



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 53, Number 10



Dr. David Noebel

October 2013

Worldviews In Collision

by David A. Noebel

“The vision concerning America that Isaiah, son of Amoz saw during the reign of Barack “Transforming America” Obama, Bill “Guilty as hell—free as a bird” Ayers, Kevin “Queering elementary education” Jennings, and Kathy “red diaper baby” Boudin...the ox knows its owner, and the donkey its master’s feeding-trough, but America does not know; My people do not understand. Oh—sinful nation, people weighed down with iniquity, brood of evildoers, depraved children! They have abandoned the Lord. . . . The whole head is hurt, and the whole heart is sick. From the sole of the foot even to the head, no spot is uninjured wounds, welts, and festering sores not cleansed, bandaged, or soothed with oil. . . . If the Lord had not left us a few survivors, we would be like Sodom, and we would resemble Gomorrah. . . . Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Listen to the instruction of our God you people of Gomorrah. . . . Remove your evil deeds from My sight. Learn to do what is good. Seek justice. Correct the oppressor.” Isaiah 1:1-17

In 1950, Immanuel Velikovsky wrote *Worlds in Collision* and caused a minor eruption, which still continues today. In fact, five years later he followed up with *Earth in Upheaval*, which caused his opposition further heartburn—especially the Darwinists and their uniformitarian partners.

Worldviews in Collision contains the same potential for the Christian community to understand the lay of the land for the 21st century and not be fooled or seduced by the Humanistic/Marxist/Islamic worldviews arrayed against them. For an in-depth analysis of the above three worldviews see your humble servant’s *Understanding The Times* (2nd edition).

Let’s begin to dispel some darkness and understand the lay of the land, not only here in the United States, but around the globe.

“One day while browsing through a library in Colorado Springs, Julian Huxley came across some essays by Lord Morley in which he found these words: ‘The next great task of science will be to create a religion for humanity.’ Huxley was challenged by this vision. He wrote, ‘I was fired by sharing his conviction that science would of necessity play an essential part in framing any religion of the future worthy of the name.’ Huxley took up Morley’s challenge to develop a scientific religion. He called it ‘Evolutionary Humanism’” (See Norman L. Geisler, *Encycl. Of Christian Apologetics*, p. 346). Huxley was the president of the British Humanist Association and developed his scientific religion at UNESCO which he headed for 10 years.

While at UNESCO, he gave his biological/political game away for all of us to ponder when he wrote “the unifying of traditions into a single common pool of experience, awareness, and purpose is the necessary prerequisite for further major progress in human evolution. Accordingly, although political unification in some sort of world government will be required for the definite attainment of this stage [of evolution] unification in the things of the mind is not only necessary also, but it can pave the way for other types of unification” (Taylor, *In The Minds of Men*, p. 424).

What Julian Huxley was propagating regarding a religion based on evolutionary science didn’t come from Lord Morley alone. His grandfather, Thomas H. Huxley was also in on the war to overthrow “the cultural dominance of Christianity” with the religion of “secular naturalism.” Thomas Huxley and his atheistic friends had as their goal “the establishment of the ‘church scientific’” and Huxley actually referred to his scientific lectures (primarily on Darwinian evolution) as “lay sermons.”

That scientific religion today is called humanism, secular humanism, ethical humanism, evolutionary humanism, secularism, or in Dennis Prager’s word—“leftism.” It was bred in England and America via Thomas Huxley, Julian Huxley, and John Dewey; ushered on to us through the United Nation’s Robert Muller and his UNESCO published “World Core

Curriculum” and right down to 2013 with Bill Gates and his Big History Project and Common Core curriculums.

Richard Dawkins, the world’s leading atheist and his Foundation for Reason and Science is being brought into America’s high schools through Big History. Gates is also funding, to the tune of \$150 million, the Common Core curriculum which is sweeping across the USA. Alex Newman says that “Evolution is heavily emphasized [along with a socialist agenda, Planned Parenthood propaganda, human caused global warming and World Government propaganda] as ‘fundamental’ in the controversial standards, even though more than half of Americans reject the theory in scientific polls and, to date, there is no fossil record showing one type of animal morphing into another, despite millions of fossils collected” (*The New American*, August 19, 2013, p. 13).

While fossils were at one time a major “proof” of Darwinianism (gradual movement from one species to another via natural selection and mutations) it now appears that the fossil proofs are evaporating before our eyes. The lowly trilobite of the Cambrian is a huge bone in the throat of the evolutionists. For readers interested in this issue (and all should be) check out Stephen C. Meyer’s *Darwin’s Doubt: The Explosive Origin of Animal Life and The Case for Intelligent Design*.

Gates’ former Microsoft partner, Charles Simonyi, named Richard Dawkins as the Charles Simonyi Professor of Public Understanding of Science at Oxford University. Its latest professor is Marcus du Sautoy, another atheist. It appears that Gates, Dawkins, Simonyi, and atheism go together like Mary and Mary’s little lamb!

Keep in mind that the US Supreme Court identified Secular Humanism as a religion in its 1961 *Torcaso v. Watkins* decision. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in 2005 that atheism is a religion—which happens to be the theology of Secular Humanism. In other words, everything that Julian Huxley wished to see happen is happening.

Back in February 2003, Dennis Prager observed the world and concluded that three worldviews were vying for the hearts and minds of its people. “The world’s future,” said Prager, “is being decided at this time. Such moments are extremely rare in history. And when they have occurred they have been between two, not three, competing ideologies [worldviews]. But there are now three ideologies competing to share the future of mankind. They are militant Islam, Western European secularism and socialism, and American Judeo-Christianity and capitalism.”

Prager suggested that Islam is being spread both

peacefully and violently, Secular Humanism is being spread peacefully, and Christianity is not being spread at all!

In fact, Christianity is the fastest growing religion in Asia and Africa, so I do not accept Prager’s point here, but if he was referring to the West he would be right on target. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that Europe has abandoned Judeo-Christianity in favor of something resembling Secular Humanism or, as Prager says in his July 2013 article, “The World’s Most Dynamic Religion” is “Leftism.”

“Even Christianity and Judaism,” says Prager, “the pillars of Judeo-Christian values, the moral value system upon which America was founded and thanks to which it became the world’s beacon of liberty, have been widely influenced by leftism. Many priests, ministers, rabbis, and many Jewish and Christian seminaries are leftist in content and Jewish or Christian only in form” (*Whistleblower*, June 2013, p. 39).

He further states, “The truth is that the left has been far more successful in converting Jews and Christians to leftism than Christianity and Judaism have been in influencing leftists to convert to Christianity or Judaism. . . leftism has even attained considerable success at undoing the central American values of liberty, ‘In God We Trust,’ and ‘E Pluribus Unum,’ supplanting liberty with egalitarianism, a God based society with secularism, and ‘E Pluribus Unum’ with multiculturalism.”

Paul Belien, editor of the *Brussels Journal* and adjunct fellow of the Hudson Institute, outlines the fall of Western Europe to the forces of secularism and socialism in an article entitled “Europe’s Culture War: Secularism on the March” (*The Washington Times*, May 23, 2007). His analysis is so compelling for the Christian community that I quote freely from his article.

“Europe,” says Belien, “is in the middle of a three-way culture war, between the defenders of traditional Judeo-Christian morality, the proponents of secular hedonism, and the forces of Islamic Jihadism.

“In Western Europe, the fight between Christians and secularists is all but over. The secularists have won. Now, the religious vacuum left by the demise of Christianity is being filled by the Muslims. Since one cannot fight something with nothing, the European secularists are no match for Islam.”

I support Belien’s take with Melanie Phillips’ book *Londonistan: How Britain Is Creating a Terror State Within*. She refers to the Brit’s capital as Londonistan. In present day London, Muslims are much safer walking the streets than any evangelical Christians. . . ask Tommy

Robinson and Kevin Carroll. Recently the British Home Secretary Theresa May banned Pamela Geller and Robert Spencer from entering the country. Both were declared a threat to the peace and security of the country for telling the truth about Islamic Jihad!

Before continuing with Belien's article, allow me to repeat a similar observation I have been making for a number of years: If Christianity succumbs to Secular Humanism, Muslims would march into Vienna without a struggle because Secular Humanists are not willing to die for their faith in atheism, naturalism, relativism, and Darwinian evolution, etc. Men and women die for their flag, their country, their fellow warriors, and their God (as C. S. Lewis notes in *The Abolition of Man*), but not for a compilation of unbelief's that run counter to their very nature. The vast majority of us (I would wager about 96%) still cannot bring ourselves to believe that the universe and life itself are the result of chance and accident, as Secular Humanists would have us believe. And Michael Denton (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*) insists that microbiology since the 1950s is making it crystal clear that the cell could never be the result of natural selection, or more accurately, "chance on chance." He says, "every living cell is a veritable automated factory depending on the functioning of up to one hundred thousand unique proteins each of which can be considered to be a basic working component."

Hence, Islam will ultimately triumph as Secular Humanism and the secularists continues to marginalize God, Christ, and Christianity, and especially Christian morality which physicist Richard Feynman said was one of the very foundation stones of Western Civilization.

"Meanwhile," says Belien, "the dark forces of secularism, such as the European Union (EU), are waging war in Central and Eastern Europe, where they target countries such as Poland, Slovakia, and the Baltic states.

"On April 25, 2007, the European Parliament (EP), the EU's legislature, adopted a resolution condemning 'homophobia.' With 325 votes against 124, and 150 abstentions, the EP warned Poland that it will face sanctions if it adopts a law barring the promotion of homosexuality in its schools. Churches, too, were reprimanded for 'fermenting hatred and violence [against homosexuals].' Poland's Prime Minister, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, commented on the resolution: 'Nobody is limiting gay rights in Poland. However, if we're talking about not having homosexual propaganda in Polish schools. . . such propaganda should not be in schools.'

"Cardinal Angelo Scola of Venice retorted: 'There

is no homophobia in the Catholic Church and it is time that all this [recrimination of Christians in the European Parliament] ended.'

"It is not likely to end. The fight against 'intolerance'—i.e., adherence to traditional Christian morality—is intensifying. On May 3, 2007, the European Court of Human Rights found Polish President Lech Kaczynski guilty of violating human rights because he banned a 'gay pride' parade in Warsaw in 2005. Last March the same court ordered Poland to compensate a woman who was denied an abortion. Last year, Poland was denounced by the Council of Europe because it prohibited the distribution in schools of a leaflet about homosexuality."

And so it goes! Secular Humanists and their Marxist brothers are using "sexual preference," "sexual orientation," "sexual liberation," "Same-sex marriage," etc. as powerful weapons, portraying Christian morality as an intolerant, bigoted, mean—even an enemy of the human race (per Antonin Scalia). And their success can be measured by such remarks as "I would not worship a God who is homophobic and that is how deeply I feel about this. . . I would refuse to go to a homophobic heaven. No, I would say sorry, I mean, I would much rather go to the other place." These were the words of the South African archbishop Desmond Tutu, speaking to the United Nations Gay-Rights commencement program.

Allow me to emphasize this point by quoting from an article by William S. Lind in the *Marine Corps Gazette*, December, 1994, and an observation by Malcolm Muggeridge in his great work *The End of Christendom*.

Lind writes, "In the United States of America, our traditional, Western Judeo-Christian culture is collapsing. It is not collapsing because it failed. On the contrary it has given us the freest and most prosperous society in human history. Rather, it is collapsing because we are abandoning it. Starting in the mid-1960s, we have thrown away the values, morals, and standards that define traditional Western culture. In part, this has been driven by cultural radicals, people who hate our Judeo-Christian culture. Dominant in the elite, especially in the universities, the media, and the entertainment industry, the culture radicals have successfully pushed an agenda of moral relativism, militant secularism, and sexual and social 'liberation.'"

Now Muggeridge's take: "Previous civilizations have been overthrown from without by the incursion of barbarian hordes. Christendom has dreamed up its own dissolution in the minds of its own intellectual elite. Our barbarians are home products, indoctrinated at the public expense, urged on by the media systematically stage by

stage, dismantling Christendom, depreciating and deprecating all its values. The whole social structure is now tumbling down, dethroning God, undermining all its certainties. All this, wonderfully enough, is being done in the name of the health, wealth, and happiness of all mankind.”

Unfortunately, however, some of this subversion has been promoted by the antics of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church throughout Europe and the United States. Enrique T. Rueda, in his powerful work *The Homosexual Network*, puts it on the line when he says, “As a matter of fact, Roman Catholic facilities are regularly used for holding homosexual events—fundraisers, conferences, organizational meetings, workshops, and others. The number of instances is so large that it is impossible to cite them all.”

And everyone thought that Randy Engel, a Roman Catholic, was off base when he wrote a 1,318 page book *The Rite of Sodomy in the Roman Catholic Church*. Yet, here is an article in *The Wall Street Journal* (June 13, 2013, p. A 13) entitled “Pope Says ‘Gay Lobby’ Is at Work In Vatican.”

The article says in part, “A year before resigning, Pope Benedict XVI ordered three cardinals to conduct an internal investigation into published leaks that raised questions about the Curia’s conduct, including alleged financial impropriety. . . . Days before he stepped down, however, Italian media reported that the inquiry had revealed the existence of a ‘gay lobby’ of sexually active Vatican clerics. . . . The ‘gay lobby’ is mentioned, and it is true, it is there. . . . We need to see what we can do, Pope Francis is quoted as saying in the memo.”

Protestants, unfortunately, are neither immune nor innocent in this matter since among their ranks are those denominations that allow and defend the ordination and employment of openly homosexual clergy! Some even permit their bishops to divorce their wives and marry their “significant other.” How many evangelicals are buying into the same-sex marathon is yet to be determined, but knowing how some evangelical colleges have their own gay and lesbian organizations plaguing them is a scandal in itself. For example, Biola University has its Biola Queer Underground group which should cause some of us heartache! Calvin College has been famous for its GLBTQ undertakings over many years and those who dare oppose it are called some very intolerant names.

Secular Humanism is slowly but surely subverting all of Europe (West, Central, and East), and it is only a matter of time before Christians in America will begin to fully experience the repercussions. As in Europe, America’s public schools embrace a Secular Humanist curriculum.

And much like their counterparts in Europe, American Secular Humanists use sexuality as a weapon to portray Christian morality as intolerant.

One of Secular Humanism’s early battle plans was to infiltrate the public school curriculum with so-called “sex-education” classes. This plan of attack was championed by Lester Kirkendall, Sol Gordon, and Margaret Sanger’s Planned Parenthood [funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—now the Department of Health and Human Services], Mary Calderon’s SIECUS, as well as other programs such as Family Life Education Program, Project 10, etc. And certainly Kevin Jennings role to queer elementary education with such jewels as *The King and King* is just the most recent part of the plague.

Does anyone now doubt Dr. James C. Dobson’s observation, “The Secular Humanist system of values has now become the predominant way of thinking in most of the power centers of American society. It has outstripped Judeo-Christianity precepts in the universities, in the news media, in the entertainment industry, in the judiciary, in the federal bureaucracy, in business, medicine, law, psychology, sociology, in the arts, in many public schools and, to be sure, in the halls of Congress [the radical House of Representatives’ organizations include—Progressive Democrats of America, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic Socialists of America]. Indeed, the resources available to secular humanists throughout society are almost unlimited in scope, and they are breaking new ground almost every day” (*Children At Risk*).

For the skeptics in the audience, I direct you to a work by Michael L. Brown entitled *A Queer Thing Happened to America*. The underlying goal was to subvert traditional moral absolutes and supplant them with the humanistic concepts of ethical relativism, situational ethics including redefining the family, values clarification, students deciding what is right and what is wrong. Sidney Simon labeled it “the immorality of morality”—in other words, a complete repudiation of Christian values.

With the US Supreme Court handing down two of its latest decisions relating to the Defense of Marriage Act and same-sex marriage we are now finding ourselves on Main Street Sodom and Gomorrah! And it was the President of the United States who not only decrees June of each year as Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer month, but in June 29, 2009 welcomed 300 gay activists to the White House in celebration of homosexuality, including Frank Kameny (a Harvard PhD in astronomy) who referred to the God of the Bible as “a sinful homophobic bigot.” Nevertheless, such blasphemy didn’t stall the president of the

United States from saying, “And so we are proud of you, Frank, and we are grateful to you for your leadership.”

Incidentally, Kameny’s full quote reads: “Your God of Leviticus (and of the whole Bible) is clearly a sinful homophobic bigot. He should repent of his sinful homophobia. He should atone for that sin, and he should seek forgiveness for the pain and suffering which his sinful homophobia has needlessly inflicted upon gay people for the past 4,000 years.”

Today, the world’s rejection of and indifference to Christian values brings to mind the words in the Gospel of Luke preparing us for Christ’s return: “When I [Jesus] return, the world will be as indifferent to the things of God as the people were in Noah’s day. They ate and drank and married—everything just as usual right up to the day when Noah went into the ark and the flood came and destroyed them all. And the world will be as it was in the days of Lot: people went about their daily business—eating and drinking, buying and selling, farming and building—until the morning Lot left Sodom [because of the perversion of the city—Genesis 19: Jude vs. 7]. Then fire and brimstone rained down from heaven and destroyed them all. Yes, it will be business as usual right up to the hour of my return.” (Luke 17:26-30, Living Bible)

In closing my jeremiad, the powers that be (Iowa’s Family Leadership Institute) want me to recommend a positive action or two in light of the above collision of worldviews that we are now engaged. This is easier than at first glance and quite simple: a) defend, protect, and deepen your marriage; b) protect your children above everything else. The Christian worldview (which includes Creationism, redemption through Jesus Christ, and Christian morality) can be rationally, emotionally, and spiritually defended and must be passed along to our children and the next generation. If we fail here, we fail in everything that is of primary importance in life. I would be amiss if I didn’t encourage everyone here with teenagers to consider a two-week course of study at Summit Ministries in Manitou Springs, Colorado or Dayton, Tennessee (www.summit.org).

I leave you with a bit of wisdom from that 21st century philosopher—Larry, the Cable guy: “Everyone concentrates on the problems we’re having in our country lately: Illegal immigration, hurricane recovery, alligators attacking people in Florida. . . Not me. . . I concentrate on solutions for the problems—it’s a win-win situation. A) Dig a moat the length of the Mexican border; B) Send the dirt to New Orleans to raise the level of the levees; C) Put the Florida alligators in the moat along the Mexican border.

Red Nation

by Jeremy Page

Mao Tse-tung, who for decades held absolute power over the lives of one-quarter of the world’s population, was responsible for well over 70 million deaths in peacetime, more than any other twentieth-century leader. Jung Chang and Jon Halliday, *Mao: The Unknown Story*, p. 3

Mao himself was to say that before this trip [to Hunan] he had been taking a moderate line, and “not until I stayed in Hunan for over thirty days did I completely change my attitude.” What really happened was that Mao discovered in himself a love for bloodthirsty thuggery. This gut enjoyment, which verged on sadism, meshed with, but preceded, his affinity for Leninist violence. Mao did not come to violence via theory. The propensity sprang from his character, and was to have a profound impact on his future methods of rule.” *Ibid.*, p. 41

On a visit here [Wuhan, China] in July, Chinese President Xi Jinping went to a lakeside villa where Mao Zedong spent summers in the 1950s enjoying such luxuries as a swimming pool and air conditioning. Opening a new exhibition there that makes no mention of the millions who died under Mao’s leadership, Mr. Xi declared that the villa should be a center for educating youth about patriotism and revolution.

A week earlier, he went to a village from which Mao attacked Beijing in 1949. There, Mr. Xi vowed that “our red nation will never change color.”

It isn’t just Mr. Xi’s rhetoric that has taken on a Maoist tinge in recent months. He has borrowed from Mao’s tactical playbook, launching a “rectification” campaign to purify the Communist Party, while tightening limits on discussion of ideas such as democracy, rule of law, and enforcement of the constitution.

Mr. Xi’s apparent lurch to the left comes as Chinese authorities prepare for the coming trial of Bo Xilai, the former party rising star who led a Maoist revival movement until his dramatic downfall last year. Two of Mr. Bo’s lawyers said they expected the trial, where he faces corruption charges, to take place next week. Before he was detained, Mr. Bo rejected allegations of corruption.

The Chinese president’s Maoist leanings have dis-

mayed many advocates of political reform, who hoped that Mr. Bo's downfall signaled a repudiation of his autocratic leadership style and might lead to a strengthening of the rule of law and other limits on party power.

But Mr. Xi's recent record has delighted and emboldened many former Bo supporters who advocate stronger, centralized leadership as the solution to the country's problems.

"Chairman Mao is a rich resource for us," said Hu Angang, an economist and leading member of the "New Left" intellectual movement that backed Mr. Bo. "I'm not surprised by what Xi is doing." Zhang Hongliang, another New Left economist, said in a blog post last month that the New Left should support Mr. Xi because his recent speeches showed he had fully absorbed their political agenda.

The Chinese Foreign Ministry, which usually handles inquiries from the foreign press, didn't respond to a request for comment for this article.

Mr. Xi's use of Maoist imagery, rhetoric, and strategy sets him apart from his two predecessors—who both emphasized collective leadership—and suggests to many party insiders that he won't pursue meaningful political reform during the 10 years he is expected to stay in power.

In fact, he appears to be doubling down on China's authoritarian political model, while borrowing elements of Mr. Bo's Maoist revivalism and media-savvy politics to boost his own stature and revive public support for the party, according to political insiders and analysts.

Last month Mr. Xi launched a yearlong campaign to strengthen and purify the party that for many insiders is a conscious echo of Mao's "rectification" movements to purge rivals and enforce ideological discipline.

He has commanded army generals and senior officers to reconnect with the "masses" by serving as privates for 15 days minimum.

The new Chinese leadership has also ordered officials to combat the spread of "seven serious problems" including universal values, press freedom, civil society, and judicial independence.

At the same time, state media have published a series of attacks on civil society and "constitutionalism"—the idea that the party's power be limited by China's existing constitution.

Human-rights groups say police have detained dozens of political activists in recent weeks, including Xu Zhiyong, a constitutional lawyer who has called for officials to declare their financial assets publicly. The government hasn't commented on Mr. Xu's detention.

Mr. Xi's attitude toward political reform is a critical issue in China today because the country may be entering a prolonged period of slower economic growth and mounting public discontent over environmental problems, patchy public services, and widespread corruption.

The new Chinese leadership has sent clear signals that it plans to unveil a package of economic reforms this year to stimulate domestic consumption as an alternative growth engine to the investment and exports that have powered the economy for the past 30 years.

On the political front, however, Mr. Xi has shown no sign of considering even limited liberalization, party insiders say. "Xi is really starting to show his true colors," said one childhood friend who recalls Mr. Xi spending hours reading books on Marxist and Maoist theory as a teenager. "I think this is just the beginning."

That friend, and others who have known Messrs. Xi and Bo for many years, said they had been deeply affected by the experience of their fathers, both revolutionary heroes who were jailed by Mao in the 1960s and rehabilitated after his death.

Yet rather than losing faith in one-party rule, both Mr. Xi and Mr. Bo had worked harder than many contemporaries to prove their allegiance to Mao as young men, and had been left with a heightened sense of how to get ahead in Chinese politics.

"Their thinking is quite similar: They have the same Maoist education, the same red family background, and the same experiences growing up," said Zhang Lifan, a historian whose father was a senior official. "When they face a problem, they revert quickly to Maoist thinking."

No one expects Mr. Xi to turn the clock back to the Mao era, during which millions of Chinese died as a result of political campaigns and a man-made famine.

Mr. Xi's predecessor, Hu Jintao, also paid public homage to Mao, as did the president before him, Jiang Zemin, and both carried out limited campaigns to root out corruption in the party. But neither launched those campaigns so early in their tenures, or in such explicitly Maoist terms.

Mr. Xi's political posturing is all the more striking in the context of the controversy surrounding Mr. Bo, whose wife was convicted last year of murdering a British businessman.

After Mr. Bo was detained, many in the party concluded that he made powerful enemies through his policies in Chongqing, the city he governed, which included a crack-down on organized crime and a campaign to revive Maoist values through mass renditions of revolutionary songs.

Now, however, party insiders are saying that the

charges against Mr. Bo are far less severe than expected.

They believe that Mr. Xi has struck a deal with Mr. Bo's supporters and other "princelings"—sons and daughters of party chieftains—under which Mr. Bo will plead guilty to lesser charges as long as no further action is taken against his family and allies, or other princelings whose families have gotten rich in recent years.

In exchange, many of Mr. Bo's former supporters and several powerful princelings have thrown their weight behind Mr. Xi's efforts to establish himself as a much stronger leader than his predecessor, the party insiders said.

Mr. Xi spent much of his first few months in office trying to reunify the party by appealing to different interest groups, including advocates of limited political reform such as the sons of Hu Yaobang, a reformist party chief who was close to Mr. Xi's father but was ousted by hard-liners in 1987.

But people in the latter camp were alarmed when Mr. Xi made a speech in December in which he declared that the Soviet Union had collapsed because of a lack of ideological conviction among its leaders, and because there was no "real man" to stop the process.

In June, the transcript of a speech by Hu Yaobang's second son, Hu Dehua, was posted online in which he directly contradicted Mr. Xi's analysis, arguing that the Soviet Union collapsed because a privileged elite monopolized power and resources for its own benefit.

"We blame everyone else, but never try to find problems from within. Is this a correct attitude?" he said.

Hu Dehua confirmed that the transcript online was his, but declined further comment, telling the *Journal*: "I've said everything I want to say."

Party insiders say his views are shared by senior people in the party, but many of them are now in their 70s or 80s and have dwindling political influence.

Advocates of political liberalization have been further dismayed in recent weeks by a spate of attacks on constitutionalism and civil society in prominent party publications, some of them penned by prominent New Leftists.

"Just as liberals pinned their hopes on Xi supporting their agenda, the New Left saw an opportunity when Xi's rhetoric veered to the left and adopted Maoist overtones," said Joseph Fewsmith, an expert on Chinese politics at Boston University.

More important, Mr. Xi was given a highly unusual public endorsement last month from former President Jiang, who was once a patron of Mr. Bo and is still considered the leader of an influential group of current and retired party officials.

A statement on the Foreign Ministry website said

Mr. Jiang had met with Henry Kissinger, the former US Secretary of State, in Shanghai and declared that "a big country like China with a population of 1.3 billion needs a strong and capable leader."

Mr. Jiang described Mr. Xi as "a wise leader who can really get things done," the statement said.

—*The Wall Street Journal*, August 17-18, 2013, p. 1

The Axis of Evil: Alive and Well

by Humberto Fontova

"Foreign reporters—preferably American—were much more valuable to us at that time (1957-59) than any military victory. Much more valuable than recruits for our guerrilla force, were American media recruits to export our propaganda" (Che Guevara 1959).

"Reporters in Havana are either insensitive to the pain of the opposition 'or in clear complicity' with the government" (Cuban torture-victim Jorge Luis García Pérez known as Antunez in the *Miami Herald* 8/7/2013).

Note the time span between the quotes above. Few propaganda recruitment drives and PR campaigns in modern history have been as phenomenally successful or as enduring as Fidel Castro and Che Guevara's.

During the past few weeks, for instance, the Castro regime was caught red-handed shipping a huge tanker-load of illegal weapons (including missile equipment) to North Korea, a fleet of Russian warships visited Havana, Cuba's vice president visited Iran to "expand ties," Cuba's vice foreign minister visited Pyongyang to foment "closer cooperation," and Amnesty International decried the wave of terror against Cuban dissidents, naming five of them as "prisoners of conscience."

But a quick Cuba news scan will show that the top Cuba item reported in the US during this period was about a paddleboarder who paddled from Havana to Key West to "promote peace, love, and friendship between the peoples of Cuba and of US." This week, birthday greetings to Fidel Castro on his 87th filled the media bucket.

Castro jailed political prisoners at a higher rate than Stalin during the Great Terror, murdered more Cubans in his first three years in power than Hitler murdered Germans during his first six, and came closest of anyone in history to starting a worldwide nuclear war. In the

above process he converted a nation with a higher per capita income than half of Europe and a huge influx of immigrants into one that repels Haitians and boasts the highest suicide rate in the western hemisphere.

Who would guess any of this from reading the mainstream media?

In 1990 Castro's KGB-trained secret police arrested Black Cuban dissident Antunez (quoted above) and Castro's kangaroo courts sentenced him to 17 years in prison. His crime was shouting anti-Castro slogans in public. Black Cuban doctor Oscar Biscet was sentenced to 25 years in Castro's torture chambers for the crime of reciting the works of Martin Luther King and the UN Declaration of Human Rights in a Cuban public square. This "crime" was greatly compounded by Dr. Biscet's specifically denouncing the Castro regime's policy of forced abortions (which account for those "low infant-mortality" figures, much-trumpeted by such as Michael Moore and the Congressional Black Caucus.)

Many Cuban blacks suffered longer incarceration in Castro's dungeons and torture chambers than Nelson Mandela suffered in South Africa's (relatively) comfortable prisons. In fact, these Cubans qualify as the longest-suffering political prisoners in modern history. Eusebio Penalver, Ignacio Cuesta Valle, Antonio Lopez Munoz, Ricardo Valdes Cancio, and many other Cuban blacks suffered almost thirty years in Castro's prisons. These men (and many women too, by the way, black and white) suffered their tortures 90 miles from US shores.

But you've never heard of them, right? And yet from CNN to NBC, from Reuters to the AP, from ABC to NPR, Castro's fiefdom hosts an abundance of US and international press bureaus and crawls with their intrepid "investigative reporters."

According to anti-Apartheid activists a grand total of 3,000 political prisoners passed through South Africa's Robben Island prison in roughly 30 years under the Apartheid regime. Usually about a thousand were held. These were out of a South African population of 40 million.

According to Freedom House, a grand total of 500,000 political prisoners have passed through Castro's various prisons and forced labor camps. At one time in 1961, some 300,000 Cubans were jailed for political offenses. This is

out of a Cuban population in 1960 of 6.4 million. A quick punch of a calculator will easily reveal the grotesque disparity in repression between the two regimes. A quick scan of the media will reveal the grotesque disparity of condemnation applied to the (relative) molehill instead of to the mountain.

In 1964, the government of Apartheid South Africa sentenced Nelson Mandela to 30 years in prison. Mandela's trial was conducted by an independent judiciary and witnessed by scores of international observers. The charges against Mandela included: "The preparation, manufacture and use of explosives, including 210,000 hand grenades, 48,000 anti-personnel mines, 1,500 time devices, 144 tons of ammonium nitrate, 21.6 tons of aluminum powder, and a ton of black powder. 193 counts of terrorism committed between 1961 and 1963."

"The [Mandela] trial has been properly conducted," wrote correspondent for the *London Observer* Anthony Sampson (who later wrote Mandela's authorized biography). "The judge, Mr Justice Quartus de Wet, has been scrupulously fair."

Antunez, Biscet, and thousands of other Cubans were condemned by a judicial system founded by Felix Dzerzhinsky during Lenin's Red Terror, perfected by Andrei Vishinsky during Stalin's Great Terror and transplanted to Cuba in 1959 by their "Latino" disciples. "Judicial evidence is an archaic Bourgeois detail," Che Guevara stressed to his prosecutors. "When in doubt—execute."

"Legal proof is impossible to obtain against war criminals," Fidel Castro explained to *Time* magazine in February 1959. "So we sentence them based on moral conviction."

These "executions" (murders, technically) would surpass Hitler's during the Night of the Long Knives and the rate of jailings would exceed Stalin's during his Great Terror, to say nothing of South Africa's during Apartheid.

And yet the "injustice" against Nelson Mandela is a media cause célèbre. But most of you have never heard of Antunez, Biscet, or any of those hundreds of other black Cuban political prisoners. Why?

The quotes heading this article probably explain it best.

—FrontPage Magazine, August 16, 2013

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 PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is 719-685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at www.schwarzreport.org. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.