Some say (A) that statistics regarding the deleterious effects of a missing parent are invalid regarding same-sex marriage because those statistics usually come from one-parent welfare homes, not two-parent homes, and (B) that same-sex marriage posits a two parent, not one parent, home. That is wrong. First, it begs the question by asserting that mommy's same-sex partner and daddy's same-sex partner are actually parents, which is precisely what we are trying to decide. Second, the statistics come from welfare homes, but they are not homes with only one adult. Welfare homes are normally two-adult homes, not one-adult homes, though the adults are not usually married. That is one of the tragedies of welfare as we now do it: We say to young women that they can get money—money for housing, food, clothing, education, child care, and medicine—if they have a child. If they want more money, they need to have another child—but only by a different father. If the children have the same father,

then the government thinks that that father ought to pay the bills, not government. This rule makes it more likely that the children will not have a natural father at home, but that there will be a man in the house, just a different one.

Finally, nomenclature: Abraham Lincoln is reputed to have said this: When asked if we called a tail a leg, how many legs would a horse have? "Four," Lincoln replied, because calling a tail a leg doesn't make it one."

Right, and calling a same-sex union a marriage doesn't make it one either.

Kathy Boudin: Terrorist

The academic honors are raining down on Kathy Boudin. The Weather Underground terrorist, who already has an adjunct professorship at the Columbia School of Social Work, was named by New York University Law School as Rose Sheinberg Scholar in Residence (for "working on cutting-edge issues of gender, race, and class"). Boudin knows about cutting edges. In 1981 she drove the getaway car in the hold-up of a brink's truck in which two police officers, Sergeant Edward O'Grady and Officer Waverly Drown, and one guard, Peter Paige, were gunned to death. After a decade on the lam, Boudin served 22 years in jail. She never truly repented for her role in these murders (she says she wrote letters of apology to the families of her victims but never mailed them). Yet none of that matters to an academic establishment that's still starry-eyed about 1960s radicals.

—*National Review*, May 6, 2013, p. 8

People have been outraged to learn that Kathy Boudin, imprisoned for her role in the 1981 Brinks armored car robbery and murders in New York and paroled a decade ago, now holds an adjunct professorship in the school of social work at Columbia University, where she has been lecturing since 2008. When asked by the *New York Post* about Boudin, associate dean Marianne Yoshioka enthused that her colleague is "an excellent teacher who gets incredible evaluations from her students each year." The Scrapbook is prepared to believe that. What student, even a student of social work, would not be fascinated by the spectacle of a professor who is also a felony murderer?

Kathy Boudin, now nearly 70 years old, is practically a parody of a superannuated 1960s radical. The daughter of a famous left-wing lawyer and the niece of the radical journalist I. F. Stone, she dropped out of Bryn Mawr to live and study in the Soviet Union, then joined the terrorists

of the Weather Underground, bombing the Pentagon, the US Capitol, various civic and commercial sites in New York and Chicago—and ultimately themselves, in the famous 1970 explosion of a townhouse bomb factory in Greenwich Village.

Boudin and a handful of comrades (three of whom were killed in the blast) had been making bombs for detonation at a soldiers' dance at nearby Fort Dix. Boudin was injured, but survived—and then became a fugitive for more than a decade until she and fellow Weathermen and members of the Black Liberation Army robbed a Brinks armored truck in Rockland County, New York, in 1981. Boudin and friends shot and killed one guard and two policemen, and wounded another guard. This time Boudin was captured, was offered a plea bargain, and served 22 years in prison.

In a perfect world, of course, unrepentant domestic terrorists like Kathy Boudin would not be offered plum faculty posts at Ivy League institutions. But as *The Scrapbook* is well aware, this is not a perfect world—nor especially uncharacteristic of our nation's more prestigious institutions of higher learning, where the Boudin generation remains in control and anti-Americanism is the predominant faith. Kathleen Cleaver, ex-fugitive onetime wife of Eldridge Cleaver, teaches at Yale Law School; Boudin's fellow bomber (and Obama pal) Bill Ayers taught at the University of Illinois, Angela Davis at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The list goes on.

The *Scrapbook's* view of all this is cautiously optimistic. First, it is entirely possible that, when the academy is finally liberated from its baby boom captivity, the self-consciously radical atmosphere on our nation's campuses may lift, if only partially. Second, if it had been revealed in, say, 1975 that Kathy Boudin (then probably residing in Cuba) would someday be teaching at Columbia, nobody would have noticed. Today, it's a big deal. And that's progress, of sorts: The romantic view of the anarchists and murderers of the left in that era has given way to revision and reassessment and, to some degree, revulsion.

The *Scrapbook* has another perspective as well. Such spectacular events as the Brinks robbery tend to concentrate attention on the perpetrators, not the victims, especially when the perpetrators have minor celebrity status.

Lest we forget, Kathy Boudin and her comrades shot and killed three men, leaving two widows and nine children. It might be worth asking Dean Yoshioka whether any of those children (or grandchildren now, in some cases) have ever applied to Columbia University for admission, or for employment—and whether, under the circumstances, Boudin's patron feels any lingering sense of obligation.

—*The Weekly Standard*, April 15, 2013, p. 2, 3

Hatched At Columbia University

by Wayne Root

President Obama and I were college classmates at Columbia University, class of '83. I know all too well how mindlessly liberal the students and faculty of that institution can be, and Barack Obama is certainly no exception. My time at Columbia made it crystal clear: liberals always believe they are morally superior. While they publicly state that their mission is to save the world from prejudice, patriotism, racism, greed, and inequality, they are, in fact, hostile and resentful towards anyone who has achieved self-made success through American values. It is in this cesspool of intolerance that Obama and his Marxist cronies hatched a secret plan to destroy our country. They openly hated America calling it racist. They hated capitalism and vowed to bring “the system down.” (Fast-forward thirty years, and they may finally be close to succeeding—if we don't act soon—but more on that in a minute.)

There are two things you need to know about Obama at Columbia University. First, he was Pre-law and a Political Science major just like me. I thought I knew everyone studying Political Science during my four years at Columbia. Not Obama. I never met him, never saw him, never even heard of him. Strange. Same major, same career path, and graduated on the same day—where was he? Was he busy attending communist party meetings? No need to guess. In his autobiography he proudly admits attending Socialist Party meetings at Cooper Union in downtown Manhattan. He also admits publicly in his

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.

own book to not wanting to meet anyone at Columbia who wasn't black, Hispanic, gay, or a Marxist professor. His words. So it's possible he was so busy attending communist meetings and trying to avoid guys like me (white, straight, loved America) that our paths never crossed. Unlikely, but possible.

But, it's the second thing you really need to know about Obama at Columbia. He says he graduated Class of '83. Let's give him the benefit of the doubt. Well then Obama had to attend the same political science classes as me and I can tell you, almost to a man, my classmates in the Class of '83 proudly called themselves Marxist, communist or socialist. They bragged of being radical like a badge of honor.

In my class the typical Columbia political science student vowed to destroy capitalism, bankrupt business owners, and vaporize what they called "the white power structure." For the most part these were spoiled brat white students of privilege and power. They were children of wealth, given everything on a silver platter and all they felt was anger and guilt. Their goal was to destroy their own fathers. They talked about it all day long.

So let me tell you a story. Back in 1981 I was sitting in a political science class. The president at the time was Ronald Reagan, a man reviled by the left just as viciously as any Republican is today. Suddenly our lecture was interrupted by a door swinging open violently—whereupon a breathless fellow student raced into the room screaming, "The president has been shot! They've just assassinated President Reagan."

Ronald Reagan was my hero. The news hit me like a ton of bricks. I instantly felt sick to my stomach, and tears flowed down my cheeks. But it was the response of the rest of the class that I will remember for the rest of my life. They cheered. They clapped, they yelled, they high-fived, and whooped in sheer unadulterated joy. My fellow classmates, the ones I was naively trying so hard to befriend despite their radical leftist views, were HAPPY that my hero President Ronald Reagan was dead (or so they thought). They were celebrating what they thought was the assassination of America's president.

Incidentally, if Obama actually went to Columbia, he'd almost certainly have to have been in that class leading the cheers. Feel like you need a shower yet? Lest you think I'm exaggerating, British leftists just celebrated and cheered upon hearing of the death of Margaret Thatcher only days ago.

But wait, the most frightening and eye-opening is still to come. You see political science students at Columbia were taught a detailed plan designed by two former Co-

lumbia professors named Cloward & Piven to bring down "the system," destroy capitalism, and turn America into a socialist state. We discussed it in class, wrote about it, and debated it outside class. It was our #1 topic for four years.

The plan was revolting, but brilliant. Cloward & Piven taught that America could only be destroyed from within. Only by overwhelming the system with debt, welfare, and entitlements could capitalism and the America economy be destroyed. So the plan was to make a majority of Americans dependent on welfare, food stamps, disability, unemployment, and entitlements of all kinds. Then, under the weight of the debt, the system would implode and the economy collapse, bankrupting business owners (i.e. conservative donors). Americans would be brought to their knees, begging for big government to save them. Voilà—you'd have a new system—socialism!

Sound familiar?

Why would anyone want to purposely collapse the economy you might ask? Saul Alinsky taught the ends justify the means. A bankrupt America wipes out the middle class and small business. That wipes out the majority of donors to conservative causes—meaning Obama has no opposition. It creates "equality"—by putting everyone on equal footing (shared misery). It causes panic—and in panic, voters often make hasty decisions—like choosing big government to save them.

The destruction and devastation we see happening right now is classic Cloward & Piven. It's the plan we learned, studied, and discussed day and night at Columbia. This is no coincidence. This is the Marxist attack from within. This is a purposeful attempt to take down the economy, collapse the middle class, wipe out small business, bankrupt the wealthy (conservative donors), and addict the country to big government Nanny State socialism.

And it's working. Obama has been working on his plan for 30 years (our 30th Columbia class reunion is next month). Now it is time for us to get to work. As I explain in my brand new book, "The Ultimate Obama Survival Guide," all success, all progress, all the miracles in this world are based on heart, on spirit, on will, and on the power of being relentless. We are all going to need to muster the power of the relentless to defeat Obama and his socialist game plan. We're going to need to overcome the damage Obama has done to our economy...and our children's future. It's time for battle. Go create your own Booming Personal Economy. Go protect your family. Go take back this country. Your mission is to survive, thrive, and prosper despite Obama.

—*Human Events*, April 14, 2013