



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 45, Number 11

November 2005

Our 51st Year!

Inside

Marxism and Terror

by Samuel Gregg, Page 3

Karl Marx—greatest philosopher of all time or instigator of terrorism?



The American Civil Liberties Union

by Jamie Glazov, Page 4

Mr. Glazov interviews the author of *The ACLU vs. America: Exposing the Agenda to Redefine Moral Values*.



Canada's Lesbian Rangers

by Henry Makos, Ph. D., Page 6

Read about the bizarre campaign by lesbians at the University of Winnipeg.



The Mitrokhin Files: Castro and the KGB

by Bill Gertz, Page 8

From the Mitrokhin Files, read about more KGB operations to defeat freedom around the world.

Communism's Legacy: The Frankfurt School

by William S. Lind

It sometimes happens that the worst characteristic of an otherwise valuable book is its title. Such is the case with Paul Gottfried's latest work, *The Strange Death of Marxism*. Instead of Marxism's obituary, what Gottfried has actually written is the story of its transmutation into—well, into exactly what remains in dispute. Whatever it might best be called, it is clearly the basis for the political correctness and multiculturalism that have become the state ideology in most of Europe and the United States.

Along the way, Gottfried does chronicle the death of classical, economic Marxism-Leninism both in and beyond European Communist Parties. There are no surprises here; postwar revelations of Stalinist horrors coupled with a rising prosperity that enabled European workers to join the middle class undermined the powerful French and Italian Communist Parties of the 1950s, along with those in most other countries. Maoist and Castroite attempts to internationalize the workers' revolution by translating it into Third World liberation kept Marxism-Leninism on life support for a while, but it was already brain dead. By the time the Soviet Union fell in 1989, classical Marxism had long since been stuffed and mounted, like Lenin. Not even the Chinese Communist Party takes it seriously anymore.

Were that the main substance of Gottfried's book, it would amount to little more than the usual ho-hum academic work. In fact, it is very much more. What Gottfried really presents is the history of Marxism's bastard offspring, political correctness, and the institution most responsible for its birth, the Frankfurt School. In so doing, *The Strange Death of Marxism* joins Lorenz Jäger's superb new biography of Theodor Adorno in making the intellectual history of the most radical of anti-Western ideologies accessible to a nonacademic audience.

Gottfried traces the rise of PC and multiculturalism through Antonio Gramsci, Georg Lukacs, the Frankfurt School, and others, showing how Marx's economic determinism evolved into an obsession with the unholy trinity of "racism, sexism, and homophobia," which now demands endless sacrifices. The first way station was what Gottfried calls "neomarxism":

Neomarxists called themselves Marxists without accepting all of Marx's historical and economic theories but while upholding socialism against capitalism, as a moral position Thereafter socialists would build their conceptual fabrics on Marx's notion of "alienation," extracted from his writings of the 1840s [they] could therefore dispense with a strictly materialist analysis and shift ... focus toward religion, morality, and aesthetics.

What happened next is a matter of dispute, more over terminology than anything

And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. Ephesians 5:11

"Dwell on the past and you'll lose an eye; forget the past and you'll lose both eyes." Old Russian Proverb

else. As Marxism became PC and multiculturalism, did it turn into cultural, as distinguished from economic, Marxism, or did it, as Gottfried contends, move so far beyond Marx as to constitute post-Marxism? Gottfried writes,

Is the critical observation about the Frankfurt School therefore correct, that it exemplifies ‘cultural Bolshevism,’ which pushes Marxist-Leninist revolution under a sociological-Freudian label? To the extent its practitioners and despisers would both answer to this characterization, it may in fact be valid ... but if Marxism under the Frankfurt School has undergone [these] alterations, then there may be little Marxism left in it. The appeal of the Critical Theorists to Marx has become increasingly ritualistic and what there is in the theory of Marxist sources is now intermingled with identifiably non-Marxist ones In a nutshell, they had moved beyond Marxism ... into a militantly antibourgeois stance that operates independently of Marxist economic assumptions.

Here Gottfried is both right and wrong. He is correct that the cultural Marxism we know as political correctness has left Marxism-Leninism and orthodox Marxist economics behind. It did so early; by the late 1910s, Gramsci and Lukacs perceived that culture was not merely “superstructure” but a separate and important variable, and in 1930 Max Horkheimer, the Frankfurt School’s new director, said that the working class would not be the basis of a revolution.

But Gottfried writes, “In defense of this project as a Marxist one, it might be said that its practitioners regarded themselves as revolutionary disciples of Marx and took pains to place their work into a Marxist framework.” Perhaps we should simply take them at their word.

While much has been written about the Frankfurt School’s move from Germany to the United States after Hitler came to power and its subsequent influence here, Gottfried breaks some new ground in his look at the boomerang effect. How is it that Jürgen Habermas, Horkheimer’s and Adorno’s successor at the Frankfurt School, has good things to say about America? As Gottfried writes,

Immigration reform for the benefit of Third World populations, followed by laws aimed at curbing discrimination against racial minorities and recognition of feminist and gay rights, began in the

United States about ten to fifteen years earlier than in Western Europe.

Far from being a bastion of church-going cultural conservatism, the United States has become the world leader of the culturally Marxist revolution, to the point of attempting to impose secular democracy and women’s rights on the Islamic world by force of arms.

Gottfried rightly traces European cultural Marxism back to the American-designed re-education of the Germans after World War II, of which Habermas proudly proclaims himself an heir. If some European countries have now gone farther than the U.S. in making cultural Marxism the state ideology—any dissent from which risks a term in prison—America had much to do with injecting the poison into the European body politic. This time it was Horkheimer and Adorno who arrived on the sealed train.

In his last chapter, Gottfried argues that the “soft despotism” of cultural Marxism, the spirit of Huxley’s *Brave New World*, is a political religion. That is a fair description of ideology in general; all ideologies are anti-Christ, false Christianity promising heaven on earth through man’s own efforts. Despite labeling cultural Marxism “post-Marxism,” Gottfried acknowledges that “the appeal of a Communist god remains a critical point of reference for explaining the current European parliamentary left.” The transmuted effect of this god is that

Those who are secure in their pure intentions also understand the pervasive evil of their Euro-American or German identity. It is something that must be devalued and eventually removed from human relations, in the transition to a global society that will ‘enrich’ the Western world by replacing it.

Nor is this goal confined to the European Left:

Prominent American neoconservative journalist and author Stephen Schwartz has argued in the *National Review* that those who are fighting for global democracy should view Leon Trotsky as a worthy forerunner.

In the end, Gottfried ends up proving the opposite of the thesis in his book’s title. Uncle Karl may be buried, but he’s far from dead.

—*The American Conservative*, October 10, 2005, p. 33, 34

Marxism and Terror

by Samuel Gregg

Karl Marx is the greatest philosopher of all time. Or at least that is what many BBC Radio listeners suggested recently when asked to nominate such a person. To the surprise of some, Marx topped the poll, beating thinkers including Aristotle to Kant.

Marx wrote many things, including admiring words about capitalism, which he regarded as a definite advance on previous economic arrangements. The BBC result, however, underlines a strange blindness about Marx within Western societies.

This is nothing new. In the 1930s, intrepid Westerners traveled to the USSR and returned saying they had seen the future. Somehow they managed not to see the purges, the collectivization and the gulags that resulted in the imprisonment and deaths of millions. Communism, it is said, was a godless system. Communism was godless insofar as it was based upon an atheistic vision of man. Yet Communism had its deity to whom anything and anyone could be sacrificed—the state.

One response is to claim that Marx's philosophy was distorted by Lenin and Stalin. Marx himself was a humanist who wished to liberate people from their chains. Even cursory attention to Marx's writings quickly reveals the hollowness of such defenses. For Marx, man is a being whose origins are irrelevant, whose future is extinction and whose present is beyond his control. Even people living in Marx's communist society have no possibility of a meaningful existence. Marx once described communist society as one in which it would be possible "to do one thing today and another tomorrow; to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, breed cattle in the evening and criticize after dinner, just as I please."

This sounds idyllic until one realizes that, from Marxism's perspective, none of these activities can have any value for humans. For true materialists, there can be no qualitative difference between reading and fishing, working or sleeping, living or dying. Everything has the same value. In this world, there is no difference between Mother Teresa's work and that of a concentration camp guard. This tells us that Marxism cannot be interested in justice or liberty. It insists that we

are like driftwood, floating hither and thither on the waves of history. In such a world, our lives matter naught. Our deaths are irrelevant. We merely try to salvage whatever animal satisfaction we can from life, before our essential nothingness is finalized in our ultimate annihilation as living beings.

So much for Marx's humanism. A more serious problem with Marxist philosophy is its legitimatizing of criminality. By "criminal" I do not simply mean the occasional breaking of the law. Rather, I mean a situation whereby people decide that they are above law; they are not subject to law; that law is merely another tool of power.

For if Marxism is right and materialism is true, the systematic violence to pursue political goals is acceptable.

The irony is that while millions today know about the Nazis' unspeakable crimes, fewer know about the atrocities committed by Lenin, Stalin, Castro, Pol Pot and other Marxists. It is as if there has been subtle agreement not to discuss these crimes. This studied ignorance manifests itself when we observe red flags emblazoned with hammers and sickles waved at demonstrations. Do the wavers know what the red flag means for those who were enslaved by Marxist regimes? Why is Marxism's red flag not treated with the same contempt rightly attached to the swastika?

Marx died years before his followers managed to seize power. But one suspects Marx would have applauded the communist use of violence. Marx advocated hanging capitalists from the nearest lamppost. "When our turn comes," Marx warned his opponents, "we shall not disguise our terrorism."

Much violence has been done in the name of philosophies and religions, including Christianity. The difference is that Christianity contains moral criteria according to which we can judge and condemn such activity on the part of Christians. Marxism never had and never could have such standards. For in Marxist philosophy there is no place for love of God and love of neighbor. Perhaps that, above all, is what makes Marx so unworthy of contemporary admiration.

—*The [Colorado Springs] Gazette*, September 22, 2005, p. M6

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at www.schwarzreport.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

The American Civil Liberties Union

by Jamie Glazov

The following is an interview between *FrontPageMagazine* and Alan Sears, the co-author (with Craig Osten) of the new book, *The ACLU vs. America: Exposing the Agenda to Redefine Moral Values*.

FP: What inspired you to write *The ACLU vs. America*?

Sears: In late 2003, I appeared on *The O'Reilly Factor* to discuss the ACLU's relentless legal attacks on the public celebration of Christmas and how the Alliance Defense Fund was responding to them, including our campaign to educate and equip public officials to stand up the ACLU's multiple year campaign of "fear, intimidation, and disinformation."

At the outset of the interview, Bill O'Reilly asked me: "Mr. Sears, isn't the ACLU an organization that had noble beginnings, but just went off track over the past ten years or so?" Of course, there was not enough time to answer that question in a "sound bite", so I decided right then and there that we would have to write a book to provide an adequate response—that the ACLU had a VERY different vision right from the start for America than our nation's founders. Craig Osten and I saw how the organization looked "one way from a distance but yet another way up close" so we decided to tell the *real story* about the ACLU, its founder Roger Baldwin, its ultra-radical roots, its promotion of socialism, and its extreme positions that few Americans know about.

FP: Tell us about some of the extreme positions of the ACLU that many Americans probably do not know about.

Sears: There are so many, but let's start with the issue of marriage. The ACLU's policy guide states that all civil and criminal laws prohibiting polygamy should be done away with. Earlier this year, during a speech at Yale Law School, ACLU President Nadine Strossen said: "We have defended the right for individuals to engage in polygamy. We defend the freedom of choice for mature, consenting individuals."

This is not a *new* position for the ACLU. Read the wedding "vows" of ACLU founder Roger Baldwin in 1919: "To us who passionately cherish the vision of a free human society, the present institution of marriage among us is a grim mockery of essential freedom.... We deny without reservation the moral right of state or church to bind by force of law a relationship that cannot be maintained by the power of love alone.... The highest relationship between a man and a woman is that which welcomes and understands each other's loves.... The creative life demands many friendships, many loves shared together openly, honestly, and joyously...." (See

pages 12-13 of our book).

To show how extreme this is, 92% of Americans oppose such practices today as they have for nearly 150 years. Opposition to polygamy was in the first platform adopted by the new Republican Party in 1856 and several western states, including Arizona, where I live today, were required by Congress to outlaw the practice in their state constitutions as a precedent to being admitted to the union and even to bar the future reconsideration of the issue.

The ACLU also asserts that the First Amendment, which was NEVER meant by its authors to do so, "protects" child pornography. This is material so foul, that after my years as a federal prosecutor and Director of the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography, I call it "crime scene photography" because of the actual abuse required for its production. The ACLU asserts there should be *no* federal or state governmental restriction on its distribution, reproduction, sale, and use by pedophiles and others. A very small minority of the American public shares this view.

These are just two of the many extreme positions that the ACLU holds that we discuss in the book.

FP: The ACLU is for polygamy and child pornography? This is truly incredible—and shameful. Why do you think so few people know about this? How come the media isn't all over this outrage?

Sears: The ACLU has made no secret of their incredible "First Amendment" defense of the distribution of even the roughest child pornography for those who know where to look for it. Their former national counsel's testimony supporting this "right" in Washington D.C. before the Pornography Commission was delivered after a slide show of such photos depicting in frightening detail the sexual abuse and then murder of a small boy. The ACLU actually filed a brief before the United States Supreme Court defending the "rights" of child pornographers in the *New York v. Ferber* case. But they are clever enough that you do not see the ACLU creating television or print ads to proclaim their support for these positions.

And of course no matter how much one is offended by this and other forms of the vilest pornography imaginable, the ACLU says the government cannot take any action that could protect any citizen from unwanted exposure. Ironically, this is the same ACLU which claims that offended persons must be forcefully protected by them in court from the dreaded public display of the Ten Commandments of Christmas.

Similarly, from their founder's earliest sentiments, to their policy guide and board statements, to President Strossen's comments at Yale in 2005, the ACLU record of support for polygamy and much more than that to redefine "marriage" is clear but generally unknown.

The major media has generally given them a free pass on

all of this, and why the media choose to ignore these facts and give the ACLU a “free pass” is beyond us.

FP: So what do you think is the ACLU’s *true* agenda?

Sears: To get the answer to this question, let’s look at a little history. Today the highest award the ACLU bestows annually is its Roger Baldwin Medal of Liberty, named for their founder, who they still hold in highest regard. Though Baldwin said he was not a communist, he visited the Soviet Union in 1924 and wrote glowingly about Stalin’s government and the great social experiment then being undertaken in that country (see page 15 of our book). Then let’s look at the words of Roger Baldwin back in 1935 when he wrote the following in his thirtieth anniversary Harvard University classbook: “I am for Socialism, disarmament, and ultimately the abolishing of the state itself as an instrument of violence and compulsion. I seek social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class, and sole control by those who produce wealth. Communism is the goal.”

Ask today’s ACLU president Nadine Strossen what these words mean to her and today’s leadership.

The ACLU’s agenda from its beginning has been to radically reshape America into a nation vastly different from that desired by most Americans and that of our Founding Fathers. They got away with nearly two generations of legal battles without really serious or highly organized opposition.

But the good news is that they are not doing so well on a lot of fronts today. Consider the fact that despite the ACLU’s eight-decade long campaign against the public display of the Ten Commandments, *seventy-five percent* of Americans feel that they should be allowed to remain. Despite the ACLU’s war on the public celebration of Christmas, *ninety-six percent* of Americans of *all* faiths celebrate Christmas and *eighty-seven percent* believe Christmas displays *should be allowed* on public property. Despite the ACLU’s years of effort to promote unlimited abortion – and protect even “partial-birth” abortion – *seventy-five percent* of Americans now believe that there should be at least *some* governmental restriction on its practice. Finally, despite their attempts to keep Americans from voting on same-sex “marriage”, voters of 18 states have **OVERWHELMINGLY** affirmed marriage as between one man and one woman by enacting state constitutional amendments to hold the line on activist state judges.

The ACLU desires a secular, faithless America where all memory of faith traditions and religion are absent from the public square, morals are relative, and where parental rights, religious freedom, and the sanctity of human life—except as defined to be precious to their agenda—are nearly non-existent. This is the America we will get unless we stand up to the ACLU.

FP: So Roger Baldwin was a Stalinist. The ACLU is

founded by a Stalinist and supports polygamy and child pornography and it is considered to be an organization that somehow promotes American values. Unbelievable.

Tell me, for a guy like Baldwin that venerated Stalin and was a believer in communism, what was his objective in creating the ACLU? What do you think he had in mind? What were his motives? Sounds like some kind of malicious ploy to me. How is a Stalinist genuinely concerned with civil liberties? It doesn’t make sense. Was the objective to exploit the concept of civil liberties as a weapon to destroy American society?

Sears: He might not have called himself a Stalinist, but what/who was he?

Early on, Baldwin aligned himself with individuals such as the radical anarchist Emma (a.k.a. “Red Emma”) Goldman and her “mentor,” Prince Peter Alexeevich Kropotkin, who was a Russian revolutionary. Baldwin was enamored with Kropotkin’s beliefs calling for the elimination of the church as an instrument to “exercise control over the individual spontaneity of man.”

Baldwin showed much sympathy to the Soviet economic system in his statement in his Harvard classbook, and in the forward he wrote to *Letter from Russian Prisons* (1924), even after warned by a then deported Goldman of what Stalin was about, he amazingly said; “Many of them look upon Russia today as a great laboratory of social experimentation of incalculable value to the development of the world.”

We believe Baldwin was more desirous of a totally secular society where no one had to be held personally responsible for their actions because of an obligation of a greater good to society, which requires personal restraint. William Donahue pointed out Baldwin’s justification for embracing the Stalin regime thusly: “Economic freedom, i.e. the abolition of class privilege, was more important than civil liberties. Anticipating the charge that he was engaging in duplicity, Baldwin frankly acknowledged that ‘repressions in western democracies are violations of professed constitutional liberties and I condemn them as such. Repressions in Soviet Russia are weapons of struggle in a transition period to socialism.’”

Baldwin also said, “I accepted the fact that civil liberties were not suitable for Russia....” a position we suspect few Russians agreed with....

Thus, ultimately, the ACLU’s brand of “civil liberties,” per se, is just a means to an end, not the end. The end is the destruction of the primary roots of Western civilization, the “constraints” they hold, and their biggest proponent, the United States of America.

FP: How serious and damaging is the ACLU’s agenda in the context of the war on terror?

Sears: The ACLU and its allies have used every time of

national crisis to pursue their agenda. Roger Baldwin, before he settled on the present ACLU name and structure was jailed in World War I for refusal to undergo a physical examination for the draft and used his organizations to push his personal agenda. ACLU members in California supported the Assembly's action on September 12, 2001—while the rest of the nation was focused on terrorist seizure of four airliners—to ram through “domestic partner” legislation AB205 in their quest to redefine marriage in America.

In their selective comments about the war on terror, the ACLU—which has no bones about people who “spy” on the weekend activities of former congressman Henry Hyde or demand to read his mail—has used its PR machine to paint America as a rogue nation with little or no regard for human rights, therefore empowering our enemies and to push the ACLU's agenda to implement the use of international law to further undermine the U.S. Constitution.

After filing a complaint against the United States to the United Nations, ACLU executive director Anthony Romero said: “With today's actions, we are sending a strong message of solidarity to advocates in other countries who have derided the impact of U.S. policies on the human rights of their citizens. We are filing this complaint before the United Nations to ensure that U.S. policies and practices reflect not just domestic constitutional standards but accepted international human rights principles regarding liberty and its deprivations.”

So, while the ACLU may actually stumble across some areas of governmental overreach, it is never all as it seems on the surface. Much of what the ACLU is doing not only fuels those who seek to destroy America, but it also undermines and subverts the very Constitution that millions have fought and died to protect.

FP: What can all of us do best to fight this sinister organization and to expose it for what it really is?

Sears: Well, that's why we wrote the book.

The American public needs to know that the ACLU is not an organization that stands up for the little guy, or was a “good” organization that somehow got off track for awhile. The public needs to know that the ACLU was created to destroy the America our founders created right from the ACLU's start. It is our hope that people will read the book, share it with their friends, and as a result a groundswell of opposition will occur to the ACLU and its secular agenda for America.

The ACLU has achieved many of its victories because no one showed up in the courtroom—or those who did show up to oppose them were not those who cared most about the outcomes or were under funded and ill-prepared.

That's why thirty-five concerned organizational leaders came together in 1994 to form the Alliance Defense Fund. “Enough was enough.” While the ACLU and its allies still dwarf the resources of ADF and our allies, they are no longer allowed to run roughshod over the American people. When a public official falls prey to the ACLU's strategy of “fear, intimidation, and disinformation,” ADF and its allies are there with the training, strategy, funding, and litigation to assist them to stand up to the ACLU's bully tactics. We now have over 800 trained allied attorneys nationwide, and hope to have 5,000 within the next ten years to take the battle to the ACLU and reclaim our nation's legal system to the original intent of our Founding Fathers, and not the intent of the ACLU. We would greatly appreciate any support your readers could provide in this effort. I am confident, that if we work together, we CAN and WILL WIN.

FP: Mr. Sears, thank you for joining us today. You are doing truly valuable work. We wish you the best of luck.

Sears: Thank you.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, September 26, 2005

Canada's Lesbian Rangers

by Henry Makos, Ph. D.

University students continue to face a bizarre government campaign to make them homosexuals.

Last week at the University of Winnipeg, co-eds were invited to participate in a lesbian “Reorientation Week.”

They were asked to become “rangers” with the “Lesbian National Parks and Services,” the brainchild of local “performing artists” Shauna Dempsey and Lorri Millan. This is the lesbian equivalent of the university and government hiring two middle-aged males to recruit co-eds to go camping and have sex.

The two women had a “field office” in the university art

gallery, staffed by a university employee in ranger uniform. They took part in pancake breakfasts, barbecues and interviews on campus radio.

“Lesbian Rangers salute and welcome you!” their brochure said. “Here you will encounter new, even life-changing lifestyles and ideas. These may challenge you in uncomfortable ways.”

The university art gallery, the Manitoba Arts Council and the Canada Council, sponsored this spectacle to the tune of \$10,000. This doesn't include thousands of taxpayer dollars already expended on their promotional video and “Field

Guide” which includes examples of lesbian “flora and fauna.”

Their message: “Homosexuality is natural. Question the heterosexual model. Heterosexuality is a social construct.”

When I went to university, students learned to question authority. Today, they learn to question their gender.

Does the LNPS actually exist? This is social engineering masquerading as art, propaganda disguised as parody. It is a shock tactic. Eventually the outrageous becomes accepted. Often, what happens in the imagination occurs in reality.

The Lesbian Rangers don’t actually work in any parks. But the artists claim to have hundreds of junior members called “Eager Beavers.”

Their video (online) is full of such *double entendres* and sexual innuendo. The two “bush women” leave “no stone or lesbian unturned.” It’s a “lesbian-eat-lesbian-world.” Knots are practiced in various bondage positions.

Yet, in the video, they fine a heterosexual male \$100 for wearing a lewd T-shirt and intimidate him when he protests. He is reprimanded for “threatening the lesbian environment.” Rangers are urged to make “citizens’ arrests.”

Lesbians are just a few grants shy of having a paramilitary organization, a cross between the Girl Scouts and Hitler’s Brown Shirts. Its function: Persecute heterosexuals. (see my *The Dawn of the Feminist Police State*).

In the video, they “rescue” a straight female from drowning. She is enchanted by her hairy-legged saviors and “sees the world through brand new eyes.”

If the University of Winnipeg is an indication, universities are playgrounds for lesbianism. It makes sense. Enrollment is already 2-1 female.

In June 2001, the University of Winnipeg made headlines when high school students attending a summer art history course complained they were shown lesbian porn and instructed to use zucchinis instead of seeking male companionship. The instructors were not removed.

The following year, the “Women’s Center” sponsored an event where co-eds had casts made of their breasts! Imagine if heterosexual male students sponsored such an event.

Each February, the gay-dominated student council sponsors a “Question Your Gender” week.

The “Sexual Harassment Officer” stated that the university takes a grim view if only one student is made “uncomfortable.” Apparently this rule only applies to the discomfort of feminists, gays and lesbians. The claim of “victimhood” masks an aggressive destructive ideology.

In Women’s Studies courses, co-eds learn to be feminist “change agents” and harass professors who step out of line. Women’s Studies originated in the training schools of the US Communist Party in the 1940’s. The Rockefeller Foundation sponsors Women’s Studies. If you Google “Rockefeller” and

“Women’s Studies,” you will get 73,000 entries.

The Rockefellers have supported Communist and Fascist causes for almost 100 years. The principle is divide-and-conquer. They are the American agents for the London-based banking cartel that is establishing a world dictatorship to translate their monopoly of credit. . . into world institutions of political and thought control.

They now direct government and education through their sponsor-ownership and control of most politicians, parties, cartels, business councils, professional associations, think tanks, foundations, university endowments, mass media, intelligence agencies, secret societies and organized crime. Yes Virginia, the West is a pathetic one-horse company town.

I have no problem with lesbians, many of whom are my neighbors. They seem to be nice people who just want to lead their lives in peace. But their activists are funded to depopulate and destabilize society in advance of “world government.” Their message is that lesbianism is not a developmental disorder but a natural alternative for women.

Unfortunately, many ex-lesbians disagree. In her book, *Restoring Sexual Identity*, Anne Paulk surveyed 265 ex-lesbians like herself and conducted numerous personal interviews. She found that, to cite a review, “same-sex attraction is seldom really driven by sexual needs; it is driven by an unconscious desire to be loved and to trust another person. It is also frequently driven by a desire to reconnect with the feminine but in the wrong way.”

“Childhood trauma, poor self-image, anger at men, poor relationships with either or both parents, and pro-homosexual media propaganda are several key elements in women developing an attraction to other women.”

In... the “classic development of lesbian attraction,” Paulk discovered that these women had ... domineering, critical, detached, or weak mother; and/or ... a father who was detached, critical or abusive.”

“In many cases, the mother was viewed as weak or was cruelly dominated by her husband. Seventy-five percent of the women viewed the male as a more favorable role model for their lives—with a rejection of their own gender and pursuit of male characteristics.”

“An astounding 90 percent experienced some form of abuse themselves. This abuse was not just sexual but included emotional abuse (70 percent), sexual (more than 60 percent), and verbal abuse (more than half of those surveyed).”

As far as I could tell, University of Winnipeg students mostly avoided the Lesbian Rangers. But there are many feminist or lesbian professors who are harder to avoid. They make their dogma of male oppression of women (i.e. divide men and women and conquer) a prerequisite for a passing grade.

Let’s not mince words. Orwell’s *1984* has arrived. The

government and universities are foisting a developmental disorder caused by dysfunctional families on our children.

Dempsey and Millin try to be campy and nice but they are really obnoxious hypocrites. Like fellow lesbian Irshad Manji, they are New World Order “change agents,” cultural agitators highly paid to subvert the young. Destruction of the family is a main tenet of the Communist Manifesto.

The LNPS motto is “Treat a Lesbian as you would like a Lesbian to Treat You.” I ask them, do they want to be treated like they are treating straights? What if straight society launched a comparable campaign teaching them that their deepest life

desires are not natural but a “social construct?” Do *they* want to be converted?

It’s ironic that they refer to lesbians as an endangered species. Heterosexuals are the real endangered species. They are the ones who conceive and nurture the young in nuclear families. And when they disappear, so will the human race as we know it.

—Robert A. Jason website, bobeva@niagara.com, September 10, 2005

The Mitrokhin Files: Castro and the KGB

by Bill Gertz

Soviet intelligence files made public in a new book show that American travelers to Cuba helped KGB agents obtain identity documents and that Fidel Castro and his brother worked with the spy agency five years before taking power in the 1959 revolution.

New details of Moscow’s intelligence work in Cuba were disclosed by Vasili Mitrokhin, a former KGB archivist who defected to Britain in 1992.

According to the book, Russian KGB officer Nikolai Leonov became “firm friends,” with Mr. Castro’s younger brother Raul in Prague in 1953 and then worked together with Fidel from 1956 and after he took power in 1959.

The book, the second volume of what is known as the Mitrokhin archive, also reveals how Moscow sought to indirectly defeat the United States during the Cold War through large-scale “disinformation” and influence operations in the developing world.

“The KGB really believed they could win the Cold War in the Third World,” said Christopher Andrew, a Cambridge history professor and co-author of the new book, *The World Was Going Our Way*. Mr. Mitrokhin died last year.

The information provided by Mr. Mitrokhin was considered an intelligence bonanza and identified hundreds of KGB officers, agents and operations.

Among the thousands of classified KGB files provided by Mr. Mitrokhin were documents related to Americans who traveled to Cuba beginning in 1969 as part of the pro-Castro Venceremos Brigade.

The KGB helped set up Cuba’s DGI intelligence service, which imposed draconian controls on Cuban society and also arranged for the visits of Americans.

The book reveals that Fidel Castro publicly supported

the American activists but privately “looked askance at the presence of gay and women’s liberation movements among his American New Left supporters,” the book stated.

According to the authors, the DGI complained to its KGB counterparts that “the New Left brigadistas were homosexuals and drug addicts.”

“Venceremos gays, the DGI bizarrely reported, saw ‘the possibility of using homosexuality to bring about the physical degeneration of American imperialism,’” the authors write, quoting the Cuban memo to Moscow.

“The Brigade however, proved a valuable source of U.S. identity documents for use in [undercover] intelligence operations,” the authors said, noting that the American travelers were ‘an important propaganda asset.’”

A spokesman for the Venceremos Brigade, based in New Jersey, could not be reached for comment.

In Iraq, the KGB also sought unsuccessfully to recruit Saddam Hussein who was fascinated with Soviet dictator Josef Stalin and had all of Stalin’s writings translated into Arabic. The KGB also supplied Saddam with military intelligence about U.S. war plans during the 1991 Persian Gulf war.

Other KGB operations outlined in the book include:

- * The recruitment of Palestinian terrorists and providing advice to terrorists involved in kidnappings and assassinations.
- * The planting of agents inside the Syrian intelligence service that allowed Syria to become a Soviet ally in the Middle East.
- * The backing of Sandinista guerrillas in Nicaragua.
- * Covert funding of Indian political parties and newspapers, including Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s government and party.

—*The Washington Times*, October 6, 2005, p. A4