



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 51, Number 2



Dr. David Noebel

February 2011

The President of the United States Is a Socialist

by David A. Noebel

It's official—Barack Obama is a socialist! Fox News commentator Bill O'Reilly posed the question to Dick Morris: "In your heart, you believe [Obama] is a socialist?" to which Morris replied, "Yes, I do" (The O'Reilly Factor, December 15, 2010).

Dick Morris has made very few political mistakes in his life, and his opinion confirms my longstanding belief that our current president is a Fabian Socialist with a bias toward revolution! Anyone who counts among his associates and mentors Frank Marshall Davis, Saul Alinsky, Cornel West, Jim Wallis, Jeremiah Wright, Michael Klonsky, and Bill Ayers could not come away without such a bias.

Remember John C. Drew, who knew Obama when they were both students at Occidental College back in the early 1980s? Drew admits that he was at one time a revolutionary Marxist and concluded that Obama was "a pure Marxist socialist." Indeed, he also said that from his perspective Obama "had a hard Marxist-Leninist point of view." (See Stanley Kurtz, *Radical-in-Chief: Barack Obama and the Untold Story of American Socialism*, page 88.)

Obama's very rhetoric gives him away. He refers to opponents in the Senate and House as "enemies." He exemplifies the typical Marxist socialist who lines up in his crosshairs for destruction whatever institution he has his eye on to socialize (nationalize) in his quest to destroy capitalism in any way possible. His move to nationalize the health care industry (which will eventually make the federal government the single payer) and the student loan industry are dead giveaways of what Marxists have in mind: ultimately all Americans will be dependent on government for their health care and only radical students will be eligible for student loans. Evangelical conservative Christians need not apply.

The confirmation that Obama is swimming in Marxist waters right up to the present time is his endorsement that allowed the Communist Party USA to participate in the October 2, 2010, "One Nation Working Together" rally in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the George Soros funded Tides Center.

Andree Seu at *World* magazine picked up the significance of this event when she remarked, "Once Communists in America lurked in the shadows: now the Communist Party USA is an unabashed presence at the Oct. 2 'One Nation Working Together' rally" (November 6, 2010, p. 79).

John Sweeney, former president of the AFL-CIO, also allowed Communists back into his union. David Horowitz and Richard Poe in *The Shadow Party* say, "Much has been made of Sweeney's political radicalism. A card-carrying member of the Democratic Socialists of America [a part of the Socialist International founded by Karl Marx], Sweeney opened the AFL-CIO's door to Communist Party organizers for the first time since the 1950s, allowing Communists to distribute literature at his conventions and recruit workers to their cause" (p. 166). President Obama plans to award Sweeney the Medal of Freedom in February.

Yes, the AFL-CIO was also one of the 400 Marxist organizations participating in the October 2 rally. In fact, the list of organizations participating in the "One Nation Working Together" rally provides a good cross section of the radical Marxist organizations operating in the United States. There were more Communists in attendance at that rally than are found in Moscow's Red Square and probably Beijing's Tiananmen Square!

Of course, Jim Wallis and his Sojourners organization were also rally goers. Wallis made recent news on another front as well. According to *Newsweek's* Educational Site, on November 30, 2010, Wallis was among a dozen "moderate" Christian leaders who gathered in Washington to discuss ways to "articulate a vision of Christianity that will counter a new—and newly powerful—religious-right rhetoric in advance of the 2012 election." In other words, they were plotting

ways to make conservative evangelicals think of Obama as one of them. How this pro-abortion, pro-homosexual, pro-socialist president could be “one of them” is difficult to fathom. But Joel Hunter, pastor of the Northland Church in Orlando, and Tony Campolo, sociologist and advisor to former President Clinton, were among the Christian leaders at the meeting.

Campolo set the tone for the meeting by denouncing the religious right’s “vision of America as God’s own country, and free-market capitalism as crucial to the nation’s flourishing.” He went on to elaborate that what motivates religious conservatives is this distorted vision of God and country and that anyone who disagrees with them “is a socialist or a communist.”

To this group and others of like mind, the “radical right” (i.e., conservative Christians) must be demeaned if not destroyed so the new guard of evangelicals, led by the Rev. Wallis and his loyal sidekicks Bill and Lynne Hybels (Lynne writes for *Sojourners* magazine) of Willowcreek Church in Chicago, must emerge as the new leaders.

The truth is that Jim Wallis and Tony Campolo have been part of the religious left for years (see Ron Nash’s *Why the Left Is Not Right*), and Wallis has been swimming in Marxist waters ever since his college days at Michigan State University when he was involved with Students for a Democratic Society.

Wallis recently showed his dialectical morality when challenged by Marvin Olasky, editor of *World* magazine. When Olasky asked Wallis to finally admit he was “a man of the left,” Wallis insisted he was a man of the center. When Olasky insisted that men of the center don’t take financial help from the radical leftist George Soros and his Open Society Institute, Wallis insisted his organization (*Sojourners*) never took funds from Soros. When Olasky produced evidence that *Sojourners* has taken tens of thousands of dollars from Soros, Wallis finally had to say “uncle.” Indeed, Wallis actually apologized to Olasky for calling him “a liar.” (See *World* magazine, August 18, 2010.)

Evangelical Christians will no doubt hear how bigoted and brain dead they are if they plan to vote against the socialist Obama in 2012. America is presently at the edge of a spiritual, moral, political, and financial abyss. Congress and the president just made the military safe for a practice that every religion in the history of the world has condemned. Stay tuned to see which evangelicals line up to push America over the edge in favor of some form of global governance and socialist paradise!

Further Reading

Stanley Kurtz, *Radical-in-Chief: Barack Obama and the Untold Story of American Socialism*

Aaron Klein (Brenda J. Elliot), *The Manchurian President: Barack Obama’s Ties to Communists, Socialists and other Anti-American Extremists*

David Horowitz and Richard Poe, *The Shadow Party: How George Soros, Hillary Clinton, and Sixties Radicals Seized Control of the Democratic Party*

Socializing the Internet

by John Fund

The Federal Communications Commission’s new “net neutrality” rules, passed on a partisan 3-2 vote yesterday, represent a huge win for a slick lobbying campaign run by liberal activist groups and foundations. The losers are likely to be consumers who will see innovation and investment chilled by regulations that treat the Internet like a public utility.

There’s little evidence the public is demanding these rules, which purport to stop the non-problem of phone and cable companies blocking access to websites and interfering with Internet traffic. Over 300 House and Senate members have signed a letter opposing FCC Internet regulation, and there will undoubtedly be even less support in the next Congress.

Yet President Obama, long an ardent backer of net neutrality, is ignoring both Congress and adverse court rulings, especially by a federal appeals court in April, that the agency doesn’t have the power to enforce net neutrality. He is seeking to impose his will on the Internet through the executive branch. FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski, a former law school friend of Mr. Obama, has worked closely with the White House on the issue. Official visitor logs show he’s had at least 11 personal meetings with the president.

The net neutrality vision for government regulation of the Internet began with the work of Robert McChesney, a University of Illinois communications professor who founded the liberal lobby Free Press in 2002. Mr. McChesney’s agenda? “At the moment, the battle over network neutrality is not to completely eliminate the telephone and cable companies,” he told the website So-

cialistProject in 2009. “But the ultimate goal is to get rid of the media capitalists in the phone and cable companies and to divest them from control.”

A year earlier, Mr. McChesney wrote in the Marxist journal *Monthly Review* that “any serious effort to reform the media system would have to necessarily be part of a revolutionary program to overthrow the capitalist system itself.” Mr. McChesney told me in an interview that some of his comments have been “taken out of context.” He acknowledged that he is a socialist and said he was “hesitant to say I’m not a Marxist.”

For a man with such radical views, Mr. McChesney and his Free Press group have had astonishing influence. Mr. Genachowski’s press secretary at the FCC, Jen Howard, used to handle media relations at Free Press. The FCC’s chief diversity officer, Mark Lloyd, co-authored a Free Press report calling for regulation of political talk radio.

Free Press has been funded by a network of liberal foundations that helped the lobby invent the purported problem that net neutrality is supposed to solve. They then fashioned a political strategy similar to the one employed by activists behind the political speech restrictions of the 2002 McCain-Feingold campaign-finance reform bill. The methods of that earlier campaign were discussed in 2004 by Sean Treglia, a former program officer for the Pew Charitable Trusts, during a talk at the University of Southern California. Far from being the efforts of genuine grass-roots activists, Mr. Treglia noted, the campaign-finance reform lobby was controlled and funded by foundations like Pew.

“The idea was to create an impression that a mass movement was afoot,” he told his audience. He noted, “If Congress thought this was a Pew effort, it’d be worthless.” A study by the Political Money Line, a nonpartisan website dealing with issues of campaign funding, found that of the \$140 million spent to directly promote campaign-finance reform in the last decade, \$123 million came from eight liberal foundations.

After McCain-Feingold passed, several of the foundations involved in the effort began shifting their attention to “media reform”—a movement to impose government controls on Internet companies somewhat related to the long-defunct “Fairness Doctrine” that used to regulate TV and radio companies. In a 2005 interview with the progressive website Buzzflash, Mr. McChesney said that campaign-finance reform advocate Josh Silver approached him and said, “let’s get to work on getting popular involvement in media policy making.” Together the two founded Free Press.

Free Press and allied groups such as MoveOn.org

quickly got funding. Of the eight major foundations that provided the vast bulk of money for campaign-finance reform, six became major funders of the media-reform movement. (They are the Pew Charitable Trusts, Bill Moyers’s Schumann Center for Media and Democracy, the Joyce Foundation, George Soros’s Open Society Institute, the Ford Foundation, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.) Free Press today has 40 staffers and an annual budget of \$4 million.

These wealthy funders pay for more than publicity and conferences. In 2009, Free Press commissioned a poll, released by the Harmony Institute, on net neutrality. Harmony reported that “more than 50% of the public argued that, as a private resource, the Internet should not be regulated by the federal government.” The poll went on to say that since “currently the public likes the way the Internet works . . . messaging should target supporters by asking them to act vigilantly” to prevent a “centrally controlled Internet.”

To that end, Free Press and other groups helped manufacture “research” on net neutrality. In 2009, for example, the FCC commissioned Harvard University’s Berkman Center for Internet and Society to conduct an “independent review of existing information” for the agency in order to “lay the foundation for enlightened, data-driven decision making.”

Considering how openly activist the Berkman Center has been on these issues, it was an odd decision for the FCC to delegate its broadband research to this outfit. Unless, of course, the FCC already knew the answer it wanted to get.

The Berkman Center’s FCC-commissioned report, “Next Generation Connectivity,” wound up being funded in large part by the Ford and MacArthur foundations. So some of the same foundations that have spent years funding net neutrality advocacy research ended up funding the FCC-commissioned study that evaluated net neutrality research.

The FCC’s “National Broadband Plan,” released last spring, included only five citations of respected think tanks such as the International Technology and Innovation Foundation or the Brookings Institution. But the report cited research from liberal groups such as Free Press, Public Knowledge, Pew, and the New America Foundation more than 50 times.

So the “media reform” movement paid for research that backed its views, paid activists to promote the research, saw its allies installed in the FCC and other key agencies, and paid for the FCC research that evaluated the

research they had already paid for. Now they have their policy. That's quite a coup.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, December 22, 2010, A19

For greater context on Robert McChesney, *Free Press*, *Monthly Review*, Mark Lloyd, etc. see *You Can Still Trust the Communists (to be Communists)*.

Sodomizing the Military

Part I

by Robert Knight

Once again, as in 2008, Sen. John McCain has led conservatives over a cliff. Both defeats were a result of a conscious decision to unilaterally disarm morally and allow spurious claims to go unchallenged.

When an opponent advances by asserting moral authority, it's powerful even when wrong, as just occurred in the Senate vote to overturn the military's ban on homosexuality. The most effective defense is a superior moral offensive. That did not happen.

To his credit, the veteran soldier Mr. McCain, Arizona Republican, took up the cause. But weeks ago, he insisted that the debate be limited to combat readiness (a good argument, but in isolation, not a winning hand), procedure, and timing. Even some pro-family groups bought into self-censorship. And the conservative talk show hosts were for the most part AWOL. That's why the moral invertebrates that populate some of the GOP leadership refrained from making a clear case. They also failed to examine the core issue—homosexual behavior, and its impact on morale, health, discipline, and the freedoms of soldiers to disagree.

Contrast this with the GOP's unexpected defeat of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's omnibus spending bill. Now, there's something they got passionate about—money. But when it came to protecting our servicemen and women, the rallying cry was basically “run out the clock.”

Instead of using the military debate to bring to light many suppressed facts that could cripple the homosexual juggernaut if Americans only knew, they played by their opponents' rule book.

In *After the Ball*, a 1989 gay-strategy manual, two Harvard-trained public relations experts warn that “the public should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the im-

agery of sex per se should be downplayed, and the issue of gay rights reduced, as far as possible, to an abstract social question.” Elsewhere, the authors say, “first, you get your foot in the door by being as similar as possible; then and only then . . . can you start dragging in your other peculiarities, one by one. You hammer in the wedge narrow end first . . . allow the camel's nose beneath your tent, and his whole body will soon follow.”

With Democrats and turncoats like Sen. Susan Collins, Maine Republican, and Sen. Scott Brown, Massachusetts Republican, falsely framing military service as a “civil right,” the focus remained off behavior and morality. Hapless defenders such as Sen. Saxby Chambliss, Georgia Republican, fell back to saying things like “this is not the time to do this,” as if there ever were a good time to turn the U.S. military into a gay mecca with zero tolerance for chaplains and anyone else who disagrees.

Moral arguments against repeal were AWOL during Saturday's cloture debate. All the moral posturing was on the side of repeal. Sen. Joe Lieberman, Connecticut Independent, even had the gall to cite the Declaration of Independence in support of open homosexuality in our military. That was nearly up there with Barack Obama invoking Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount in 2008 to support homosexual civil unions.

When Center for Military Readiness President Elaine Donnelly at a 2009 House hearing tried to introduce the reality of homosexuality in the barracks and other intimate environs, she was jeered repeatedly by viciously rude congressmen who followed the gay rulebook. As is typical, Ms. Donnelly's bravery drew virtually no defense from Republicans on the committee. She was then mocked the next day in one of *Washington Post* columnist Dana Milbank's funhouse-mirror treatments.

Here are some more cards Republicans refused to play:

* All major religions teach the primacy of sex between husbands and wives and the immorality of homosexuality. Enforcing acceptance of homosexuality may endear us to the weak sisters of Western Europe, but it puts the United States military in conflict with universal moral traditions. Between this and Hollywood, it shouldn't be hard for our enemies to make an even stronger case that we're “the Great Satan.”

* Flawed science has been misused mightily. From Alfred Kinsey's fraudulent research in the 1940s to UCLA Prof. Evelyn Hooker's cooked psychological studies in the late 1950s to misreported “genetic” studies of the 1990s, the public has been browbeaten into ignoring biology, common sense, and thousands of years of moral teaching

about human sexuality.

* The obvious threat to the military blood supply. According to the Centers for Disease Control, men who have sex with men are 44 times more likely to have HIV and 46 more times to have syphilis. Even if gay men enter the services testing negatively, they're going to have sex in the most likely pool in which to become infected.

* Data compiled by the Family Research Council showing that homosexuals commit a disproportionate number of sexual assaults in the military, even with the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy.

* Military history in which leaders such as John Adams, the father of the American Navy, stressed the irreplaceable element of moral character.

* It's important to emphasize that this battle is not over. For example, state Delegate Robert G. Marshall, Virginia Republican, has introduced legislation instructing the Virginia National Guard to bar homosexuality. That should spur similar legislation.

Virginia Col. Richard Black, U.S. Army retired, who was chief of the Army's criminal-law division and who compiled a list of 100 cases of homosexual misconduct, said, "Congress must amend Article 125, UCMJ, to permit consensual sodomy, which is now a serious crime. Otherwise, an intractable conflict would remain between regulation and law.

"The statutory ban imposed by 10 USC 654 [the 1993 law passed by Congress and watered down to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"] was relatively new, dating back to the Clinton presidency. However, Gen. George Washington first instituted the ban in the Continental Army in 1778 by drumming out those who engaged in acts of sodomy. The homosexual ban has been maintained ever since. Obama breaks a 232-year military policy."

A more conservative Congress should restore the law. At some point, America's temporary plunge into moral insanity must end, or it will be the end of this self-governing republic that God has blessed so richly—up to now.

—*The Washington Times*, December 20, 2010

Sodomizing the Military,

Part II

by Ann Coulter

The Pentagon's poll on "don't ask, don't tell" is beyond idiotic. Instead of asking whether the troops support repeal of DADT, the Pentagon asked only if they can learn to play nice with the gays.

Even more absurdly, the Pentagon polled all military "personnel"—and their spouses! Only a small portion of what is known as "the military" actually does the fighting. The rest is a vast bureaucracy along the lines of the DMV.

Today's military features "victim advocates" and sensitivity training facilitators, the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services personnel and a million other goo-goo positions. How did we ever take the shores of Normandy without a phalanx of "sensitivity training" counselors?

No one has any need to be reassured that the military's "social action" staff will enjoy working with gays. Whatever a career in "social action" entails, it better be gay-friendly. Frankly, it's appalling the Pentagon's poll of all military personnel and their families didn't produce better numbers for the gays.

We're interested in what the men who fight think. As the Pentagon study itself reports: "A higher percentage of service members in war-fighting units predicted negative effects."

So gays openly serving in the military will harm the "war-fighting" part of the military, but the "social action" part will thrive!

Naturally, Marines are the most resistant to overturning "don't ask, don't tell," with 58 percent of those in combat opposed.

Who cares if the Pentagon's sexual harassment task force supports gays in the military? The combat units don't, and they're the ones who do the job. The rest of us shouldn't get to vote on gays in the military any more than we get to vote on the choreography of "Chicago."

Military combat is a very specialized field comparable to nothing in civilian life. There has to be a special bond among warriors—and only one kind of bond. The soldierly bond gets confused if some guys think their comrades are hot or if they suspect their superior is having a relationship with a fellow soldier.

It's the same confusion that results from putting girls in the military. When an officer makes a decision, nothing should enter into it except his views on the best military strategy.

The military part of the military has valid reasons for wanting to separate the idea of martial ardor and sexual attraction. Combat units can't have anything that interferes with unit cohesion, such as, for example, platoon members who are dating one another. Racial prejudice is not the same thing as sexual attraction, so please stop telling us this is just like integrating blacks in the military.

A *Military Times* survey in 2005 found that nearly half

of all women in the military claim to have been the victim of sexual harassment—ludicrously more than women in civilian life. By contrast, two-thirds of minorities said they were treated better in the military than in society at large.

The Pentagon's report found that service members "repeatedly" said that allowing gays to serve openly would "lead to widespread and overt displays of effeminacy," as well as "harassment" and unwelcome advances. (To which I would add, "and the occasional leak of massive amounts of classified documents.")

Gays in the military understand this better than heterosexuals in civilian life. According to the Pentagon's survey, only 15 percent of gays currently serving said they would want their units to know they're gay. (Also, 2 percent of gays currently serving giggled when asked about their "unit," which is down from last year.)

There are far more discharges for pregnancy and "parenthood" than for homosexuality. In the past five years, less than 1 percent of all unplanned military discharges (i.e. not due to retirement or completion of service) were for homosexuality.

Here's a record of the discharges for 2008, according to the Defense Department:

- Drugs: 5,627
- Serious offenses: 3,817
- Weight standards: 4,555
- Pregnancy: 2,353
- Parenthood: 2,574
- Homosexuality: 634

The main lesson from these figures isn't that we should have gays openly serving in the military, but that we need to get girls out of the military, inasmuch as they are constantly being discharged for pregnancy, parenthood, and weight issues.

According to a 1998 Department of Defense report, most discharges based on homosexuality involved "junior personnel with very little time in the military" and "the great majority of discharges for homosexual conduct are uncontested and processed administratively." More than 98 percent of discharges for homosexuality were honorable.

So gays and girls can join the military, get taxpayers to foot the bill for their education and then, when it comes time to serve, announce that they're gay or pregnant and receive an honorable discharge. Indeed, there's no proof that all the discharges for homosexuality involve actual homosexuals.

Why can't the Army and Marines have their own rules? Why does everything have to be the same? Whatever happened to "diversity"?

Maybe we could have an all-gay service! They'd be

allowed to wear camouflage neckerchiefs (a la Paul Lynde) and camo capri pants. To avoid any sexual harassment claims, they'd have to have their own barrack, which we could outfit with a dance club, a cosmo bar, and a counseling center called "The Awkward Place." Their band would mostly play show tunes, and soldiers captured by the enemy would be taught to reveal only their name, rank, and seasonal color analysis ("I am Private First Class Jeffrey Smith and I'm a 'winter.'")

They wouldn't be allowed in combat, however, for the same reason women aren't—it takes them too long to get ready.

Most people have no clue what military life is like, least of all the opinion makers in New York, Los Angeles, and the nation's capital. The military is not representative of the country at large. It is disproportionately rural, small-town, Southern, and Hispanic.

We ask our troops to do a lot for very little money. Sometimes they die for us. The least Democrats could do is not pass grandstanding bills while self-righteously denouncing our servicemen as homophobes.

—*Human Events*, December 13, 2010, p. 7

Marks of Weakness, Marks of Woe

by Ralph Peters

The William Blake poem from which this column takes its title lamented the effects of syphilis on London's population—but the lifted line also describes the wasting disease of strategic incompetence with which the Obama administration has infected our foreign policy. The primary difference seems to be that Georgian Londoners at least had some fun early in the process, while this administration's performance has been excruciating from the start.

Is there a single world leader remaining who respects President Obama? Certainly, none fear him. He established himself as a strategic pushover more swiftly than any president in history—even allowing for the near-record times clocked by Presidents Carter and Clinton (to be fair, Clinton at least had the slickness to wheedle the occasional advantage from his foreign counterparts). Right up to the final days of the Bush administration, rogue states stepped lightly, casting a careful eye at Washington over their hunched shoulders. Today, the world's worst actors are playing Dictators Gone Wild.

With the ratification late last year of the new Strategic

Arms Reduction Treaty (START), the administration hit its lowest point thus far, giving the Russians everything they wanted, while getting nothing in return that Moscow wasn't happy to discard. Obama got to wave a signed treaty, declaring it a diplomatic triumph. For his part, Russia's new czar, Vladimir Putin, gained recognition for his two-bit dictatorship as a superpower equal to the US. Instead of measuring our arsenal against the sum of global dangers, No-Nukes Obama reduced it to the size of Russia's, pretending that China and the growing number of nuclear rogue states don't exist as additional threats—and even letting Russia keep 1,500 tactical nuclear weapons for which we no longer have equivalents. Obama also gave away dual-use systems that would be essential in a conflict with Beijing. This particular strip-tease was all strip on our side, all tease on Putin's, a mortifying example of unilateral disarmament by a president who still despises the military. Mere days after the Senate foolishly ratified this treaty and Obama signed it, Putin—howling with delight—mooned Obama by imposing a fresh prison term on political prisoner Mikhail Khodorkovsky. Some re-set.

As for China, one fears that Obama's upcoming head-of-state meeting will reach new heights of appeasement. While claiming that he's concerned about American job losses, this president will do nothing to halt Beijing's myriad trade abuses. He will not take a stand against currency manipulation that's bankrupted countless US manufacturers and swelled our jobless rolls. He will not take a stand against Chinese industrial (and military) espionage. He will not take a stand against extensive Chinese dumping of goods on our market. He will not take a stand against Chinese piracy of intellectual property. And he certainly won't stand up for Chinese dissidents, Christians, or grass-roots reformers. The Chinese will toss him a few stale fortune cookies—and our president will return home delighted, holding in his hand a piece of paper that looks suspiciously like a Chinese menu.

But China's a big player, and Russia does still have a strategic arsenal. A president does have to handle them gingerly. The humiliating thing is that even the likes of Hugo Chavez have pegged Obama as a narcissistic weakling. With this administration adamantly unwilling to criticize abusive leftwing regimes in Latin America, we now have the looming destruction of Nicaragua's democracy; family-mafia rule in Argentina; an incompetent demagogue ravaging (what little is left to ravage in) Bolivia; and Chavez running his murderous dictatorship with Cuban intelligence personnel, while flirting with Iran's offer to provide him with missiles that can strike

US soil. There will be no replay of the Cuban Missile Crisis, either, because Obama would not send our Navy to prevent a missile transfer—it might be against the law. Oh, and Chavez just contracted for \$5 billion in arms—a record for Latin America—from Russia: Yet another re-set benefit, one supposes.

Even Sub-Saharan Africa doesn't take Obama seriously. The bloodstained chieftain of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, has given up his pretense of power-sharing, while China bribes the continent's power-brokers to let Beijing rape the continent of its minerals and rob its people of even primitive justice. And when Muslims slaughtered Christians in Nigeria on Christmas Eve, the White House had no comment (which, of course, is better than yet another repetition of the mantra that “Islam is a religion of peace”).

Then there's the greater Middle East, which Obama expected to win over with his groveling, dishonest, destructive Cairo speech praising Islam, attacking Israel, and re-writing American history. Muslims were, indeed, flattered that an American president would kiss the soles of their feet. But they also knew that Obama was full of ca-ca. Lack of a Harvard or University of Chicago degree does not mean hundreds of millions of Muslims are stupid. They knew Obama didn't know what he was talking about. They know the historical score. They even know the real deal regarding Israel, although they dare not admit it publicly. Obama offered them strategic baby-talk. And they nailed him as a strategic baby.

What grand results has Obama obtained across the Middle East with his gushing praise for a religion in moral retrograde and his refusal to couple the words “Islamist” and “terrorist?” Iran is more aggressive than it's been in decades—and pursuing nuclear weapons. Iranian influence in Iraq and interference in Afghanistan have burgeoned. Sanctions complicate the lives of the average Iranian, but the country's leaders are doing just fine, thanks. And Iran's surrogates have grown bolder again, with Hezbollah launching a political coup in Lebanon and terrorists in Gaza quietly building their arsenal.

Egypt staged a phony election that would have embarrassed the Cold War-era Soviets and responded weakly and reluctantly to attacks on Coptic Christians. Tunisia is wracked with riots as I write. Al Qaeda in the Maghreb (AQIM) haunts a vast region from Algiers to Timbuktu. And Somalia is a chamber of horrors, whose top exports are terrorists and pirates—both of whom this administration insists should be dealt with in civil courts on American soil.

Yemen has become yet another terrorist refuge, and

(contrary to administration propaganda) the cross-border military effort launched by the worried Saudis last year was a Keystone Cops debacle—all the billions in US weaponry purchased by the kingdom is worthless when it's operated by cowardly fools too lazy to train and too disinterested to fight. Iraq, at Iran's behest, wants our last troops gone. And our "NATO ally" Turkey is becoming an Islamist state, chummier by far with Tehran than with Washington (when Ankara's not staging provocations against Israel). Of course, the administration denies all of this, portraying our pathetic president's every failure as a triumph (he really should sit down with North Korea's "Dear Leader," Kim Jong Il—they might get along wonderfully, given the delusional qualities they share and their mutual love of personality cults).

Speaking of North Korea . . . we haven't heard Obama speak of North Korea. Others get to do the dirty-work on that, since the president has no idea what to do. While the White House wrung its hands, it took South Korea's president to man up and tell the North Koreans: No more—or it's war. The North Koreans blustered, but backed down.

Last but not least, there's AfPak. It would be unfair to say that the administration's strategy is failing, because the administration still doesn't have a strategy—just a disconnected bunch of efforts that cost a great deal and produce little or nothing. We're told that we're making progress, even as the Taliban skip their usual winter break to maintain the pressure on our troops and on the Afghan civilians the Kabul government can't protect. Nurtured by our Pakistani friends, the Taliban is more pervasive than it's been since the autumn of 2001—and this administration doesn't know what to do.

The gleefully corrupt Karzai administration continues to ignore its fundamental responsibilities to its own people, while engaging in cronyism to a degree that would have shamed Tammany Hall. Our Afghan allies won't fight, won't govern, and won't work. Ten years into this, we've made far less progress than the Soviets did in their time (and we know how that one ended). To top it all, we insist we're not nation-building, while 90% of what we do is nation-building. But you can't nation-build where there's no nation.

And then there are our Pakistani "allies," who are raking in another \$6 billion from us for protecting our enemies. Pakistan's military and security services shelter the Afghan Taliban's leadership (the Quetta Shura) and,

I believe, shield al Qaeda's top operatives. Meanwhile, the state's decomposing, as radical Muslims murder the country's last politicians committed to human rights and the rule of law. With a willful ignorance of history and human affairs, our State Department assures us that fanaticism isn't that big a threat, really, because the extremists don't perform well in elections. But Hitler didn't come to power with a majority of the popular vote. And "Bolshevik" may mean "majority party," but the Bolsheviks never had one. Rogue states aren't run by electoral majorities, but by minorities armed and determined.

We never run out of excuses for Islamabad, even as Pakistan sponsors terrorist attacks against India, knowing we'll keep New Delhi from retaliating—a practice that makes the US an accomplice to terror. We insist we have friends on the Indus, but even the politicians upon whom we lavished praise over the years played the anti-American card for their own advantage—as do Pakistan's irresponsible journalists (can't wait to see how they fare under a nuclear-armed terror regime). In Pakistan, we're trying to bribe a state with 175-million anti-American Muslims to help us defeat Muslim terrorists the state intends to use to its own advantage. If this is a brilliant strategy on the part of the administration, it's too deep a game for me to understand.

Almost forgot the narco-insurgency in Mexico (there's just so much hostile ground to cover these days): In a stunning blunder, Secretary of State Clinton described the situation accurately for one brief moment—before retreating back into the fantasy that the civil war in Mexico doesn't really exist and wouldn't affect us if it did—let's focus on the beach chairs and margaritas. Well, on a day-to-day basis, Mexico is the most important foreign state to the US—strategically, economically, socially, and criminally. But, hey, just have another tequila and pretend the border's secure.

Has this administration—so full of self-praise—achieved a single foreign-policy win that means anything?

Well, yes. It won a significant victory over Israel—the only rule-of-law democracy in the Middle East—by convincing the Palestinians that we were ready to betray our only true allies in the region and encouraging them to pull back from any hint of rational compromise. Single-handedly, President Obama created a diplomatic Intifada that set back the peace process by at least a decade.

See? I'm willing to give full credit where it's due.

—*FrontPageMag.com*, January 17, 2010