



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

60 Years Defending Our Christian Faith



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 60, Number 3

March 2020

Democrat Socialism—100 Years

by E. Jeffrey Ludwig

President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal was a response to a crisis in America’s economy. Stock prices were crashing, businesses were failing, and unemployment was soaring. FDR’s popularity was engendered by his ability to generate hope that there could be relief, recovery, and reform that could bring us out of our straitened circumstances, and keep us out. His policies were aggressive and his uncanny paternalistic communication skills—such as his fireside chats on the radio—endearred him to the masses. When he said “we have nothing to fear but fear itself,” he highlighted the deep-seated fear of tomorrow in the hearts of the citizenry.

FDR introduced “socialism-lite” into American politics and economics with the implementation of Keynesian or demand-side economics, as it is sometimes called. However, the economic theories created to justify increased governmental spending were advanced by John Maynard Keynes, a British economist who did not portray himself as a socialist. Instead of a balanced budget goal, deficit spending by government was justified by Keynes. Government expenditures were increased, which required increased borrowing of funds and increased printing of money (we went off the gold standard in 1933 which enabled greater printing of currency). The increase of the money supply led to an increased rate of inflation. With more dollars chasing fewer goods, prices rise. But this inflationary trend was offset by the multiplier effect whereby the number of economic transactions produced by the increased supply of money more than offset the inflationary problems. Government spending could thus bring about a stability in economic markets that regular supply and demand curves in a *laissez-faire* market could not by themselves achieve. This influx of money into the economic system is still called “priming the pump.” However, modern critics of Keynesian deficit spending will now suggest that deficit spending at some point produces grave distortions. Overspending encourages crony capitalism, and that dependency upon government means more economic regulations which stifle economic liberty and even our God-given personal freedom.

However, Socialism from its inception went a giant step further than priming the pump, and called for government ownership of large sectors of the economy. The 1912 Socialist Party Platform, for example, called for extensive government ownership:

1. The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire, and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express service, steamboat lines, and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

2. The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the states, or the federal government of all grain elevators, stockyards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests, and water power. . . The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all the land held for speculation and exploitation.

Thirty-six years later, in 1948, the Democratic Party split into three parts: the Dixiecrats with their segregationist program, the mainstream New Deal Dems under Truman who would carry on their Keynesian programs, and the Progressive Party under Henry Wallace, FDR’s vice-president during his third term, that adopted a socialist ideal of government ownership. He had been pushed out of the vice-presidency and later as secretary of Commerce because of his hardline leftist views. Their platform stated:

“The Progressive Party will initiate such measures of public ownership as may be necessary to put into the hands of the people’s representatives the levers of control essential to the operation of an economy of abundance. As a first step,

the largest banks, the railroads, the merchant marine, the electric power and gas industry, and industries primarily dependent on government funds or government purchases such as the aircraft, the synthetic rubber and synthetic oil industries must be placed under public ownership.” Again, public ownership was a cornerstone of their pro-Marxist agenda.

In 2018, seventy years after the Progressive Party was swallowed by defeat, the Socialist Party Platform nevertheless continued to echo the same outdated and useless cry for government ownership. It stated: “We call for social ownership and democratic control of productive resources, for a guarantee to all of the right to participate in societal production, and to a fair share of society’s product, in accordance with individual needs.”

That point expresses the desire for governmental ownership of the means of production, an axiom of Marxist theory under the principle “from each according to his ability to each according to his needs.” That same Socialist platform has 246 bullet points. They want to see this vast number of changes take place under governmental authority in the USA. Yet there is not one word about the Bill of Rights or the freedoms established by the Constitution, no mention of the foundational freedoms and legal rights of our society.

Now we are in 2020 and see that the Democratic Party has identified itself with proponents of the so-called Green New Deal. In reality, it has joined with the hard left that has, since 1912 and later in 1948 and in 2018, called for government ownership of huge sectors of the economy which are listed here. In the Green New Deal proposals, our chief concern is that section which reads, “providing and leveraging, in a way that ensures that the public receives appropriate ownership stakes and returns on investment, adequate capital (including through community grants, public banks, and other public financing), technical expertise, [and] supporting policies,” The key word in this “Green” obscurantist lingo is “ownership.” Healthcare, agriculture, energy production (gas, electricity, oil), education, technology, and who knows what else will be owned by the government in the name of “climate change” to insure the well-being of American citizens and of the world. Climate change has become the buzzword substituting for the longstanding Marxist “class struggle.”

There is a direct line of identity from the Socialist Party of 1912 through the Progressive Party of 1948 through the Socialist Platform of 2018 to the left-wing candidates that are offering themselves for the Demo-

cratic Party nomination, most especially Bernie Sanders (a self-designated Democratic Socialist) and Elizabeth Warren. The others are chameleons, who, unlike Harry S. Truman, do not have the gumption to flatly repudiate the Green New Deal and the Socialist agenda even where they are not wholly in agreement with it. Just their willingness to compromise and “be flexible” in listening to the left-wing bilge itself reveals a weakness of character and a lack of commitment to American principles of free enterprise and Constitutional integrity. Therefore the hard-leftist doctrines of the Socialists and Communists which—while partially implemented by the Democrats in the past going back to Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt—are now in the ascendancy and must be given a message of utter repudiation.

—*American Thinker*, January 17, 2020

The Chinese Communist Party

by K.S. Guardioli

Bill Gertz is an author of eight books and an award-winning national security journalist and currently is the national security columnist for *The Washington Times*. His recently published book, *Deceiving the Sky: Inside Communist China’s Drive for Global Supremacy* provides valuable insights revealing why Chinese communist leaders and their increasing totalitarian system of government pose such a menacing threat to the world and how they are actively undermining American democracy and freedom.

While the book is focused on modern China, valuable lessons can be learned about the dangers of totalitarianism and political corruption operating anywhere in the world. Especially noteworthy is material presented in Chapter 1—“How Communists Lie,” specifically by Guo Wengui, who is a Chinese billionaire and political exile and former insider who left China in 2014. The first chapter includes quotes by Guo Wengui exposing how the Chinese communist system operates in deceitful ways.

Guo Wengui is a controversial public figure operating from his current home in NYC. He is a leading and well known activist opposing the Chinese communist government through several different methods, including social media, public appearances, and meeting

with prominent Western opinion-makers and politicians. Opinions today widely differ about his actual status, his background, and his true intentions. However, he knows the communist system well as a former political insider and the ideology behind it, so the ideas offered by him are valuable to consider.

Guo Wengui starts by reminding us that China is a communist country and that communism attempts to build a utopian society, therefore the very basis of the system is false. As a consequence, he persuasively states that in fact, communists are professional liars, because they will never realize what they promise. It is in fact impossible to do so. He states that traditional Western culture is built on the morality of right and wrong. On the other hand, he asserts that in the communist system, truth and lies are interchangeable. As an example, if the truth furthers the ideological cause, it will be used, and when outright lies are expedient, there is no unwillingness to use them.

Guo Wengui labels today's Chinese political system as a kleptocracy concerned and primarily motivated by fulfilling the interests of a comparatively small elite rather than the well-being of the Chinese people. These selected few elites are all exclusively high-ranking members of the Communist Party. Totalitarian systems such as the one that exists today in China strive to take total control of the everyday lives of their citizens, including their thoughts and attitudes as well as their daily activities. The Chinese Communist Party regularly uses its state-controlled mass and social media to maintain absolute political control, often relying on outright deceit.

As I read this characterization of the workings of the Chinese Communist Party and its leaders, it led me to thinking more about current political conditions closer to home.

In our country, the most powerful collective mechanism for the people to come together on a regular basis and have the right to choose the political agenda and the type of country we want to live in is by voting. The American voter goes to the polls with the expectation that our elected representatives will work to deliver solutions to the issues and challenges facing our country. Since his inauguration, President Trump has worked tirelessly to implement his agenda and has been exceptionally successful in doing so. Various positive results have occurred in a wide variety of areas ranging from the economy, immigration, and trade policy to national security.

The most dangerous assault on our system of government today is the orchestrated efforts by the Democratic

Party to actively work in a series of campaigns to invalidate the results of the 2016 election. Democrats actively resist, impugn, and call into question without exception any policy initiative by the Trump administration. The Democrats currently promote an environment of resistance by outright deception indicating a determination not to offer any compromise on issues. In addition, they do not seem to display any regard for the consequences of their actions on our country.

Extending over more than three years, on December 18, these efforts led to the House voting along party lines on two articles to impeach President Trump. The House voted 230-197 to charge Trump with abuse and 229-198 to charge him with obstruction of Congress. A key indicator of the continued magnitude of their determination to remove the president from office is that only three Democrats joined in to vote in opposition to one or both of the charges against the president.

All of this is occurring within an environment where there is no actual evidence of any impeachable offenses ever being committed by the president or any members of his administration. However, there is being uncovered on virtually a daily basis extensive evidence of unprecedented political corruption and subversive activities authorized and conducted by high-ranking members of the Obama administration, with all of them directed at destroying candidate and then President Trump.

The move to impeach President Trump is occurring as Democratic Party moves rapidly left politically openly advocating adopting socialism in America in an apparent attempt to radically transform the very nature of our country and system of government. The growing appeal of socialism in this country can be attributed to many factors. The brand of socialism presented by many of today's leading Democratic politicians has an alluring and emotional appeal to many people. It is portrayed as a political system consisting of fair and equitable solutions to many of our most challenging political, economic, and social issues.

The policy agendas of today's leading Democrats including Medicare for All; the Green New Deal; open borders; and their approach to issues such as social justice, economic and tax policy, foreign policy, gun control, and energy policy, plus so many others, are rarely held up to comprehensive public examination and scrutiny by the mainstream media in any truly meaningful way.

China today is on a path under paramount leader Xi Jinping and an increasingly powerful Communist Party of evolving its political system to be even more totalitarian, ready and willing to go to greater lengths and

measures to control virtually every aspect of its citizens' lives.

In our country, is the Democrats' socialist vision and associated policies for America fake, and can they ever deliver on what they promise, and will their agenda ultimately be of benefit or detriment to the American people? Do they threaten our freedoms in an attempt to further control our lives by implementing a significantly larger government apparatus that will include much greater regulation of a citizen's daily activities? Are they moving us on a path toward totalitarianism similar to the one evolving in China today?

The difference in our country is that our future can still be determined by the voters in 2020. At this time in our history and with an increasingly left-leaning radical Democratic Party and their agenda, the results of the next election will profoundly define the future direction of our nation and way of life.

—*American Thinker*, January 13, 2020

Men and Women

by Ashley E. McGuire

Should the legal meaning of “sex” be changed? That’s what the Supreme Court will consider Tuesday when it hears oral arguments in the cases of *Harris Funeral Homes v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* and *Bostock v. Clayton County*. Should the justices decide to broaden the meaning of sex, it would spell disaster for women.

The cases relate to whether federal law prohibits employment discrimination based on employees’ sexual orientation (*Bostock*) or “presenting” as the opposite sex (*Harris Funeral Homes*). Many Americans support legal protections against employment discrimination for those categories. But rather than new legislation creating civil rights protections for those categories, the plaintiffs seek protection under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination “on the basis of sex.”

In short, they are asking the justices to conflate sex with what is now known as gender identity. Yet “sex” has a concrete scientific definition—whether one is male or female as determined by chromosomes and biology. Gender means—well, ask Facebook. At one point the company’s alternatives numbered as many as 71, including “pangender,” “neutrosis” and “androgyné.” That wasn’t enough to placate the vast gender-identity move-

ment, which lambasted the social-media platform for those who were left out. Eventually, Facebook opted for “male,” “female” and “custom.”

The American Medical Association has a simpler approach in its style guide: “Sex refers to the biological characteristics of males and females,” but “gender includes more than sex and serves as a cultural indicator of a person’s personal and social identity.” That could mean anything.

The problem with diluting the meaning of sex is more than rhetorical. It weakens the legal status of sex that laws such as Title VII and Title IX are designed to protect. Women’s rights hinge on our charity defined status as women. We have endured centuries of discrimination because of our sex. In seeking to strip the term “sex” of legal meaning, gender-identity advocates would turn the clock back 55 years for women.

What becomes of women in a world where our legal status is in the same category as “two spirit” or “demi-boy”? It sounds like a joke, yet already women find themselves all too often in a legal pretzel where they are accused of discrimination under laws once designed to protect them. A rape victim doesn’t want a biological male in her safe house. A teenage athlete doesn’t want one on the opposing team. No woman or girl wants one in the ladies’ room. Expand the legal definition of sex to include gender identity, and girls and women will increasingly find themselves in those situations, and they could face discrimination lawsuits if they speak out.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who popularized the phrase “on the basis of sex,” wrote in 1975: “Separate places to disrobe, sleep, perform bodily functions are permitted, in some situations required, by regard for individual privacy.” Today she and her colleagues are confronted with the question: Can a woman still claim a right to privacy on the basis of her sex?

Perhaps the deepest tragedy in winnowing the meaning of sex is the diminution of what it means to be a woman. Women have spent the better part of the past century building up our stature in society. I want my daughter to grow up proud of being a woman. I want her to be a part of expanding women’s right, not fighting for the basic legal recognition we thought we’d won in 1964.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, October 8, 2019, p. A 17



The Goal of Socialism

by David L. Rosenthal

Socialism is the quieter path to Communism. Vladimir Lenin said, “The goal of Socialism is Communism.” According to Tom Perez, Chairmen of the Democratic National Committee, socialist candidates are the future of that party. But anyone who has paid attention lately knows that they are its present.

Almost all of the Democrat candidates for president support socialism. They have not yet openly supported Rashida Tlaib’s claim that the rich did not earn their wealth, which she says should be confiscated and given to the poor. But the wealthy already pay most of the taxes in America. And since the Democrats want to give free everything to everyone, it must be presumed that they know who would have to pay the bill for all that free stuff.

Socialism is not kind, however. In practice, it has always led to ubiquitous poverty. The wealthy class are devastated, but not to spread the wealth evenly. The wealth that is stolen from the wealthy ends up in the hands of a new class of overlords of society, those who had promised that all would be equal after the victory of the revolution over the unjust wealthy classes.

And when the new overlords are in power, after they have confiscated what did not belong to them, and after “nationalizing” industries “for the benefit of all,” they then assign as administrators of industry, of utilities, and of all departments and institutions of society, those who are more corrupt, inept, and stupid than any capitalist. A capitalist, after all, wants the system to continue to produce. A socialist only wants to confiscate that which a capitalist created. That is the historical model.

So while socialism pretends to be kinder than capitalism, it really only produces poverty, degradation, and chaos. Socialists do not know how to govern. And in order to maintain control, they find it convenient to exercise totalitarian power.

They disarm the population. They prohibit criticism of the government. They intimidate, persecute, jail, torture, and execute dissidents and the opposition. They do all they can to control communications, associations, movement, employment, food, electrical power, and whatever else they might control.

But since they are so corrupt, inept, and stupid, while they are robbing their compatriots blind, they allow infrastructure, industry, and the economy, all of which they have taken over, to crumble, leaving the population to

sink out of prosperity into a mean daily existence centered around finding a morsel of food. That is the essence of the kindness of socialists.

Of the Democratic presidential candidates known for the longest as loving the socialist paradigm, Bernie Sanders has said that Venezuela’s is a model society. But to be fair, he said that when finding toilet paper in Venezuela was still possible. Today he might see things somewhat differently.

If elected as president, any one of the Democrat candidates would do their utmost to arrange America’s economic affairs so as to advance the same Cloward-Piven strategy that has been for decades at the center of the Democratic Socialist movement to bankrupt America. They really have not been trying to hide it.

—*American Thinker*, August 31, 2019

An Anti-Communist Concert

by Frances Martel

The organizers of the First Anti-Communist Concert in the USA believe that it has never been more important for those communities traumatized by totalitarian leftist regimes to vocally reject Marxist ideology.

Miami music icon Frankie Marcos and wife Mariori told *Breitbart News* in a bilingual interview that they hope the event—set for April 11, 2020, and featuring 20 and counting American and Latin American artists—will help expose “the threat that communism poses to the whole world from our [Cuban] standpoint, as the oldest communist dictatorship in Latin America.”

The project was born of the Cuban-American community and will feature prominent artists in that community such as Grammy Award winners Emilio Estefan, Willy Chirino, Paquito d’Rivera, and Arturo Sandoval. Marcos and his group Clouds, credited for helping create the Miami Sound music movement, will also perform, as well as singer-songwriter Amaury Gutiérrez, and reggaeton artist Chocolate MC.

The concert will also serve as a venue for artists who have suffered under communist regimes such as Gorki Águila, head of the anti-communist punk rock outfit Porno Para Ricardo, whose music is banned in Cuba.

Marcos told *Breitbart News* he is happy with the “big response” the idea has received in the entertainment world, often identified as one of the most staunchly left-wing career paths. “We have had people change their

schedules around, because artists are always traveling and they live off of that, so that they could attend the first anti-communist concert. So one feels very proud of the response from people, some who even said, how did it take this long for someone to do this?”

The Marcos’ both feel that there is growing momentum in the world against the tide of communist repression.

“We feel for the first time in many, many, many years that geopolitically, the membrane is polarized. There are so many things happening with important players like [conservative President Jair] Bolsonaro in Brazil, what [President Donald] Trump has done here, all this happening and the things that are happening in Latin America including Bolivia and other countries that we felt that this was the right time,” Mariori Marcos said.

Bolsonaro took office as the first conservative president this century in Brazil in January, after surviving an assassination attempt at the hands of a socialist attacker. In Brazil, socialist leader Evo Morales voluntarily resigned in November after nearly 14 years in power, the product of the Organization of American States (OAS) revealing extensive evidence of fraud in the election that would have granted him an illegal fourth term. His replacement, interim President Jeanine Áñez, has realigned Brazil away from socialist Venezuela and communist Cuba and restored diplomatic relations with the United States.

Both Marcos’ reject the mainstream media “common knowledge” that American Latinos are overwhelmingly left-wing and that growing Hispanic populations will benefit the Democratic Party.

“We have a voice and I think we are the majority,” Mariori contended, adding that she believes Hispanic Americans will move further right in response to the rise of openly socialist Democrats who embrace the regimes of Venezuela and Cuba. “I have to mention that there has been a drastic change in the Democratic Party that we see and is so evident. . . . their principles were totally different, their values were different, what they were fighting for was totally different. But this shift to the left is going to create an erosive reaction.”

Frankie Marcos offers a shorter answer on the claim that a Hispanic monolithic vote exists, and it skews left: “all the media lies, it’s just one lie after another.”

Both Marcos’ assert that the concert is not partisan, however, and any Democrat can participate—“all you have to do is be anti-communist”—but lament that their phone calls to local Democrats in Florida have remained

unanswered at the time of our interview.

They hope that the concert’s appeal will not be limited to Latin America—communism is a threat to everyone, and momentum against Marxism is growing across the planet, particularly given the popularity of protests in places like Hong Kong and even within communist China.

“Miami is the face of the Cuban exile [community] but we tried not to limit this to Cubans, obviously . . . it would be wonderful if we could have an American artist to come and be part,” Mariori Marcos said.

“The concert defines you, whoever stands there, everyone knows now that he’s not a communist,” Frankie Marcos added.

And all Americans are invited to participate in an online campaign in anticipation of the concert called “I say present to the First Anti-Communist Concert in the United States.” The campaign urges Americans and global citizens to upload videos of themselves in support of the concert and stating why they oppose communism. Mariori Marcos notes that some participating have chosen to say they support the concern in the name of a loved one killed by communism, while others explain why they reject an ideology that has killed at least 100 million people.

“The concert is the culmination, is the celebration, of everything that will be accomplished from now until that day,” she added. “We want it to be from politicians, from public officials, from artists, from radio tv and press personalities, as well as the general public uploading their videos.”

Organizers are urging supporters to use the hashtag #anticommunistconcert on social media.

Some artists have already uploaded Spanish versions of their videos.

The concert will benefit the Cuban Democratic Directorate (Directorio), a non-profit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for freedom in Cuba. While the timing of the concert lands it in the heat of the 2020 presidential race, Mariori Marcos clarifies that “all the funds generated from the concert will never be used for anything to do with elections or any partisan activities or things related to it leading to the election, before, during, or after.”

Directorio organizes campaigns to advocate for human rights in Cuba but has increasingly expanded its reach to other communities oppressed by communism. Co-founder and spokesman for Directorio Orlando Gutiérrez-Boronat has met in the past year with Taiwanese President Tsai Ing-wen and advocated for solidarity between the Cuban freedom movement and the Hong Kong protesters.

—*Breitbart.com*, December 25, 2019

Yale University 2020

by William Levin

The combined endowment of the Ivy Leagues totaled \$135 billion at the end of 2018, a figure that will be considerably higher in 2019. Hence the sharp observation that they are hedge funds masquerading as universities. If only they were so benign.

As these institutions never tire of reminding us or themselves, they educate the leaders of tomorrow; are led by renowned professors; make use of research, grants, and publications to shape the contours of modern debate; and spread their influence through vast alumni networks.

I write with particular interest in my alma mater, Yale, where I graduated many years ago summa cum laude from Yale College, Yale School of Management, and Yale Law School.

I take this opportunity to renounce myself as an alumnus in good standing. And I encourage as many alumni as possible to join in the movement to Cancel Yale, or your respective educational institution.

Why? The final straw for me is a random one: the decision to eliminate the introductory History of Art class as too white, too male, and too Western, in favor of art history courses that explore race, sex, and class, with special attention to climate change!

The decision epitomizes all that woke Yale has striven to become. Lost in this particular decision is the immersion in masterpieces, the only art course many would take, taught in my era by the resplendent Vincent Scully, who later became a neighbor and friend.

The decision is one with Yale's programmatic march in the service of identity politics with an unabashedly progressive cast.

In a 2017 survey, Yale students put conservative teachers at 1%, roughly the same answer from Yale computer science professor and Unabomber victim David Gelernter, who in 2019 said it more closely approximates 0%. The Federalist Society invited a Christian speaker representing the Alliance Defending Freedom, which was denounced by law students as a "homophobic, transphobic hate group."

As it turns out, the canary in the coal mine happened a quarter-century ago, with the then unheard-of return by Yale of \$20 million to the Bass Family after four years of fruitless negotiations. The gift was intended to expand the curriculum on Western civilization. Today, the gift would not even be accepted.

Relentless identity politics in the classroom, no

meaningful political diversity, isolation of students with non-conforming views, empowerment of the most aggrieved student demands. The totalitarian spirit is alive and well at Yale.

Virtue-signaling is too kind an expression for Yale's direction under President Peter Salovey. The watchword of climate change is "sustainability," a concept grounded in the notion of inheritance. Yale, too, is an inheritance, one of excellence, that in recent years has been brazenly despoiled of its core resource: the dedicated, impartial search for truth. Truth is not 90% giving to the Democratic party. Truth is not growth in diversity for all things except intellectual. Truth is not the injection of race and sex as the dominant lens for all discussion, from the humanities, to the social sciences, the arts, to law, medicine, and increasingly even the sciences.

So what is the platform of Cancel Yale (or your favorite institution)?

1. Crowdsource support on social media. In numbers there is strength.
2. Forswear all charitable giving until such time as meaningful change is implemented. Your charitable giving is needed elsewhere.
3. Use strength to elect sympathetic Board members.
4. Require the meaningful hire of conservative and right-of-center professors, until an approximate 50/50 ideological balance is achieved.
5. Require a sharp university shift in resources, with administrative spending cut a minimum of 25%, spent dollar for dollar on teaching by intellectually diverse professors.
6. Advocate for reduced government funding. Productive research funding is fine and desirable. Woke funding to an elite institution with a \$30-billion endowment is a massive fraud on the US taxpayer.

Clearly, this program is unimaginable in the current environment. So be it. Then the university should feel the consequences. The tools are at hand if alumni unite and use social media to create a sustained opposition.

It also is inevitable, on the current trajectory, that Yale and the rest of the Ivy League will forfeit their dominance. Most obviously, employers will move to skill-based testing. Break the spell, and employment and advancement, and ultimately societal prestige, will be as they should be, based on merit, not membership in an increasingly distorted coterie, as Roger Kimball put it, of fragility and angry intolerance.

As with the *New York Times*' discredited 1619 Project, the irony of progressive elite institutions is that they advocate for the end of elite institutions. Let them have

their wish.

Cancel Yale now. Cancel the Ivy League now.
—*American Thinker*, January 29, 2020

Blacks and Liberal/ Progressive Agenda

by Walter Williams

Former presidential candidate Beto O'Rourke said that racism in America is "foundational" and that people of color were under "mortal threat" from the "white supremacist in the White House." Pete Buttigieg chimed in to explain that "systemic racism" will "be with us" no matter who is in the White House. Senator Cory Booker called for "attacking systemic racism" in the "racially biased" criminal justice system.

Let's follow up by examining Booker's concern about a "racially biased" criminal justice system. To do that, we can turn to a recent article by Heather MacDonald, who is a senior fellow at the New York-based Manhattan Institute. She is a contributing editor of *City Journal*, and a *New York Times* bestselling author. Her most recent article, "A Platform of Urban Decline," which appeared in Manhattan Institute's publication *Eye On The News*, addresses race and crime. She reveals government statistics you've never read before.

According to leftist rhetoric, whites pose a severe, if not mortal, threat to blacks. MacDonald says that may have once been true, but it is no longer so today. To make her case, she uses the latest Bureau of Justice Statistics 2018 survey of criminal victimization. MacDonald writes: "According to the study, there were 593,598 interracial violent victimizations (excluding homicide) between blacks and whites last year, including white-on-black and black-on-white attacks. Blacks committed 537,204 of those interracial felonies, or 90 percent, and whites committed 56,394 of them, or less than 10 percent. That ratio is becoming more skewed, despite the Democratic claim of Trump-inspired white violence. In 2012-13, blacks committed 85 percent of all interracial victimizations between blacks

and whites; whites committed 15 percent. From 2015 to 2018, the total number of white victims and the incidence of white victimization have grown as well."

There are other stark figures not talked about often. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting for 2018, of the homicide victims for whom race was known, 53.3% were black, 43.8% were white and 2.8% were of other races. In cases where the race of the offender was known, 54.9% were black, 42.4% were white, and 2.7% were of other races.

White and black liberals, who claim that blacks face a "mortal threat" from the "white supremacist in the White House" are perpetuating a cruel hoax. The primary victims of that hoax are black people. We face the difficult, and sometimes embarrassing, task of confronting reality.

MacDonald says that Barack Obama's 2008 Father's Day speech in Chicago would be seen today as an "unforgivable outburst of white supremacy." Here's what Obama told his predominantly black audience in a South Side church: "If we are honest with ourselves," too many fathers are "missing—missing from too many lives and too many homes. They have abandoned their responsibilities, acting like boys instead of men." Then-Senator Obama went on to say, "Children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime; nine times more likely to drop out of schools and 20 times more likely to end up in prison."

White liberals deem that any speaker's references to personal responsibility brands the speaker as bigoted. Black people cannot afford to buy into the white liberal agenda. White liberals don't pay the same price. They don't live in neighborhoods where their children can get shot simply sitting on their porches. White liberals don't go to bed with the sounds of gunshots. White liberals don't live in neighborhoods that have become economic wastelands. Their children don't attend violent schools where they have to enter through metal detectors. White liberals help the Democratic Party maintain political control over cities, where many black residents live in despair, such as Baltimore, St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago.

Black people cannot afford to remain fodder for the liberal agenda. With that in mind, we should not be a one-party people in a two-party system.

—*FrontPageMag.com*, November 29, 2019

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 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.