




Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 57, Number 4

April 2017

Progressive Capitalists

by Kevin D. Williamson

The Organization Man, whom we first met in 1956, is still very much with us. And his eccentric career since that time partly answers a question that mystifies many contemporary conservatives: Given that progressives profess to hate corporations, why are our corporate leaders so progressive? It is easy to understand their taking a self-interested stand against the Trump administration over things such as the H-1B program and visa waivers, which interfere with their access to workers and customers, respectively. But 130 corporate leaders—including the CEOs of American Airlines and Bank of America—getting together to come down on North Carolina over public-bathroom rules that annoy transgender activists? Together with business leaders who have no presence in North Carolina and nothing to do with the state or its politics? Is it only cravenness—or something more?

In the progressive lexicon, the word “corporation” is practically a synonym for “evil.” Corporations, in the progressive view, are so stoned on greed and ripped on ruthlessness that they present an existential threat to democracy as we know it. When the Left flies into a mad rage about . . . whatever, the black-bloc terrorists don’t burn down the tax office or the police station: They smash the windows of a Starbucks, never mind CEO Howard Schultz’s impeccably lefty credentials.

Weird thing, though: With the exception of a few big shiny targets such as Koch Industries (the nation’s largest privately held concern, behind Cargill) and Walmart (the nation’s largest private employer), the Left’s corporate enemies list is dominated by relatively modest concerns: Chick-fil-A, which, in spite of its recent growth spurt, is only a fraction of the size of McDonald’s or YUM Brands; Hobby Lobby, which is not even numbered among the hundred largest private US companies; Waffle House, a regional purveyor of mediocre grits and a benefactor of Georgia Republicans. Carl’s Jr. was founded by a daily communicant and Knight of Malta, a man who had some not-very-progressive opinions about gay rights. But even in its new role as part of a larger corporate enterprise (the former CEO of which, Andrew Puzder, has been nominated for secretary of labor), the poor man’s answer to In-N-Out is not exactly in a position to inflict ultramontane Catholicism on the world at large, though the idea of a California Classic Double Inquisition with Cheese is not without charm.

Far from being agents of reaction, our corporate giants have for decades been giving progressives a great deal to celebrate. Disney, despite its popular reputation for hidebound wholesomeness, has long been a leader on gay rights, much to the dismay of a certain stripe of conservative. Walmart, one of the Left’s great corporate villains, has barred Confederate-flag merchandise from its stores in a sop to progressive critics, and its much publicized sustainability agenda is more than sentiment: Among other things, it has invested \$100 million in economic-mobility programs and doubled the fuel efficiency of its vehicle fleet over ten years. Individual members of the Walton clan engage in philanthropy of a distinctly progressive bent.

In fact, just going down the list of largest US companies (by market capitalization) and considering each firm’s public political activism does a great deal to demolish the myth of the conservative corporate agenda. Top ten: 1) Apple’s CEO, Tim Cook, is an up-and-down-the-line progressive who has been a vociferous critic of religious-liberty laws in Indiana and elsewhere that many like-minded people consider a back door to anti-gay discrimination. 2) When protesters descended on SFO to protest President Donald Trump’s executive order on immigration, one of the well-heeled gentlemen leading them was Google founder Sergey Brin, and Google employees were the second-largest corporate donor bloc to President Barack Obama’s reelection campaign. 3) Microsoft founder Bill Gates is a generous funder of programs dedicated to what is euphemistically known as “family planning.” 4) Berkshire Hathaway’s principal, Warren Buffett, is a close as-

sociate of Barack Obama's and an energetic advocate of redistributive tax increases on high-income taxpayers. 5) Amazon's Jeff Bezos put up \$2.5 million of his own money for a Washington State gay-marriage initiative. 6) Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg has pushed for liberal immigration-reform measures, while Facebook cofounder Dustin Moskovitz pledged \$20 million to support Hillary Rodham Clinton and other Democrats in 2016. 7) Exxon, as an oil company, may be something of a hate totem among progressives, but it has spent big—billions big—on renewables and global social programs. 8) Johnson & Johnson's health-care policy shop is run by Liz Fowler, one of the architects of Obamacare and a former special assistant to President Obama. 9) The two largest recipients of JPMorgan cash in 2016 were Hillary Rodham Clinton and the Democratic National Committee, and the bank's billionaire chairman, Jamie Dimon, is a high-profile supporter of Democratic politicians including Barack Obama and reportedly rejected an offer from President Trump to serve as Treasury secretary. 10) Wells Fargo employees followed JPMorgan's example and donated \$7.36 to Mrs. Clinton for every \$1 they gave to Trump, and the recently troubled bank has sponsored events for the Human Rights Campaign, GLAAD, and other gay-rights groups, as well as donated to local Planned Parenthood franchises.

Even the hated Koch brothers are pro-choice, pro-gay, and pro-amnesty.

You may see the occasional Tom Monaghan or Phil Anschutz, but, on balance, US corporate activism is overwhelmingly progressive. Why?

For one thing, conservatives are cheap dates. You do not have to convince the readers of *National Review* or Republicans in Valparaiso that American business is in general a force for good in the world. But if you are, e.g., Exxon, you might feel the need to convince certain people, young and idealistic and maybe a little stupid in spite of their expensive educations, that you are not so bad after all, and that you are spending mucho shmundo “turning algae into biofuel,” in the words of one Exxon advertisement, and combating malaria and doing other nice things. All of that is true, and Exxon makes sure people know it. The professional activists may sneer and scoff, but they are not the audience.

Even if it were only or mainly a matter of publicity (and it isn't—Shell, among other oil majors, is putting real money into renewables and alternative energy), big companies such as Exxon and Apple would still have a very strong incentive to engage in progressive activism rather than conservative activism.

For one thing, there is a kind of moral asymmetry at work: Conservatives may roll their eyes a little bit at promises to build windmills so efficient that we'll cease needing coal and oil, but progressives (at least a fair portion of them) believe that using fossil fuels may very well end human civilization. The nation's F-150 drivers are not going to organize a march on Chevron's headquarters if it puts a billion bucks into biofuels, but the nation's Subaru drivers might very well do so if it doesn't.

The same asymmetry characterizes the so-called social issues. The Left will see to it that Brendan Eich is driven out of his position at Mozilla for donating to an organization opposed to gay marriage, but the Right will not see to it that Tim Cook is driven out of his position for supporting gay marriage. For the Right, the question of gay marriage is an important moral and political disagreement, but for the Left the exclusion of homosexual couples from the legal institution of marriage was something akin to Jim Crow, and support for it isn't erroneous, it is wicked. Even those on the right who proclaim that they regard the question of homosexual relationships as a national moral emergency do not behave as though they really believe it: Remember that boycott of Disney theme parks launched with great fanfare by the American Family Association, Focus on the Family, and the Southern Baptist Convention back in 1996? Nothing happened, because conservative parents are not telling their toddlers that they cannot go to Disney because the people who run the park are too nice to that funny blonde lady who has the talk show and dances in the aisles with her audience.

The issues that conservatives tend to see as life-and-death issues are actual life-and-death issues, abortion prominent among them. But even among right-leaning corporate types, pro-life social conservatism is a distinctly minority inclination.

And that is significant, because a great deal of corporate activism is CEO-driven rather than shareholder-driven or directly rooted in the business interests of the firm. Like Wall Street bankers, who may not like their tax bills or Dodd-Frank but who tend in the main to be socially liberal Democrats, the CEOs of major US corporations are, among other things, members of a discrete class. The graduates of ten colleges accounted for nearly half of the *Fortune* 500 CEOs in 2012; one in seven of them went to one school: Harvard. A handful of metros in California, Texas, and New York account for a third of Fortune 1000 headquarters—and there are 17 Fortune 1000 companies in one zip code in Houston. Unsurprisingly, people with similar backgrounds, similar experiences, and similar oc-

cupations tend to see the world in a similar way. “A new breed of chief executive is emerging—the CEO activist,” wrote Leslie Gaines-Ross, of Weber Shandwick, a global PR giant that advises Microsoft and had the unenviable task of working with Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on the ACA rollout. “A handful of CEOs are standing up and standing out on some of the most polarizing issues of the day, from climate change and gun control, to race relations and same-sex marriage.” Hence chief executives’ joining en masse the great choir of hysteria on the question of toilet law in the Tar Heel State.

Whereas the ancient corporate practice was to decline to take a public position on anything not related to their businesses, contemporary CEOs feel obliged to act as public intellectuals as well as business managers. Many of them are genuine intellectuals: Gates, PepsiCo’s Indra Nooyi, Goldman Sach’s Lloyd Blankfein. And, like Hollywood celebrities, almost all of them are effectively above money.

Some of them are rock-star entrepreneurs. But most of them are variations on the Organization Man, veterans of MBA programs, management consultancies, financial firms, and 10,000 corporate-strategy meetings. If you have not read it, spare a moment for William H. Whyte’s Cold War classic. In the 1950s Whyte, a writer for *Fortune*, interviewed dozens of important CEOs and found that they mostly rejected the ethos of rugged individualism in favor of a more collectivist view of the world. The capitalists were not much interested in defending the culture of capitalism. What he found was that the psychological and operational mechanics of large corporations were much like those of other large organizations, including government agencies, and that American CEOs believed, as they had believed since at least the time of Frederick Winslow Taylor and his 19th-century cult of “scientific management,” that expertise deployed through bureaucracy could impose *rationality* on such unruly social entities as free markets, culture, family, and sexuality. The supplanting of spontaneous order with political discipline is the essence of progressivism, then and now.

It is hardly a new idea. The old robber barons were far from begin free-enterprise men: J.P. Morgan and Andrew Carnegie, like many businessmen of their generation, believed strongly in state-directed collusion among firms (they’d have said “coordination”) to avoid “destructive competition.” You can draw a straight intellectual line from their thinking to Barack Obama’s views about state-directed “investments” in alternative energy or medical research.

It is not difficult to see the temptations of that approach from the point of view of a Bill Gates or a Warren Buffett: The decisions they have made for themselves have turned out well, so why not empower them, or men like them to make decisions for other people, too? They may even be naïve or arrogant enough to believe that their elevated stations in life have liberated them from self-interest.

Populists of the Trump variety and the Sanders variety (who are not in fact as different as they seem) are not wrong to see these corporate cosmopolitans as members of a separate, distinct, and *thriving* class with economic and social interests of its own. Those interests overlap only incidentally and occasionally with those of movement conservatives—and overlap even less as the new nationalist-populist strain in the Republican party comes to dominate the debate on questions such as trade and immigration. Under attack from both the right and the left, free enterprise and free trade increasingly are ideas without a party. As William H. Whyte discovered back in 1956, the capitalists are not prepared to offer an intellectual defense of capitalism or of classical liberalism. They believe in something else: the managers’ dream of command and control.

—*National Review*, March 6, 2017, p. 24f

Market Capitalism

by Jim Pethokoukis

Economist Deirdre McCloskey recently spoke in London, and this brief summary nicely captures her talk and her work on the power of economic freedom. Next year will see the arrival of her latest book, *Bourgeois Equality: How Ideas, Not Capital or Institutions, Enriched the World*, the completion of a trilogy on the wonder-working power of modern capitalism.

Now, McCloskey does not like the word “capitalism.” She would prefer our economic system be called “technological and institutional betterment at a frenetic pace, tested by unforced exchange among all the parties involved.”

Or perhaps “fantastically successful liberalism, in the old European sense, applied to trade and politics, as it was applied also to science and music and painting and literature.”

Or simply “trade-tested progress.”

There is a summary (at AEI.org) by McCloskey of that

upcoming work, worth reading and rereading. And here is a summary of that summary:

Perhaps you yourself still believe in nationalism or socialism or proliferating regulation. And perhaps you are in the grip of pessimism about growth or consumerism or the environment or inequality.

Please, for the good of the wretched of the earth, reconsider.

Many humans, in short, are now stunningly better off than their ancestors were in 1800. . . . Hear again that last, crucial, astonishing fact, discovered by economic historians over the past few decades. It is: in the two centuries after 1800 the trade-tested goods and services available to the average person in Sweden or Taiwan rose by a factor of 30 or 100. Not 100 percent, understand—a mere doubling—but in its highest estimate a factor of 100, nearly 10,000 percent, and at least a factor of 30, or 2,900 percent. The Great Enrichment of the past two centuries has dwarfed any of the previous and temporary enrichments. Explaining it is the central scientific task of economics and economic history, and it matters for any other sort of social science or recent history.

What explains it? The causes were not (to pick from the apparently inexhaustible list of materialist factors promoted by this or that economist or economic historian) coal, thrift, transport, high male wages, low female and child wages, surplus value, human capital, geography, railways, institutions, infrastructure, nationalism, the quickening of commerce, the late medieval run-up, Renaissance individualism, the First Divergence, the Black Death, American silver, the original accumulation of capital, piracy, empire, eugenic improvement, the mathematization of celestial mechanics, technical education, or a perfection of property rights. Such conditions had been routine in a dozen of the leading organized societies of Eurasia, from ancient Egypt and China down to Tokugawa Japan and the Ottoman Empire, and not unknown in Meso-America and the Andes. Routines cannot account for the strangest secular event in human history, which began with bourgeois dignity in Holland after 1600, gathered up its tools for betterment in England after 1700, and burst on northwestern Europe and then the world after 1800.

The modern world was made by a slow-motion revolution in ethical convictions about virtues and vices, in particular by a much higher level than in earlier times of toleration for trade-tested progress—letting people make mutually advantageous deals, and even admiring them for doing so, and especially admiring them when Steve Jobs-like they imagine betterments. The change, the Bourgeois Revaluation, was the coming of a business-respecting

civilization, an acceptance of the Bourgeois Deal: “Let me make money in the first act, and by the third act I will make you all rich.”

Much of the elite, and then also much of the non-elite of northwestern Europe and its offshoots, came to accept or even admire the values of trade and betterment. Or at the least the polity did not attempt to block such values, as it had done energetically in earlier times. Especially it did not do so in the new United States. Then likewise, the elites and then the common people in more of the world followed, including now, startlingly, China and India. They undertook to respect—or at least not to utterly despise and overtax and stupidly regulate—the bourgeoisie.

Why, then, the Bourgeois Revaluation that after made for trade-tested betterment, the Great Enrichment? The answer is the surprising, black-swan luck of northwestern Europe’s reaction to the turmoil of the early modern—the coincidence in northwestern Europe of successful Reading, Reformation, Revolt, and Revolution: “the Four Rs,” if you please. The dice were rolled by Gutenberg, Luther, Willem van Oranje, and Oliver Cromwell. By a lucky chance for England their payoffs were deposited in that formerly inconsequential nation in a pile late in the seventeenth century. None of the Four Rs had deep English or European causes. All could have rolled the other way. They were bizarre and unpredictable. In 1400 or even in 1600 a canny observer would have bet on an industrial revolution and a great enrichment—if she could have imagined such freakish events—in technologically advanced China, or in the vigorous Ottoman Empire. Not in backward, quarrelsome Europe.

A result of Reading, Reformation, Revolt, and Revolution was a fifth R, a crucial Revaluation of the bourgeoisie, first in Holland and then in Britain. The Revaluation was part of an R-caused, egalitarian reappraisal of ordinary people. . . . The cause of the bourgeois betterments, that is, was an economic liberation and a sociological dignifying of, say, a barber and wig-maker of Bolton, son of a tailor, messing about with spinning machines, who died in 1792 as Sir Richard Arkwright, possessed of one of the largest bourgeois fortunes in England. The Industrial Revolution and especially the Great Enrichment came from liberating commoners from compelled service to a hereditary elite, such as the noble lord in the castle, or compelled obedience to a state functionary, such as the economic planner in the city hall. And it came from according honor to the formerly despised of Bolton—or of Ōsaka, or of Lake Wobegon—commoners exercising their liberty to relocate a factory or invent airbrakes.

—*AEI.org/publication*, September 21, 2015

Religion of Peace Practitioner

by Lloyd Billingsley

“A startling number of American Muslims, our fellow citizens, agree that violence is a legitimate response to those who insult Islam,” John Nolte, “Shock Poll: 51% of US Muslims Want Sharia; 25% Okay with Violence Against Americans”—Breitbart.com/national-security, June 24, 2015

“A full 25% of those polled agreed that ‘violence against Americans here in the United States can be justified as part of the global jihad’—Ibid

“For those who don’t know, Sharia Law is nothing less than the Nazi-ification of a religion. Sharia authorizes murder against non-believers who won’t convert, horrific oppression of women, the execution of gays, the extermination of Jews, and the beheading of anyone who draws Muhammad.”—Ibid

Enrique Marquez Jr., collaborator with Islamic terrorists Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik in the December 2, 2015 murder of 14 innocents in San Bernardino, California, has pleaded guilty to federal terrorism charges.

“This defendant collaborated with and purchased weapons for a man who carried out the devastating Dec. 2, 2015, terrorist attack that took the lives of 14 innocent people, wounded nearly two dozen, and impacted our entire nation,” said a statement by US Attorney Eileen M. Decker.

As the *Los Angeles Times* reported, Marquez attended a mosque with Syed Farook and the pair were “secretly amassing weapons, discussing radical Islam and plotting attacks.”

The pair selected Riverside Community College because they both had been enrolled there and were familiar with the campus. The pair “drew up plans to hurl pipe bombs onto a cafeteria from the floor above and identified the escape route they would use to carry out more attacks elsewhere on the school grounds.”

Marquez and Farook did not pull off that attack, and another on freeway motorists, but Marquez purchased the rifles Farook and Malik used in the attack at the Inland Regional Center. There Farook and Tashfeen Malik shot dead 14 victims, wounding many others, in the worst

terrorist attack on US soil since 9/11, until Omar Mateen killed 49 in Orlando, Florida in June of 2016.

In the San Bernardino attack, which a Police Foundation report called “the worst thing imaginable,” Farook and Malik began firing outside, claiming two victims. Then they headed inside, to a room decorated for a holiday party.

“Suddenly, a door swung open and a person clad in all black, with a mask shielding his or her face, stepped inside, wielding what appeared to be an automatic rifle. Without saying a word, the person, now believed to be Rizwan Farook (the male assailant), opened fire.” Then Tashfeen Malik followed. “She also wore all black and entered the room shooting. Together, the shooters fired more than 100 rounds.” The shooters then “hastily departed, heading out to a black SUV they had parked just outside, leaving behind a chaotic scene of noise, fear, and pain.” In the ensuing chase, Farook fired from the front of the black SUV with Malik, firing from the back seat “out of a hole in the rear hatch of the vehicle.” All told they fired at least 81 rounds at the police, wounding one officer, who stayed in the fight as another officer dressed his wounds.

Police shooters hit Syed Farook 25 times, including one shot in the chin. The 13 shots that took down Tashfeen Malik included two to her head. Inside the SUV the police found “an additional 1,879 rounds of .223 ammunition and another 484 rounds of 9-mm ammunition.” Police also found a “trigger apparatus to detonate the secondary devices” at the Regional Center, a reference to bombs intended to increase the death toll among the first responders, an Islamic terrorist calling card.

At the time the Washington establishment denied or downplayed Islam as a motive, and even hesitated to invoke terrorism. When that could not be denied, the alibi armory broke out its Islamophobia incantation. Syeda Jafri, spokeswoman for Rialto Unified School District, near San Bernardino, told the reporters, “It’s a tragedy that the distortion of Islam is being so boldly manipulated by a few,” adding, “We will overcome this hysteria and Islamophobia through education.”

According to Tina Aoun, director of the Middle Eastern Student Center at UC Riverside, “Many of my Muslim friends, among others, have doubts about the FBI’s narrative of what happened. That’s because the story has so many holes in it. It doesn’t make any sense. Why did the FBI and police release the crime scene in the house in Redlands only one day after the shooting? Why would terrorists have a baby? Why would they target a facility for children with disabilities?”

In early January California governor Jerry Brown attended a private memorial service for the victims of the

San Bernardino terrorist attack. Neither Brown nor state Attorney General Xavier Becerra issued a statement following the Marquez plea deal.

News reports portrayed the collaborator as something of a loser with mental problems, in the style of Californian Nicholas Teasant. The National Guard reject was competent enough to attempt a trip to Syria to join ISIS, and he spoke about blowing up a “Zionist” daycare center.

Teasant has been sentenced to twelve years in prison. Enrique Marquez could get the maximum 25 years to life in federal prison, plus a \$500,000 fine.

—*FrontPageMag.com*, February 20, 2017

US State Department Treachery by Humberto Fontova

We all know about the Obama administration’s lies and treachery regarding Benghazi. But how many of you know about the Obama administration’s lies and treachery against the American families of the Americans ambushed and murdered on the orders of Raul Castro?

Thought so . . . Well, please read on:

You see, amigos: This week 21 years ago three US citizens and one legal US resident who belonged to a humanitarian volunteer organization known as “Brothers to the Rescue” were busy at their volunteer humanitarian jobs when Raul Castro (then head of Cuba’s military) gave orders for his air force to ambush and murder them. Raul Castro himself boasted about these orders.

These American volunteer workers were tangibly saving more innocent lives (countless men, women, and children) than most Peace Corp workers or “community-organizers” could ever show for their work, despite all the media hype.

You see, amigos: Twenty times as many people (men, women, children) have died trying to escape Castro’s Cuba as died trying to escape East Germany. So during the mid-1990s a volunteer outfit known as Brothers to the Rescue based in south Florida flew unarmed Cessnas over the Florida Straits alerting the US Coast Guard to the location of these desperate escapees from Stalinism and keeping many from joining the terrible tally of death by drowning, dehydration, or getting ripped apart and eaten alive by sharks. By 1996 these American humanitarian volunteers had flown 1,800 missions and helped rescue 4,200 men, women, and children.

Considering how prior to Castroism Cuba was

swamped with more immigrants per-capita (mostly from Europe) than was the US—considering how people once clamored to enter Cuba—the exodus from Castroite Cuba and the rescue flights were viewed by Castro (and his innumerable US agents of influence) as very bad publicity for the Stalinist regime.

So in preparation to murder Brothers to the Rescue (the historic Castroite remedy for this type of thing), Castro infiltrated a KGB-trained spy named Gerardo Hernandez into south Florida and into the humanitarian group. On Feb. 24, 1996, Hernandez passed to Castro the flight plan for one of the Brothers’ humanitarian flights over the straits.

With this info in hand, Castro’s MIGS ambushed and blasted apart (in international air space) the lumbering and utterly defenseless Cessnas, murdering the four humanitarian volunteers. Three of these murdered men were US citizens, one was a Marine who volunteered for two tours in Vietnam.

The murdered Armando Alejandro Jr. came to the US at age ten in 1960. His first order of business when he reached the age of 18 was fulfilling his dream of becoming a US citizen. His next was joining the United States Marine corps and volunteering for service in Vietnam. He returned with several decorations. As a member of Brothers to the Rescue he often dropped flowers over the sea, in memory of the thousands they’d been unable to rescue in time.

A man with a weapon or with both hands free to fight has always palsied the Castros with fright. The notion of Raul Castro facing a United States Marine in combat mode is simply laughable, in a pathetic sort of way. So Castro waited for Alejandro and his brothers to be carrying flowers—and made his move, ambushing and murdering them in cold blood. Migs against Cessnas, cannon and rockets against flowers.

Castro’s spy, Gerardo Hernandez, was shortly uncovered and convicted in US federal court of conspiracy to commit murder and the conviction was upheld all the way to the Supreme Court.

The Communist spy was serving two life sentences for the murder of Americans while the Castros (and their innumerable US agents-of-influence) constantly clamored for his release and return to Cuba. This clamoring was incessant for 20 years and through three US presidential administrations. But to no avail, owing to the overwhelming proof of Hernandez guilt in conspiring to murder Americans.

Enter Barack Obama. On Dec. 17, 2014—exactly 48 hours after Obama announced his new Cuba policy,

convicted Communist murderer/spy Gerardo Hernandez was released and flown first-class to Cuba.

Worst of all, amigos: For months prior to the Obama-Castro deal that released the Communist murderer, the families of the Americans he murdered were repeatedly assured by Obama's State Dept. that no such shameful deal would ever take place. Often they made this promise face to face with the grieving families, as documented in a video (at FrontPageMag.com) where Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen confronts Obama's State Dept. with their bald-faced lies and relentless treachery against US citizens. Hillary Clinton's Benghazi testimony has got nothing on this.

The Obama administration's fetish to quickly and fully satisfy every whim of the Communist murderers of US citizens reached Jerry Springer Show levels when—prior to his release—a specimen of Gerardo Hernandez semen was ferreted from his prison cell to Cuba. Hernandez and his wife, you see, were eager to add another Communist subject to the Castro-Family Kingdom but couldn't quite figure out a workable procedure.

Fear not! Raul Castro rang his little bell and Obama's State Dept. (Ben Rhodes in particular) quickly scurried over, smiling, bowing, eager to please. No hotel valet has ever been as solicitous of the whims of a big-tipping guest, no butler to his master's whims—as Ben Rhodes was to the whims of the terror-sponsors who pre-meditatedly murdered innocent US citizens.

The convicted Communist spy and terrorist provided his semen from his maximum security jail cell and Democrat Sen. Patrick Leahy's aide Tim Rieser dutifully delivered the precious item to Communist wife in Havana—all with the obvious (and eager) approval of the Obama State Dept.

—FrontPageMag.com, February 28, 2017

Meet Jorge Castañeda

by Humberto Fontova

“Yes I want to use the US judicial system—the immigration courts in particular—to jam, to backlog it so perhaps President Trump will change his mind and stop this ridiculous policy—this unpleasant and hostile policy—of deporting people. . .” (Jorge Castañeda to Tucker Carlson, Fox News, 2/14/17.)

The “ridiculous policy” consists of President Trump's executive orders to deport lawbreaking foreigners, mostly Mexicans.

In other words, this “unpleasant and hostile policy” consists of Trump's fulfillment of his campaign promises and his pledge to uphold the US Constitution when he was sworn in on Jan. 20.

The Mexican government itself has pledged \$50 million in legal defense funds towards this jamming of US courts as planned and promoted by Jorge Castañeda, who was introduced by Tucker Carlson as “Mexico's former Foreign Minister, also a NYU professor and Board member of Human Rights Watch.”

Democrats and the mainstream media would have us gag and shudder at such fulfillments of the US Constitution—because they offend the sensibilities of a former Mexican Communist Party member and spy for Cuba's terror-sponsoring Stalinist regime.

“Whoops! What was that?” some readers ask.

Yes, amigos, I'm afraid that—either due to politeness or ignorance—Tucker Carlson scrimped on his guest Jorge Castañeda's *curriculum vitae*. (We'll flesh it out in a second.)

But firstly, from 2000-2003 Jorge Castañeda served as Mexico's Foreign Minister. On March 2nd, 2002, 21 desperate Cuban refugee wannabes crammed into Mexico's embassy in Havana hoping to emigrate from Castro's Cuba to Mexico. (In prosperous, European immigrant-swamped pre-Castro Cuba, by the way, the family and friends of any Cuban seeking to immigrate to Mexico would have promptly recommended him to a psychiatrist.)

At any rate, promptly upon notice of this violation of Mexican sovereignty by immigrant wannabes, Jorge Castañeda—a man apparently scandalized by US judicial procedures, especially as regards to illegal immigrants—ordered Castro's Stalinist police to enter the embassy and drag the desperate Cubans out.

Now let's expand a bit on Jorge Castañeda's “credentials.” I hold here in my hands a document detailing how this very Jorge Castañeda was recruited by Cuba's KGB-trained secret police as a spy, where he served loyally for almost five years.

This document consists of an investigative report by Mexico's biggest and most prestigious newspaper *El Universal* dated Feb. 4, 2008. The reporter got his hands on secret documents belonging to Mexico's intelligence service that detail how in 1979 this card-carrying member of Mexico's Communist party and subsequent Mexican Foreign Minister and NYU professor, was recruited into Castro's spy service by Jorge Luis Joa Campos, Cuba's master spy in Mexico.

The Communist Jorge Castañeda was a plum recruit

for Castro's spy service. At the time, you see, Jorge's father (Jorge Castañeda y Álvarez de la Rosa) served as Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The Mexican intelligence document, which runs 264 pages, reveals the young Jorge as an eager and busy-beaver of a Communist spy, diligently reporting his father's activities, pilfering his papers and even recruiting two of his father's closest aides to aid him in his spying services for Castro's Stalinist regime.

Perhaps it ran in the family? Jorge Castañeda's mother, Oma Gutman Rudnitsky, you see was a Communist Polish-Jew who immigrated to Mexico via New York in 1938.

Among the top heroes in Soviet folklore is the little boy Pavlik Morozov. The story goes that in 1931 the 13-year-old ratted out his father to the GPU (secret police) who tortured him to death at a forced labor camp. This earned little Pavlik an honored place as hero in Soviet schoolbooks for generations.

Alas, Jorge Castañeda was already 25 when he joined Mexico's Communist Party in 1978. So he couldn't quite match little Pavlik's heroic fame.

Foreign minister/professor/author/editorialist/human rights activist/Communist spy Jorge Castañeda also authored a biography of Che Guevara. Well? Given his Cuban contacts—why not?

And whaddaya know! Castañeda transcribed the Castroite/KGB-fabricated script almost perfectly! "Che's decency and nobility always led him to apologize," writes the "former" Castroite spy. "Che presented a Christ-like figure. With his mortuary gaze it is like Che looks upon his killers and forgives them."

Let's have a look at some of the habits of Castañeda's "decent, noble, and Christ-like Che," shall we?

A Spanish priest named Javier Arzuaga had the misfortune to preside over the Havana parish that included the city's *La Cabana* Fortress which Che converted into Cuba's firing-squad and torture-central in January 1959.

During his painful rounds Father Arzuaga was shocked to find a 16-year-old boy named Ariel Lima among the condemned "war-criminals" crammed into the dungeons and torture chambers. The priest described the boy as totally dazed with his teeth constantly chattering and

probably mentally-handicapped.

Astoundingly, Father Arzuaga managed to get an audience with Che where he pleaded the boy's case. "Quickly I realized my pleas were pointless," recalls the priest. "The harder I pleaded for his compassion, the wider and crueler became Che Guevara's famous sneer."

"OK, fine. We'll take it up tonight at the Tribunal of Appeals," Che finally said while continuing to sneer at the distraught priest.

But what Che did at the "appeals hearing," (that was attended by little Ariel's single mother) was *confirm* the death sentence and schedule the firing squad murder *for that very night*.

As they left the "hearing," "Che was walking with his usual entourage when he noticed me," recalls Father Arzuaga. "He sneered again and waved hello. Suddenly I saw Ariel's hysterical mother run in front of Che and throw herself on the ground."

"Woman," Guevara laughed at her. "Go see *that* guy," and Che turned and pointed at me," writes Father Arzuaga. "Padre Javier is a professional at consoling people," Che chuckled. "Then he looked over at me laughing. 'She's all yours, padre.'"

"I walked over and helped the devastated woman who had fallen on the ground sobbing uncontrollably," recalls the priest. "Put yourself in God's hands, 'Mam'," I prayed. "Try and rise above this tragedy. God will help you learn to live without your son."

"That night (the mentally-handicapped) Ariel Lima was still in a totally dazed condition as they tied him to the execution stake," wrote Father Arzuaga, "totally unaware he was about to be murdered."

"*FUEGO!*" And the volley shattered Ariel's little quivering body.

No doubt Che was watching and gloating from his window, as was his custom. Che's second-story office in *La Cabana* had a section of wall torn out so he could watch his darling firing-squads at work.

The "former" Mexican Communist who describes Che Guevara as "Christ-like" presumes to "reform" the US judicial system—and liberals applaud.

—*Townhall.com*, February 18, 2017

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. Our daily blog address is www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com.