



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report

60 Years Defending Our Christian Faith



Dr. David Noebel

May 2021

## LGBTQIA vs. Christian Colleges

by Tyler O'Neil

When five unelected super-legislators on the Supreme Court unilaterally amended the Constitution to legalize same-sex marriage in 2015, Chief Justice John Roberts warned that the ruling would pose “hard questions” about the freedom of religious colleges to operate according to their convictions. Former Solicitor General Donald Verrilli said, “It will be an issue.” This week, Roberts’ warning has come to pass, and the time in which Verrilli’s “issue” comes to the fore is now.

On Monday [March 29], 33 current and former students at federally-funded Christian colleges and universities launched a historic attack on religious freedom by filing a class-action lawsuit against the Department of Education (DoE). The lawsuit, *Hunter et al. v. Department of Education*, claims that the DoE violated the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution by granting religious exemptions to Christian institutions that allegedly “discriminate” against “sexual and gender minorities.”

“The religious exemption to Title IX impermissibly burdens the fundamental marriage rights of same-sex couples seeking to attend taxpayer funded religious educational institutions that prohibit their marriages,” the lawsuit, filed by the Religious Exemption Accountability Project, alleges. “When sincerely held religious beliefs become enacted as school policies that harm LGBTQ+ students at taxpayer-funded colleges and universities, the necessary consequence is that the US Department of Education has put its imprimatur on an exclusion that demeans and stigmatizes sexual and gender minorities.”

“The federal government cannot claim a legitimate governmental interest in furthering discrimination that harms sexual and gender minority students,” the lawsuit adds.

The lawsuit squarely takes aim at a central point of biblical Christian conviction: the idea that Christians are to “love the sinner but hate the sin.” Christians, who are redeemed sinners themselves, should offer the grace they received in Jesus Christ to sinners, while encouraging themselves and others to stop sinning. This vital distinction allows Christians to love others without condoning their actions.

Christian colleges and universities often use this distinction to explain that they are open to students with LGBT identities even though they ask their students to sign a code of conduct barring homosexual activity (and heterosexual activity outside of traditional marriage).

The lawsuit takes direct aim at this distinction. “The law does not recognize an identity/conduct distinction. The law does not recognize ‘love the sinner, hate the sin.’ Policies and laws targeting ‘homosexual conduct’ or ‘transgender conduct’ in fact target LGBTQ+ identity,” the lawsuit claims.

By allowing such policies, the Department of Education violates the due process and equal protection rights enshrined in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, the suit alleges. The current and former students also claim that religious exemptions violate the Establishment Clause. “Religious educational institutions that do not affirm LGBTQ+ identities receive a license to discriminate from the Department of Education,” they argue.

According to the lawsuit, the Department of Education and other federal agencies provide billions of dollars annually (\$4.2 billion in 2018) to “religious colleges and universities that discriminate against LGBTQ+ students.” That funding includes student financial aid, research grants, and other forms of funding. The lawsuit seeks a permanent injunction that would cut off all of that funding.

The suit, filed in the US District Court for Oregon, asks the court to prevent the DoE from granting further religious exemptions to Title IX regarding LGBT issues, to rescind all such religious exemptions that currently apply, to mandate that the DoE treat LGBT-themed Title IX complaints at religious colleges the same as it does elsewhere, and requiring the DoE to prevent the “discrimination” at issue.

The students claim they “seek safety and justice for themselves and for the countless sexual and gender minority students whose oppression, fueled by government funding, and unrestrained by government intervention, persists with injurious consequences to mind, body, and soul.” They claim the DoE’s “inaction leaves students unprotected from the

harms of conversion therapy, expulsion, denial of housing and healthcare, sexual and physical abuse and harassment, as well as the less visible, but no less damaging, consequences of institutionalized shame, fear, anxiety, and loneliness.”

While the lawsuit takes aim at federal funding for colleges and universities like Azusa Pacific University, Baylor University, Bob Jones University, Brigham-Young University, Liberty University, and Fuller Theological Seminary, a ruling in favor of the plaintiffs would likely ultimately impact the conservative Christian colleges and universities that do not receive federal funding, such as Hillsdale College, Grove City College, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS), Boyce College, and others.

Taxpayer funding makes some institutions more vulnerable, but if the Senate passes the Equality Act and if President Joe Biden enforces his view of LGBT “rights,” then even refusal to take federal funding will not protect biblical Christian institutions from penalties for “discrimination.”

Of course, the issue also extends beyond colleges and universities. As SBTS President Al Mohler explained on Wednesday, the lawsuit targets “not just Christian institutions, organizations, and ministries, but the churches and denominations behind them.”

“If your church or your denomination cannot establish an institution serving your purpose on your own convictional basis, then you are being denied the right to operate as a church,” he argued.

The lawsuit notes that “most of the institutions seeking exemptions are Evangelical Christian institutions,” even though a few of the colleges and universities are Mormon or Seventh-Day Adventist.

Make no mistake—this lawsuit is a direct assault on the religious freedom of conservative Christians who dare to dissent from LGBT orthodoxy and attempt to live out their convictions.

Under Joe Biden, it seems tragically likely the Department of Education will cave to the demands of this lawsuit. Biden, a long-term supporter of conscience protections like the Hyde Amendment (which prohibits taxpayer funding from going directly to abortion), turned against the Hyde Amendment in the 2020 election—and he also pledged to gut religious freedom protections for a group of nuns who objected to paying for abortifacient contraceptives.

A few days into his presidency, Biden signed an executive order banning “discrimination” on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in various parts of American society, including schools.

This lawsuit is attempting to force Biden’s administration to extend the policy the president already supports and to gut the kind of religious freedom protections Biden already opposes. These students and

the “Religious Exemption Accountability Project” may not even need a court injunction to achieve their ultimate aim.

—*PJMedia*, March 31, 2021

## The COVID-19 Challenge

by Robert Jones

As recent as the mid-1800s, five women in 1,000 died in deliveries performed by midwives. On the other hand, when physicians performed deliveries, the death rate was often 10 to 20 times greater. This was because physicians often began their day performing autopsies with bare hands and then, without washing their hands, examined pregnant women and delivered babies. Midwives, on the other hand, did not perform autopsies. These physician-caused deaths were due to puerperal fever, a horrendous way to die characterized by high fevers, painful abscesses, and a tortured decline into a nightmare of irreversible sepsis.

Ignaz Philipp Semmelweis was the Hungarian physician who spent his life as a voice crying in the wilderness trying to reduce the death rate of pregnant women. He had discovered that if physicians simply washed with a chlorinated lime solution before examining pregnant women or delivering babies that the death rate dropped to less than 1%. Because his view countered prevailing medical opinion, he was shunned by the medical profession and died an ignominious death at the age of 47.

The “Semmelweis Reflex” is a metaphor for our reflex-like tendency to reject new knowledge because it contradicts with an established belief or norm. That is exactly what is happening today with COVID.

Around the world, a small number of esteemed physicians have found combinations of drugs that can produce a near complete cure for COVID, as long as patients are treated when the viral load is low.

Dr. Thomas Borody is a gastroenterologist and infectious disease specialist in Sydney, Australia who discovered cures for two diseases, ulcers and Crohn’s. According to Dr. Borody, the tri-combination of ivermectin, doxycycline, and zinc is a near complete cure for the outpatient treatment of COVID. Dr. Borody states, “it is just hard to believe how simple it is to cure the Corona virus.”

The Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance (“FLCCC”) was organized in March 2020 by a group of critical-care physicians. Their outpatient COVID protocol also contains ivermectin and zinc, but adds to it vitamins C and D, quercetin, melatonin, and aspirin. In a recently published paper, the FLCCC concluded that “ivermectin, a widely used anti-parasitic medicine with

known anti-viral and anti-inflammatory properties is proving a highly potent and multi-phase effective treatment against COVID-19.”

Also, an international group of medical experts from 16 countries have recognized ivermectin (which is typically used in combination with other drugs) as a safe and effective treatment for COVID. According to Dr. Pierre Kory, who is the President of the FLCCC, “This group is the latest in the growing number of experts from around the world who recognize Ivermectin’s role in fighting this pandemic.” Dr. Pierre Kory continued, “The BIRD [British Ivermectin Recommendation Development] panel used the highest form of medical evidence, a meta-analysis, to evaluate data from over 20 trials of Ivermectin before concluding it’s safe and effective for use in treating COVID-19.”

Given the compelling evidence that there is a close to 100% cure for COVID, it is mindboggling that a person who tests COVID positive will not be offered any medical assistance. Very recently, on March 11, 2021, Dr. Peter McCullough testified to the Texas Senate HHS Committee about this very issue. He states, “patients actually think that the virus is untreatable... [and] it says here you’re COVID positive, go home, is there any treatment, no, is there any resources I can call, no, any referral lines/hotlines, no, any research hotlines, no.” He continues, “that is the standard of care in the United States, and if we go to any of our testing centers today in the United States I bet that is the standard of care.”

In short, what we have here is a near complete failure to respond to the COVID crisis due to our reflex-like tendency to reject new knowledge (i.e., that COVID can be effectively treated) because it contradicts the established belief that COVID cannot be effectively treated. The federal government has failed because it has not evaluated possible treatments for COVID and put its imprimatur on the treatments that are safe and effective. Also, the majority of physicians have failed because they have not put into practice the safe and effective treatments that now exist for COVID. Just as in the time of Semmelweis, these failures have severe and real consequences, including needless death and suffering.

—*AmericanThinker.com*, March 26, 2021

## Sovereign Crime

by Jay Valentine

Recently our team was invited to meet with 2020 election fraud investigators in downtown Austin. Our team, with some of the top criminal profiling talent in the country, was happy to attend. At the last minute, our new pals cancelled their meeting.

Since we changed our schedules and lost those days, we decided to hold our own confab.

Our team members were the lead builders of one of the world’s most sophisticated criminal profiling systems in use by law enforcement today. We broke the eBay auction fraud rings and deployed a never-before-used technology to end auction fraud as an emerging crime category. We identified numerous Medicaid fraud rings and were hired by most of the top 10 property and casualty insurance firms to solve auto crash rings that eluded the FBI and every fraud technology.

What we do not talk about much is our team’s record predicting crime. There were several occasions when we predicted terrorist activity and warned government agencies. There is a particularly famous one, involving a military base, where they did not listen. That’s one for another day.

When you are at the table with some of the top criminal profilers in the world, talking about industrial scale election fraud, you do more listening than talking. And the listening was interesting. The profilers have zero interest in US elections. Two of them did not vote and had unflattering opinions about both presidential candidates. Their comments were most insightful because they saw the current questions about election fraud so differently than the American media.

To them, 2020 election fraud was an industrial level crime. It was of such magnitude that it moved from the category of an election crime to a sovereign crime.

Sovereign crime. It does have a ring to it.

Sovereign crime is not something we see a lot of in America as our governmental institutions are generally not organized to commit, support, or hide a crime.

Most Americans have never seen an organized crime take place, in plain view, supported by or covered up by governmental institutions. But it happens all the time around the world, even in some countries that are quite Westernized.

Sovereign crime means your government was a participant, active or passive, enabling vote fraud.

Governors and secretaries of state refusing to cleanse voter rolls, refusing to check signatures for mail-in ballots—even during recounts, changing the voting rules weeks before an election, qualifies as your government messing with your vote.

The national government refusing to investigate the most egregious examples of voter fraud like hundreds of thousands of more ballots than voters in several states, that is a pretty good indicator that they are passive participants in industrial level vote fraud.

The refusal of the FBI to fully investigate Jesse Morgan’s truck with the hundreds of thousands of ballots going from New York to Pennsylvania—yet dispatching agents to a NASCAR location to investigate a garage pull-down they hoped was a noose—well, that’s

a good indicator, too.

Wait, we're not done here.

The United States Postal Service managers telling employees to backdate ballots so they could be counted illegally. Does that sound like your government—sovereign government—participating in vote fraud?

Our team noted that this might be the first time in American history that the government from the states to the national to its agencies coordinated to either fake the vote or hide the faking.

Our profilers comfortably said the 2020 election fraud was on such a scale that it was impossible for the major law enforcement agencies to not have known about it in advance.

Governmental law enforcement either actively engaged in the fraud, which is impossible to prove, or knowingly acquiesced after the fact.

Pretty clearly, the evidence is piling up that the FBI had zero interest in trucks with ballots crossing state lines, ballots being shredded in Maricopa County, tens of thousands of ballots received before being mailed and all sorts of other clues any competent law enforcement agency would at least investigate.

The conversation did not go where I expected it.

There was no interest on our profilers' part in doing investigation of massive voter fraud. They felt it was so obvious and the current work being done by citizens and published on hard-to-find blogs was state-of-the-art and no further investigations would find much more. Their comments were striking because they said the data easily available showed the election fraud patterns had two very alarming characteristics: It was not the first time this was tried, and it will be performed again, at scale, in the next election.

Here is where the conversation got very interesting:

Violent criminals have known profiles and when law enforcement properly applies certain profiles, there can be very accurate predictions about what such persons will do next.

Fraud criminals have their own patterns. When we were doing insurance fraud, we often said, with authority, that fraud is a constant. If you stop it one place, it will pop up somewhere else.

Fraud criminals are often highly educated. In our world, they are doctors, attorneys, insurance investigators, chiropractors, running fraud rings spanning multiple states. If someone were caught and the ring broken, those who did not go to jail did not become priests or open small businesses. They started other fraud rings.

Fraud is a constant. Fraud becomes a profession.

Fraud rings, when organized, grow. They continue to expand with new entrants, slightly different profiles, corrupting more people with money that dwarfs what one might make honestly. Fraud techniques are like an organic species: what works, thrives; and what fails, dies

out. Patterns emerge. Patterns equal prediction and prediction enables eradication.

Here is where our profilers made a critical connection.

The 2020 election fraud did not just happen. It is impossible for an organization, spanning many states, using similar techniques (fake ballots, shutting down counting at the same time, more ballots than voters, dead voters, underage voters) to succeed the first time at bat. There are just too many moving parts.

So here we developed a thesis.

The team, educated in some of the most sophisticated organized fraud tactics, posited that this was not a dry run. Their thesis is that if one were to seriously evaluate the balloting in many states for 2014, 2016 and 2018, one will find traces of what happened in 2020. That project is under discussion.

Their second thesis is that this is not over by any means. This kind of election fraud was hugely successful. If one even questions the 2020 election, one can be banned from social media and labeled a "conspiracy theorist" by sovereign governmental agencies.

The team believes the best is yet to come.

Fraud perps are greedy and when left to commit fraud, for which there was likely millions of dollars in remuneration either presently or in the future, they are not going to stop. As fraudsters recognize that national law enforcement refuses to investigate and the courts will not look at evidence, they are emboldened. Who wouldn't be?

Our courts and law enforcement are saying "come, commit all the fraud you want, we won't investigate, and if there is litigation, we will toss it out on procedural grounds."

If anyone protests, the FBI may raid their home with an assault vehicle.

Don't believe me, well, meet Christopher Worrell.

And meet retired Army Sergeant Kenneth Harrelson, who, like Chris, attended the Don't Steal The Vote Rally and was greeted by an FBI turreted vehicle while he was cleaning out his gutters.

This is our government in action covering up election fraud. FBI Director Chris Wray is promising each of us the Roger Stone Experience if we doth protest too much.

We are dealing with a new type of crime, at least new to most Americans: sovereign crime. This is it, folks! This is what it looks like.

Just think if the courts and government did this for Medicaid fraud. We might all do it!

So if you are an election fraud perp, what would you do? Double down! Yes, you would, you know you would.

Fraud is a constant. What we saw in 2020 is going to happen in 2022 and 2024 in a very big way. Maybe

bigger since there are no constraints.

It is here the team made their most startling prediction. The data from 2020 are strong enough to predict exactly where the most egregious fraud is going to happen and how it is going to happen.

Texas data sent to us showed the 2020-type fraud did happen in 2016 and 2018 in a smaller degree but with the same pattern. It was not reported. In hindsight, compared with 2020, a pattern emerges.

Profiling works. Fraud is a constant. Bad guys without pushback overplay their hands.

Your government, at the state and federal level, the FBI, government agencies can be in on the scam. That is the realization slowly being accepted by millions of Americans.

We have technologies that can identify dead voters the moment they cast a ballot. We can identify people who are out-of-state, voted twice, are underage, live in a vacant lot or a UPS or FedEx postal box. We can even show a photo of that vacant lot so you can see where your fake neighbor claims to live.

Literally, the second their ballot is counted, they can be flagged as a likely fraud.

Yes, we can deploy that technology today. We have done it in the insurance industry for decades.

We can predict where election fraud is going to happen. We can predict how it is going to be done. We can deploy technologies to identify likely fraud within seconds of when it happens.

The question is, if the government is pretty much in on the election fraud, does it really matter?

—*AmericanThinker.com*, March 16, 2021

## The Transgender Hoax

by Ryan T. Anderson

A decade ago, most Americans had never had a conversation about transgender issues. Now a question few had asked has only one acceptable answer. “Transgender equality is the civil rights issue of our time,” President Biden tweeted in January 2020. “There is no room for compromise when it comes to basic human rights.”

Can we talk about that?

We might want to talk about what policies are best when it comes to athletics, for example. Should high-school girls be losing championship races to boys who identify as girls? How about female-only spaces, like shelters for victims of domestic violence? Should women in dire straits be forced to spend the night with men who identify as women?

And what’s causing the surge in the number of girls seeking sex-reassignment procedures in the past decade? Might we want to find that out before we rush to conclude that puberty-blocking drugs and cross-sex hormone therapies—and even double mastectomies for

13-year-olds—are a human right?

We should take a lesson from the United Kingdom. In September 2018, the U.K.’s minister for women and equalities launched an investigation into why girls increasingly feel uncomfortable with their bodies. In December 2020 a U.K. court put strict restrictions on the ability of doctors to “transition” a minor—after one minor who had done so sued the National Health Service because of the irreparable damage adults had inflicted upon her body.

Can we talk about this in the US?

Not if Jeff Bezos’ companies get their way. *The Washington Post* has allowed its writers to spread falsehoods about me and my work, and Amazon is using its outsize market power to prevent readers from accessing one side of this debate.

Three years ago the *Post* ran a hit piece titled “Ryan Anderson’s book calling transgender people mentally ill is creating an uproar.” The second sentence read: “In the 264-page book, *When Harry Became Sally*, Anderson makes an inflammatory claim—that transgender people are mentally ill.”

My book made no such claim. I contacted the *Post* asking them to quote a single sentence from the book supporting their contention that I had called transgender people mentally ill. They couldn’t, because it doesn’t exist. Within a day, the newspaper had entirely rewritten the story, removing the falsehoods and changing the headline.

Three years later, the world’s largest e-commerce platform—owned by the richest man on the planet—has canceled my book. In a letter last week to four US Senators, Amazon justified its decision to delist *When Harry Became Sally* by claiming it frames “LGBTQ+ identity as a mental illness.” This recycled charge is as false now as when Mr. Bezos’ newspaper first made it.

But unlike the *Washington Post*, which at least aspires to journalistic standards and must respond to market forces, Amazon occupies a singular place in e-commerce. As one literary agent once told the *Journal*: “They own the system.”

In a 1999 letter to shareholders, Mr. Bezos promised to build the “Earth’s most customer-centric company, a place where customers can come to find and discover anything and everything they might want to buy online.” For two decades, that strategy worked and Amazon consolidated market share. Today it has a stranglehold on the book-selling market, commanding 72% of all adult new book sales online and 80% of ebook sales. Amazon’s decisions to censor books have enormous consequences for authors and readers, and Amazon knows it.

Why would Amazon exercise its unrivaled market power to banish my book? Because the book is changing minds in a continuing debate about how best to help patients who experience gender dysphoria. *When Harry Became Sally* has been praised by medical and legal experts—and that’s what makes it unacceptable to the woke.

The timing of Amazon's move is telling, coming the weekend before the House voted on a radical transgender bill—the so-called Equality Act—of which I have been publicly critical. Why did Amazon suddenly delist my book without warning me or my publisher? Did an advocacy group or elected official reach out to Amazon on the evening of a big vote to ask it to remove a book it had happily sold for three years? An enterprising state attorney general may have ways to find out.

State attorneys general have the authority to investigate Amazon's conduct to learn whether the company is abusing its vast market power, doing so in a patently dishonest and deceptive way, or otherwise violating state consumer-protection and antitrust laws. Amazon's actions potentially run afoul of both. Authorities in both the US and Europe have raised serious questions about the company's dominant position in online retail. No bookseller can deny the critical importance of placing its products on Amazon's platform. For an author, to be banished from the site is akin to being silenced.

The sad reality is that very little is known about the causes of gender dysphoria, yet powerful institutions are promoting radical experimental therapies for children. We need to respect the dignity of people who identify as transgender while also doing everything possible to protect young people and foster their healthy development. This will require a better conversation about gender-identity issues, and that's why I wrote my book. No good comes from shutting down a debate about important matters on which reasonable people disagree.

When *Harry Became Sally* addresses the scientific, medical, political, and philosophical issues at the heart of our national debate on transgender issues. We should have that debate, and Amazon shouldn't get in the way.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, March 17, 2021

## L'Amour's Last of the Breed

by Nicholas J. Kaster

March 22 is the birthday of the iconic writer Louis L'Amour, a man whose name became synonymous with the American frontier and whose novels promoted old-fashioned patriotism and morality. America sorely misses his kind.

L'Amour was born in Jamestown, North Dakota, a farm town, in 1908. He was largely self-educated. As a youth, L'Amour spent many hours at the town library studying history and science and imbibing the fiction of Robert Louis Stevenson, Jack London, and Edgar Rice Burroughs. This inculcated in him a love of reading. He read 100 to 120 books a year and accumulated a personal library of over 10,000 titles. This included not only Western lore and American fiction but classics from Dostoevsky to Nietzsche.

L'Amour said that he “wanted to write almost from the time I could talk.” Starting in the 1930s he began writing poetry, then frontier and adventure stories for pulp fiction magazines. His breakthrough came in 1953 with the publication of his full-length novel *Hondo*, which became a bestseller and a major film with John Wayne.

In all, he wrote more than 100 titles, including *The Lonesome Gods*, *The Walking Drum*, *Jubal Sackett*, and *The Haunted Mesa*. With sales of over 200 million worldwide, L'Amour is one of the best-selling authors in modern literary history. Beginning with *Hondo*, some 25 works by L'Amour have inspired film and TV adaptations.

In his book *The Louis L'Amour Companion*, author Robert Weinberg wrote that L'Amour “took American ideals and gave them life in his characters. His men are strong individualists, who believe in freedom, equality, and independence.” Although most of the characters in his stories are men, when he wrote about women, they were strong and interesting as well.

L'Amour's writing was refreshingly pre-modern. He did not write about sex, he said, because it was only “a leisure activity.” He had more important things to write about: “I am writing about men and women who were settling a new country, finding their way through a maze of difficulties, and learning to survive despite them.”

One of L'Amour's last books was *Last of the Breed*, a Cold War novel, written in the Western motif, with a heavy dose of masculine survivalism that largely reflected his own values. L'Amour admired the French novelist Victor Hugo and claimed that *Last of the Breed* was modeled after *Les Misérables*, a novel about a pursuer and a pursued.

The novel tells the story of Joe Makatozi, an Air Force major whose aircraft is forced down in the Soviet Union. Makatozi is three-fourths Indian, part Sioux, and part Cherokee.

Told that he is an Indian, his Soviet interrogator says, “Ah? Then you are one of those from whom your country was taken?”

“As we had taken it from others,” Joe replies, refusing to accept “Native American” victim status.

In his autobiography, *The Education of a Wandering Man*, L'Amour states that, “A mistake constantly made by those who should know better is to judge people of the past by our standards rather than their own. The only way men and women can be judged is against the canvas of their own time.” L'Amour's insight stands a profound condemnation of today's cancel culture.

Joe was partly an Indian, L'Amour says, “but the world in which he lived was that of all men, having nothing to do with race or color”—a powerfully anti-racist message, though not one that would resonate with today's cultural Marxists obsessed with identity politics.

Joe soon escapes from the prison camp and heads toward America by following the same route that his

Indian ancestors did when passing over the land bridge across the Bering Strait into Alaska. In order to escape, however, he needs to fend off his Soviet pursuers and survive the harsh Siberian terrain.

In one wonderfully prescient moment, Joe tells one of the Soviet dissidents helping him escape that if Russia would “tear down the Berlin Wall, and build some more good hotels, we Americans would be all over your country spending money.” A year after the book was released, President Reagan made his famous speech in West Berlin, calling on Gorbachev to “tear down this wall.” Just two years later it came down. L’Amour, unfortunately, would not live to see that day.

In assessing L’Amour’s work, *National Review* writer John J. Miller cited Mark Twain’s aphorism that “a classic is a book that people praise but don’t read.” Miller observed that a novel by L’Amour “is almost the opposite: a book that people read but don’t praise, at least not in the company of sophisticates because it invites their scorn.” It didn’t help that L’Amour was Ronald Reagan’s favorite writer. Reagan awarded him a Congressional Gold Medal in 1983 and the Medal of Freedom the following year.

George Will dismissed L’Amour as a “pale writer” (an allusion to the western movie *Pale Rider*). However, Miller noted, “pale writers sometimes obtain faddish commercial success,” but “rarely secure a lasting place in the culture.” L’Amour’s lasting popularity, he wrote, is best understood “as an expression of American folk wisdom, and the abiding appeal of the author’s standard themes of patriotism, freedom, moral uprightness, and hard work.”

L’Amour’s books make excellent reading for boys. That alone makes his work especially valuable today. But, as Miller reminds us, his books reveal mature themes as well: “the notion that there is less distance between civilization and barbarism than meets the eye. To keep them apart, men and women must strive to make homes, families, and communities. . . . In short, those who would destroy are forever with us, and they can’t be wished away.”

—*AmericanThinker.com*, March 22, 2021

## Antifa Exposed

by Janet Levy

The mainstream media—silent on the Marxist ideology, violence, and militancy of groups like Antifa and Black Lives Matter (BLM)—deceptively reported that the protests they inflicted on over 200 US cities in 2020 were “mostly peaceful.” It deceitfully transformed the mayhem into a “summer of love.” Widespread rioting, looting, arson, murder, assaults, and destruction of property and businesses went unreported. Such abject

failure explains why polls consistently rank the media among America’s least trusted institutions.

Given media complicity with radical groups, it’s not surprising that the *Los Angeles Times* dismissed Andy Ngo’s *Unmasked: Inside Antifa’s Radical Plan to Destroy Democracy* as unserious, “supremely dishonest,” and “self-serving.” While video-recording left-wing protests as part of his independent reporting in 2019, Ngo was assaulted and hit with a milkshake containing quick-dry cement. But the *Times* dismissed his allegation of a brain injury from that attack. It says he’s fixated on the “imaginary threat of Antifa” and ignores the “real danger” from far-right extremists.

Ngo’s book is a riveting exposé of the background, structure and workings of the collectivist militant group, set on destroying capitalism and America’s history, culture, and institutions. He presents an accurate, well-researched picture of this insurrectionist movement, its widespread network and its hostility to the rule of law and democracy.

Antifa origins trace back to 1932: it began as Antifascist Action, a paramilitary faction of the German Communist Party. It emerged in America in the 1980s as a marginal group, remaining so through the 1990s and 2000s. About five years ago, it surfaced in earnest, and now counts students, academics, journalists, lawyers, and politicians among its members and supporters. They use sophisticated methods of propaganda, outreach, recruitment, fundraising, and reconnaissance. They strategize violent protests with full security.

Even the name is a deception, for Antifa strives to overthrow liberal democracies and abolish capitalism. The group draws on dogma from Herbert Marcuse of the Frankfurt School, considered the “father of the New Left.” It believes that there is no objective reality or truth; that tolerance means suppression of the intolerant; and that unacceptable opinions are “violent.” Large factions of the Left sympathize with Antifa; some in academia, corporations, and Big Tech assist it in silencing opponents.

Antifa’s recent rise coincides with that of BLM, which draws on the black power movement of the 1960-70s. Now linked, they share the goal of upending liberal democracy and the rule of law while purporting to fight racism, sexism, homophobia, and capitalism. They aim to abolish law enforcement, property rights, national borders, American jurisprudence, free markets, and free speech.

Antifa advocates window-breaking, looting, and arson as valid and powerful protests, deeming such actions “self-defense” against an “unjust” system. Typically, Antifa announces a gathering to oppose an event it disagrees with through social-media blasts. Members arrive in intimidating and protective black bloc—black clothing, ski masks, scarves, sunglasses,

and helmets. The use of pepper spray, batons, bats, brass knuckles, frozen water bottles, and “milkshakes” is encouraged. Many carry weapons and are trained to gouge out eyes, break ribs, and deliver hits to the liver and kidneys.

After George Floyd’s death in Minneapolis in May 2020, Antifa and BLM spread disinformation with the help of a complicit media. Floyd’s extensive criminal history and his resistance to arrest were overlooked. In fact, the autopsy showed no evidence of strangulation but revealed a fatal level of fentanyl in his blood. Riots were fueled with the hackneyed trope of an “innocent” black murdered by racist police. Widespread violence, arson, looting, and assaults escalated. But police were prevented from responding. When a mob surrounded the Minneapolis Third Precinct, the mayor ordered the evacuation of the police station. Antifa and BLM replicated such planned violence in dozens of American cities.

Besides Antifa’s systematic violence, Ngo reports on its targeting of perceived enemies through tactics such as doxing: victims find highly personal, sensitive information amplified online, leading to harassment, assault and job loss. Other intimidation tactics include “community alerts” that broadcast the real-time whereabouts of a person or group online.

A nationwide network of bookstores where selling books is clearly not a priority serves as a front for Antifa training in street violence, coordinated attacks, and psychological tactics. Radical propaganda is available, but the bookstores’ main function is to spread radicalization, destabilize communities, and delegitimize the authority of local government. Ngo reports that Antifa fields and crowdfunds candidates in elections and organizes voter fraud.

Going undercover, Ngo reported on Antifa’s occupation of a large, densely populated area of Seattle in the same month as the Minneapolis riots. Antifa members designated the area as the country of CHAZ (Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone). There was complete lawlessness: assaults, robberies, six shootings, two homicides, and an attempted rape took place. The mayor’s edict against the use of tear gas rendered police impotent. Ngo debunks claims that it was an anti-racist zone: he exposes segregation there and writes that “CHAZ ended up with a 100 percent black victim shooting rate.” The city administration refused to restore

order; instead, it provided street barriers, cleaning services, washing stations, and portable toilets to the occupiers. The city council was sympathetic to Antifa and never condemned the anti-police violence.

In Portland, Oregon, the Antifa-BLM attacks sparked by Floyd’s death went on for weeks, Ngo reports in his book. Rioters started at the Justice Center, moved downtown, smashed windows, broke into stores, started fires, looted everything in sight, brought down statues, and attacked police vehicles. The city council fanned the flames, accusing the police of racism and brutality. Police held back in the face of the allegations, so shootings and homicides skyrocketed. Mainstream media called the riots “spontaneous.” In fact, they were well-organized and funded by Leftist groups. Supplies such as water, food, “street medics,” and phone access were provided as well as projectiles and weapons. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were raised online over four months. Leftist lawyers and organizations filed 21 protest-related lawsuits against the police. The local media supplied favorable coverage. The progressive district attorney went easy on the violence: between May and October 2020, there were an estimated 1,000 protest- and riot-related cases, but the D.A. rejected 90% for prosecution. There were no arrests for vandalism.

Radical politicians like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) of the Democratic Socialist of America, too, have helped mainstream Antifa. She participates in its events and supports its call for defunding the police, ending capitalism, and abolishing the US Immigration & Customs Enforcement. AOC promoted a bail fund for rioters and urged her 6.5 million Instagram followers to donate to an Antifa propaganda outfit. Together with journalists, academics, and left-leaning intellectuals, Ocasio-Cortez and her ilk justify rioting and looting in the name of “racial justice.” Some city councils sympathize with and legitimize Antifa-BLM’s violence.

In 2019, Senators Bill Cassidy (R-LA) and Ted Cruz (R-TX) sponsored a resolution to designate Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization, saying it “represents opposition to the democratic ideal of peaceful assembly and free speech for all.” Ngo’s book provides rigorous documentation that shows the senators’ fears are real. It warns of the influence amassed by this destructive movement and cautions against an insurrection proceeding with impunity.

—*AmericanThinker.com*, March 11, 2021

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](http://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](http://www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com).