



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 52, Number 3



Dr. David Noebel

March 2012

Occupy Wall Street's One-percenters

by L. Brent Bozell, III

The Occupy Wall Street movement has hit several huge roadblocks. First it was the cold temperatures that sent many home. Next was the long-overdue decision to evacuate them out of public parks by liberal Democrat mayors. But another huge roadblock that's emerging: their enormous hypocrisy on wealth.

The occupiers have pushed the ludicrous slogan that "We are the 99 percent," somehow stands for the same public that installed 63 new conservative Republicans in the House in 2011. To demonstrate their 99 percentism, in October, these protesters staged a "Millionaires March" in New York City, parading to the homes of wealthy citizens such as Rupert Murdoch and David Koch. But OWS organizers have conveniently ignored the massive wealth of celebrities within their own ranks.

Paul Wilson of the Culture and Media Institute has run down the list of the top 25 richest celebrities supporting Occupy Wall Street, according to the website *Celebrity Net Worth*. They possess—ready?—a combined net worth just over \$4 billion. The lefties at MSNBC actually said on air these people may be "unaware" they're in the top 1 percent.

While mega-banker Jamie Dimon (worth \$200 million) was one of the targets of the "millionaires march," he has a net worth less than five of the celebrities supporting OWS. The most flagrant example of hypocrisy is hip-hop music mogul Russell Simmons (net worth: \$325 million). Simmons has been both a fervent OWS supporter and the author of a 2011 manual titled "Super Rich: A Guide to Having it All." Simmons calls his book "a stimulus package of consciousness."

Simmons visited OWS protests almost daily at the beginning, and then started a cross-country tour of different Occupy sites to gather grassroots support for his proposed constitutional amendment that would ban private donations to candidates running for federal public office. But on Christmas Eve, the *New York Post* gossips noted he "was spotted far from Zuccotti Park this week, strolling the beach in front of super-luxurious Hotel Isle de France on St. Bart's." Also, at the same time Simmons tweeted in support of "Christ consciousness," he angrily told critics to perform an oral sex act.

The hip-hop contingent wants to advocate for the far less "fortunate," but they're too rich to strike the right pose. At No. 2 on the list was rapper Jay-Z (worth \$450 million), who drew controversy for trying to sell T-shirts to Occupiers without "sharing" the proceeds. Rapper Kanye West, worth \$70 million, showed up to the protests in New York wearing gold chains.

Yoko Ono (No. 1 on the list at \$500 million) is a descendant of a prominent Japanese banking family. Her late husband John Lennon wrote "Imagine" in a Park Avenue penthouse. She threw in her support for the movement saying, "John is sending his smile to Occupy Wall Street." She actually matches the OWS movement in mental aimlessness, with tweets like "You are water. I'm water. We're all water in different containers."

Actress and fitness guru Jane Fonda, worth \$120 million, attacked the wealthy on the Joy Behar Show without contemplating she might, just might, be one of the loathsome 1 percent. Like Simmons, she is currently selling two exercise DVDs and an advice manual. But she said the Occupiers were the forces of common sense. "Any country that has a very, very small narrow layer of very rich, powerful, privileged people and no middle class and the rest are just really struggling and some of them not making it, is a country that's not going to be stable." She even said of the Occupiers: "They're the Paul Reveres."

Alec Baldwin (No. 19 on the hypocrite list with a net worth of \$65 million) visited the Occupy crowd in November and praised "a lot of dedicated people at Zuccotti Park." But as Jeffrey Lord reported for *The American Spectator*, Baldwin's partnerships with corporations for the Carol Baldwin Breast Cancer Research Fund show high levels of hypocrisy. "Alec Baldwin is a board member of a family charitable fund which partners with and takes money from a veritable who's who of that famous trifecta of liberal enemies: Wall Street, Big Oil, and Corporations."

The funniest hypocrite was radical filmmaker Michael Moore (net worth: \$50 million), who tried to tell CNN's Piers Morgan he wasn't in the 1 percent, and then later had to confess the obvious. The conservative site The Michigan View found and displayed photographs of Moore's 10,000 square foot mansion on Torch Lake in northern Michigan, where the average property sells for \$2 million.

So have a good laugh when you read of Moore speaking to a very supportive Occupier crowd in September about those other rich people: "They are thieves. They are gangsters. They are kleptomaniacs. They have tried to take our democracy and turn it into an hypocrisy."

—*The Washington Times*, January 19, 2012, p. 32

The True Face of the Democrat Party

by Matthew Vadum

Salvador Dali would have been comfortable painting a mural of the surreal Occupy Wall Street movement.

Supported by billionaire Marxists, mega-rich Hollywood airheads, radical libertarians, indebted students, sexual exhibitionists, malingerers, and professional protesters, the neo-communist "Occupy Wall Street" movement is fast becoming the face of the modern Democratic Party.

This is a wonderful thing, says conservative columnist George F. Will. Will said he wants the Occupy Wall Street protests to prosper: "I think they do represent the intellectual spirit of the American left, but also I remember the 1960s. We had four years of demonstrations like this [that] led up to 1968, when the Nixon/Wallace vote was 57 percent—the country reacting against demonstrators, and Republicans went on to win five of the next six presidential elections."

Organized by Obama allies such as the sleazy, SEIU-funded ACORN front group known as the Working Families Party, the Occupy Wall Street mob's demands are strikingly similar to the Democratic Party platform, differing largely only in degree. They include creating a single-payer health-care system and a "guaranteed living wage," abolishing credit agencies, free college education, banning the use of fossil fuels, open borders, and \$1 trillion in useless new infrastructure spending.

Prominent national Democrats and the mainstream media are now working overtime to convince Americans that a revolution is in the air and that they should embrace it. In order to make the movement more palatable to middle America, they are pushing the line that Occupy Wall

Street is a left-wing version of the Tea Party movement.

Democratic office holders have been sprinting so hard to align themselves with the unwashed masses squatting in lower Manhattan that it's a miracle they haven't suffered sports injuries.

President Obama threw his lot in with the demonstrators and used the occasion to smear Republicans. The movement "expresses the frustrations the American people feel, that we had the biggest financial crisis since the Great Depression, huge collateral damage all throughout the country," Obama said in a reference to Wall Street, which has long been a Democratic fundraising powerhouse.

"Yet you're still seeing some of the same folks who acted irresponsibly trying to fight efforts to crack down on the abusive practices that got us into this in the first place," the president pontificated, ignoring the role that Democrat-dominated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the Democrat-created Community Reinvestment Act, and Democrat-aligned ACORN, played in sabotaging the economy.

House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi said she supports "the message to the establishment, whether it's Wall Street or the political establishment and the rest, that change has to happen."

Al Gore whined predictably. "With democracy in crisis, a true grassroots movement pointing out the flaws in our system is the first step in the right direction," said the world's preeminent global warming charlatan. Of course Democrats only complain that democracy is in crisis when they're down in the polls.

The media and the left end of the think tank world are also pushing the movement's socialist propaganda.

The *New York Times* and media outlets across the country hang on every word from every absurd and anti-American pronouncement issued by Occupy Wall Street and its supporters. James Taranto of the *Wall Street Journal* points out that Jim Roberts, the *New York Times*'s assistant managing editor, seemed to signal approval of a radical revisionist interpretation of the Boston Tea Party by linking to it via Twitter. (Whether Roberts agreed with the post is almost beside the point, according to Taranto, because it was greatly out of character for Roberts to highlight an item from an aggressive left-wing policy shop.)

The ahistorical post Taranto and Roberts referenced is by Lee Fang, a researcher at the Center for American Progress Action Fund's Think Progress blog with a penchant for getting basic facts wrong. Like much of the propaganda emanating from the George Soros-funded, John Podesta-run Center for American Progress, Fang's item is a litany of falsehoods and half-truths.

In the article titled “Top 5 Reasons Why The Occupy Wall Street Protests Embody Values Of The Real Boston Tea Party,” Fang writes that the Occupy Wall Streeters share the same values as the Bostonians of the 1770s because they rail against corporate abuses and use civil disobedience techniques against private corporations.

Of course this is nonsense. In fact, the company on the receiving end of American ire in pre-revolutionary days was the tea-importing East India Company, which in a sense is a forerunner of today’s taxpayer-supported “government-sponsored enterprises” or GSEs. Like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the rent-seeking East India Company enjoyed special privileges such as trade monopolies granted by the Crown.

It is true that both Occupy Wall Streeters and the Tea Party today oppose crony capitalism, but the similarities end there. The leaders of Occupy Wall Street denounce markets themselves as unfair and demand a radical transformation of American society, while Tea Partiers revere markets and want the government to get out of the business of picking winners and losers.

Occupy Wall Street supporters want the government to control every aspect of Americans’ lives. Come to think of it, that’s what today’s Democratic Party wants too.

—FrontPageMagazine, October 17, 2011

Fidel Castro’s State Department

by Humberto Fontova

January 7, 1959 marked a milestone in US diplomatic history. Never before had the State Department extended diplomatic recognition to a Latin American government as quickly as it bestowed it on Fidel Castro’s that day.

At the time, Castro himself had yet to enter Havana.

Nothing so frantically fast had been bestowed upon “US-backed” Fulgencio Batista (obligatory prefix, used in every MSM and “scholarly” mention of him) seven years earlier. Batista had in fact been punished by a US arms embargo and heavy diplomatic pressure to resign for a year. Batista was subsequently denied exile in the US and not even allowed to set foot in the country that “backed” him.

On a visit to Cuba in 2001 for a “scholarly summit” with Fidel and Raul Castro, Robert Reynolds—who served as the CIA’s Caribbean desk’s specialist on the Cuban revolution in 1960—clarified the US diplomatic stance of the time: “Me and my staff were all Fidelistas,” he boasted

to his beaming hosts.

Reynolds’ colleague Robert Weicha, who served as CIA chief in Santiago, Cuba in the late 1950s, concurred: Everyone in the CIA and everyone at State were pro-Castro, except ambassador Earl T. Smith.

In the fall of ’57, Weicha and US Consul Park Wollam smuggled into Cuba the state-of-the-art transmitters that became Castro and Che’s Radio Rebelde. From these mics, the Castroites broadcast their “guerrilla victories” island-wide, along with their plans to uplift Cuba into a Caribbean Shangri-La inspired by the principles of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Thomas Jefferson, and St Francis of Assisi. These proclamations were then reaching most of the English-speaking world through the good work of the *New York Times* and CBS (Herbert Matthews and Don Hewitt, respectively).

“War against the United States is my true destiny!” Fidel Castro had confided in a letter to a friend in June 1958. “When this war’s over I’ll start that much bigger war.” Alas, this message was not broadcast over the US-issue “Radio Rebelde,” and apparently slipped past our crackerjack CIA.

Within days of recognizing Castro’s regime, the US State Department sacked its Republican ambassador to Cuba, Earl T. Smith—that insufferable pest mentioned by Weicha. Smith’s unforgivable gaffe was repeatedly warning that supporting the Castro rebels (as we’ve seen, both morally and materially) while pulling the rug out from under Batista was not the shrewdest method of advancing US interests, to say nothing of the interests of the Cuban people.

Months earlier, an alarmed Smith contacted Jim Noel, CIA station chief in Havana, with reports from his Cuban contacts about communist string-pullers existing within Castro’s movement, and about Che Guevara’s well-known communist ties and sympathies. (When arrested in Mexico City in 1956, Guevara was carrying in his pocket the business card of the local KGB agent, who also served as Raul Castro’s KGB handler since 1953.) But Noel could hardly mask his annoyance at the naysaying Republican alarmist. “Don’t worry, Ambassador,” snapped the typically liberal CIA officer. “We’ve infiltrated Castro’s group in the Sierra. The Castros and Che Guevara have no affiliations with any Communists whatsoever.”

Smith’s replacement—Phil Bonsal, a liberal career diplomat—fully backed and quickly adopted the official “carrot and even bigger carrot” policy towards Castro. The policy soon showered the new Cuban regime with \$200 million in subsidies from US taxpayers.

Castro was quick to respond: “The US is a vulture preying on humanity!” he raved just a week after Smith’s sacking. “Let the Marines invade! Then we’ll pile up 200,000 dead gringos!”

As mentioned, the only “US invasion” then envisaged was one of smiling, groveling Yankee diplomats and Yankee taxpayer subsidies.

Alert Cubans started plotting against Castro almost from day one, but—alert to who helped him into power—they kept well clear of US officials, turning instead to Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic for some logistical assistance. Nonetheless, in August 1959, Phil Bonsal got wind of this plot and promptly alerted Castro to a conspiracy against his regime manned solely by Cubans. Thanks in part to Bonsal’s solicitude for the regime insulting his nation as “a vulture preying on humanity” and poised to steal \$2 billion from US stockholders, the anti-Castro plot was foiled.

Hundreds of the Cuban plotters were imprisoned. Some were executed. And the regime that three years later came close to vaporizing many of America’s largest cities with nuclear missiles (including Bonsal’s home) survived.

Then, as now, the word gringo was very rarely used by Cubans. So in his “vulture” tirade, Castro was already mugging to the Latin American gallery. Castro’s very first trip abroad as head of state was to Caracas, where on January 25, 1959 he implored Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt to “join” his “master plan against the gringos.” The newly elected Venezuelan president soon learned that his “joining” would consist of massive loans, financial aid, and shipments of free oil to Castro from Venezuela. So Betancourt decided to “think it over.”

It took Hugo Chavez for Venezuela to finally “join” Castro’s master plan. In mid-2005, 160,000 barrels of essentially free oil were flowing from Venezuela to Cuba daily, a flow that continues unabated despite Venezuela’s pathetic economy. Chavez’s honorarium comes in the form of the thousands of Cuban specialists who essentially run his regime’s security and intelligence sectors.

Not a bad bargain, actually. Trained and mentored for decades by the KGB and East German STASI, Castro’s secret police is considered among the most “proficient” on Earth, as befits a regime that jailed political prisoners at a higher rate than Stalin’s and executed (murdered,

actually; the former term implies some form of judicial process) more people (per capita) in its first three years in power than Hitler’s did in its first six.

Within weeks of his “dead gringos!” tirade and his Venezuelan visit, Castro’s regime had stolen the Cuban Telephone Company (an ITT subsidiary), commencing a mass larceny of US property at Soviet gunpoint that would reach almost \$2 billion in little over a year—and included the torture and firing squad murder of several US citizens who resisted.

The Castro regime has never settled a penny of this mass burglary with its US victims. Search for any mention of the above in a mainstream media article on the so-called US embargo of Cuba (in fact, we’ve been Cuba’s main food supplier and fifth largest trading partner for close to a decade now) and you will draw a complete blank.

“But that’s hoary Cold War stuff, Humberto,” some will counter. But the same people run Cuba today as ran it in 1959.

—FrontPageMagazine, January 9, 2012

Conservatives: What’s in a Name?

by Dr. Michael Bauman

Pitchers pitch. Runners run. Conservatives conserve. *Cultural conservatives* conserve the best that’s been said, done, or thought in Western culture, things like the daring and inimitable epic panoply of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, by which he sought “to justify the ways of God to man;” the haunting and profound chiaroscuro of Rembrandt’s human images, which depicts the enduring truths of revelation by using little more than visual rhythm and the light that signifies the Divine Essence; the ethereal and liquid beauty of Debussy’s “Beau Soir,” “Reverie,” and “Clair de Lune,” which says in tones what cannot be said in words; the heroic and transcending single-mindedness of Solzhenitsyn in the gulag or of Wilberforce in the teeth of entrenched and money-besotted evil in the highest places, by which both men pressed doggedly forward against all odds and refused to accept defeat because they knew

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 P.O. 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. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.

that, with God, just one resolute man can be a majority; and the razor-sharp, soul-rending brevity of Augustine, who said to God, “You have made us for Yourself, and our hearts are restless until they find their rest in You,” which articulates in the space of but one brief and electric sentence both our deepest problem and its Only Answer.

Political conservatives conserve the best political principles of the past, like Aristotle’s ancient insight that the fundamental building block of a society is not the allegedly autonomous individual but the family, and that whatever undermines the family undermines the nation. Political conservatives value the prudence of Edmund Burke’s *Reflections* and see in it the righteous alternative and antidote to Machiavelli’s perverse political virtuosity. They learn from Adam Smith that precise observation is a better path to economic understanding than is rationalistic and abstract theorizing, and that a profound difference exists between selfishness and self-interest. The former destroys a people; the latter makes them prosper.

Political conservatives also know that government closest to home is best. They know that, whenever we can, we are better advised to address problems at the lowest political level than at the highest. They do so because we tend to know our own affairs better than anyone else knows them. We know our issues, our resources, our challenges, our needs, our desires, and our own set of tradeoffs better than do the folks in the state capital or in Washington. Conservatives also know that each one of us labors under the burdens of incomplete knowledge and that we do not know all we need to know in order to choose well. We make mistakes. Because the central planners know us even less well than we know ourselves, whenever we yield our decision-making responsibilities to the bureaucrats, the effects of ignorance are compounded and things get worse, much worse.

Religious conservatives know that we were born into a world not of our own making, that we are the blessed inheritors of the great and manifold gifts of life and culture, mediated from God to us by our faithful ancestors, to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. That debt includes knowing who they were, what they believed, what they did, and why they did it. It entails conserving their insights and achievements, adding to them if possible, and then passing those things on to those who follow.

Religious conservatives know the human condition: We make our way through a fallen world with fallen minds. Because we do, it is easy to be wrong—shockingly and embarrassingly wrong. They know that wisdom is neither the habit of our minds nor the content of our normal discourse. They know that so much of what we

say and do is permeated with sin and its attendant, humanly inescapable, insanities. They know that we all live in Muddledom and are its loyal citizens. They know we reproduce after our own kind, which is why they are wary of contemporary education and of the cultural, political, and theological barbarians who run it, all the way from the kindergartens to the graduate schools.

Conservatives of all stripes know that we cannot effectively engage the problems of the present or the challenges of the future without the wisdom of the past. They know that we must remain resolutely tied to the hard-won insights of our ancestors rather than to the overly-optimistic fantasies of the change mongers, who never seem to learn that, while change is easy, improvement is hard. Conservatives know that we must not trust our grandchildren and their prospects to those who disrespect our grandparents and their achievements.

After millennia of listening to the alleged experts—and suffering setbacks of every sort because we did—Conservatives know that the alleged experts cannot be trusted. That’s why the late William F. Buckley, Jr. once said that he’d rather be ruled by the first fifty names in the Boston telephone directory than by the entire faculty of Harvard.

When Buckley said that, he was echoing Jesus, who, 1900 years earlier, said that “the stone which the builders rejected is the very one that God has made the capstone” (Mark 12:10). Please note Jesus’ point: God did not choose the stone rejected by the butchers, the bakers, or the candlestick makers; He chose the stone rejected by the experts, by the builders themselves, and made it the crowning glory of his great redemptive accomplishment.

When Jesus said that about the experts, He was simply quoting something said by the Psalmist many centuries earlier (Psalm 118:22). The stupidity of the expert is an ancient phenomenon, one almost as old as the wisdom that rejects it.

My point is this: Conservatives long have recognized the stupidity of the alleged experts and, in its place, prefer the hard-won wisdom of the ages. Conservatives look to history and to Heaven for wisdom, not to Harvard; they look to the past and to prudence, not to Princeton, for the knowledge that endures. They do what Jeremiah suggested more than 25 centuries ago: “Stand at the crossroads and look; ask for the ancient paths, where the good way lies, and walk in it, and find rest for your souls” (Jer. 6:16). They know that the best way to build a bridge to the future is to keep a well-traveled and well-maintained bridge from the past.

Communist China's Human Rights Abuses

by Tony Blankley (1948-2012)

A just-released book *Bowing to Beijing: How Barack Obama is Hastening America's Decline and Ushering a Century of Chinese Domination* by Brett M. Decker and William C. Triplett II, will change forever the way you think about China—even if, like me, you already have the deepest worries about the Chinese threat. As I opened the book, I was expecting to find many useful examples of Chinese military and industrial efforts to get the better of the United States and the West.

Indeed, there are 100 pages of examples of the most remorseless Chinese successes at stealing the military and industrial secrets of the West and converting them into a growing menace—soon to be a leviathan—bent on domination and defeat of America. The authors itemize the sheer unprecedented magnitude of this effort. But the opening chapters deal with human rights abuses, and my first thought as I started reading was that I wanted to get right to the military and industrial examples.

But the authors were right to lead with 50 pages itemizing in grisly detail Chinese human rights abuses—for the profound reason that after reading those first 50 pages, the reader will be impassioned to resist Chinese domination not only on behalf of American interests, but for the sake of humanity.

Many people think America is in decline and mentally acquiesce to the thought that the rise of China is inevitable. Those 50 pages will stiffen your resolve to be part of the struggle never to let such a malignancy spread to the rest of the world—let alone to America. One of the authors, Brett M. Decker, is a friend—and I have never been more proud of his (and his co-author's) accomplishment of providing such a deep moral vision in this carefully factual book.

In an astounding narrative, Brett and Mr. Triplett have refuted the growing authoritarian temptation for too many privileged people around the world, expressed by Thomas L. Friedman, senior *New York Times* foreign-policy columnist, who wrote recently: "One-party autocracy certainly has its drawbacks. But when it is led by a reasonably enlightened group of people, as China is today, it can also have great advantages. That one party can just impose the politically difficult but critically important policies needed to move a society forward in the 21st century."

The authors do not mention Mr. Friedman. In those first 50 pages, they focus their compelling narrative on a strictly

factual exposé of the moral horror being brought down on the Chinese people by their ever-more-powerful leadership.

The authors carefully delineate the reversal in the past decade of the previous, modest Chinese movement toward rule of law and a small hint at decency. It had been the hope of everyone from Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger onward that as China came into the world and embraced capitalism, it would become "a modern, progressive society that [would] eventually bring the communist state in line with the rest of the civilized world." That was the moral foundation for "engaging" with China. It also was a convenient rationalization for trying to make a fortune in the vast Chinese market.

But, grimly, the authors explicate the sad fact that the engagement was a false dawn. In the past decade, it has gotten worse and worse as the Chinese leadership has consolidated its power. Oligarchic "princelings"—the 200 to 300 descendants of the founders of the Communist Party—have gained a stranglehold on both the business and the government of China. They are using the incomprehensibly vast power that comes with that total control to buy off the business class, exploit the working class and peasants, and prepare China to replace America as the world's dominant nation.

Once you have read the searing first 50 pages of this book, the hope that China is becoming a "decent," liberal society is no longer morally available to you. I mention Mr. Friedman because of his claim that Chinese leaders are a "reasonably enlightened group of people." The authors' narrative shows Mr. Friedman's words to be not merely fatuous but uniquely immoral.

Whatever one thinks about the influence of Western civilization on the broader world over the past half-millennium, it can be said that the West has lived out a "reasonably enlightened" view of humanity. It would be very different under Chinese domination. Here is just one of hundreds of examples offered by the authors of the moral pit that China has become: "It is routine for children as young as nine years old and for the mentally handicapped to be sold to sweatshops where they work around the clock in slave-like conditions. Tragically, child labor is most common in toy factories. Other workers initially take jobs voluntarily but then are padlocked in dormitories and forced to work up to 18 hours a day in a subhuman environment." Those cheap toys found on American shopping shelves come at a horribly high price.

The authors systematically assess the evil intents and consequences of the communist government from child labor to environmental damage to the selection and murder of prisoners for their body parts. After a particularly riveting narrative of the Chinese regime's religious intolerance, the

authors conclude with Pope Benedict XVI's soul-rending observation: "In China, Christ is living out His Passion."

Just as the authors are ferocious toward the Chinese regime, they are equally tough on the Washington establishment that helps the Chinese. The authors name names and present chapter and verse of how China—and its American allies—penetrate US business and compromise government secrets. The failure of our government even to begin to resist the Chinese threat is aptly described as a bipartisan failure of both vision and will—if not patriotism. But it is fair to say that President Obama, in particular, will not enjoy reading this book, although he would vastly benefit from it, as would the country if he were to act on the authors' advice.

—*The Washington Times*, November 21, 2011, p. 32

Communist China's Economic Vassal

by Jeffrey T. Kuhner

President Obama is creating a post-American world—one that is ushering in the dominance of China. Mr. Obama is fostering US economic and military decline while simultaneously empowering Beijing's rise to superpower status. China's communists are on the march. Unless Americans wake up to the growing threat, both internal and external, our victory in the Cold War will have been useless.

This is the disturbing theme of *Bowing to Beijing: How Barack Obama Is Hastening America's Decline and Ushering a Century of Chinese Domination* by Brett M. Decker, editorial page editor of *The Washington Times*, and William C. Triplett II, a best-selling author and renowned China analyst. Lucid, concise, and comprehensively researched, the book is a fire bell in the night. It is a dire warning that China has become what America once was to Great Britain: the ambitious upstart determined to eclipse the global colossus. The result will be not only the end of the American moment, but the triumph of a belligerent authoritarian communism hostile to democracy and the West.

"China's leaders are engaged in a war against America. They view us as a threat to their regime and way of life. Hence, they have embarked on a systematic, long-term program to surpass us militarily, economically, and politically," Mr. Decker said in an interview. "They are willing to do anything—purchase our national debt, steal our intellectual property, spend obscene amounts to buy influence in Washington, engage in extensive espionage in our government and large corporations, and sell sensitive missile

and nuclear technology to our mortal enemies—to defeat us. And the Obama administration is turning a blind eye."

The authors reveal that Beijing believes it is in a life-and-death struggle against America. For years, China's ruthless communist regime has been committing hostile, aggressive acts—stealing valuable military technology, blatantly violating patent and intellectual property laws, manipulating its currency to artificially boost exports to the United States, lying about the nature and extent of its massive military buildup, sending spies into the highest echelons of our government and private sector, hacking into our computer networks, waging cyber warfare, purchasing stakes in major banks, and cultivating our economic dependence on Chinese business.

Mr. Obama's behavior does more than demean and degrade the presidency. For the authors, it rightly signifies Washington's growing subservience to Beijing. Under Mr. Obama, America's national debt has soared to nearly \$15 trillion. Obamacare, the massive stimulus, crippling regulations, and the reckless borrowing and public spending have brought us to the brink of bankruptcy. The private sector has been shackled. Economic sclerosis has set in. Our military lacks the dynamic economy necessary to sustain our global standing. Mr. Obama has significantly weakened American power. China is filling the vacuum. Beijing now owns more than \$1.3 trillion of US debt. It annually runs huge trade surpluses, flooding our market with everything from toys to computers to manufacturing products. America's industrial base is being wiped out. As we become the world's greatest debtor nation, China is amassing more than \$3 trillion in hard-currency reserves. Its economy is exploding, fueling annual growth rates averaging 10 percent for nearly two decades.

Beijing is embarking on a huge, almost unprecedented military buildup. It possesses the largest armed force on the planet. It has 2.3 million men in uniform, compared to 1.4 million in the United States. If one includes reservists and paramilitary forces, the total number is close to 5 million. China is expanding its nuclear arsenal. It is constructing a world-class navy to dominate the western Pacific. It menaces its democratic neighbors, Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea. Along with its client state of North Korea, China has sold missiles and vital nuclear technology to Iran, Syria, and Venezuela—aiding and abetting our arch adversaries.

America is turning into an economic vassal of China. We can no longer afford to upset—never mind challenge—our new imperial master. Instead, we must bow. This is Mr. Obama's real, enduring and shameful legacy. We didn't win the Cold War. Communist China did.

—*The Washington Times*, November 21, 2011, p. 31

THE NAKED TRUTH THE NAKED COMMUNIST—REVISITED

James C. Bowers, SC.D.

This book is an analysis of a specific section in the book, *The Naked Communist* by W. Cleon Skousen, published in 1958. The section to be evaluated is entitled, “Current Communist Goals.” For his FBI background, Mr. Skousen lists what he considered to be the top 45 Goals of the Communists as of 1958. The progress and status of each of these Goals as of 2011 is carefully documented. Prepare to be shocked!



HELP OTHERS UNDERSTAND! Give copies of

THE NAKED TRUTH

to Friends, Neighbors, Relatives, Clergymen, Teachers, or anyone who *still* doesn't get it.

Do your part! To order, go to schwarzreport.org or call 719-685-9043.

SPECIAL QUANTITY PRICES

1 copy: \$12 5 copies: \$40 (\$8 each)
12 copies: \$84 (\$7 each) 48 copies: \$240 (\$5 each)
Prices include shipping.

SCHWARZ REPORT PRESS
P.O. Box 129
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

“This is a must read!”—David A. Noebel