



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 43, Number 6

June 2003

## Inside

### Castro's Heavy Communist Hand, Part I

by Bart Gobeil, Page 2

Even after a visit from Jimmy Carter, Cubans are still enslaved under a brutal dictator.

### Castro's Heavy Communist Hand, Part II

by Amy Fagan, Page 3

More evidence of Castro's human rights violations.

### The Gathering Storm

by Steven C. Baker, Page 4

Read about the "gathering storm" of anti-Americanism in our own hemisphere.

### Castro, Human Rights and Latin Anti-Americanism

by Michael Radu, Page 6

Mr. Radu calls for a strong show of support for the United States' security, even from countries such as Cuba.

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

## Christian Anti-Communism Crusade's 50th Anniversary 1953-2003

### Fidel Castro's CNN Connection

by Rich Noyes

Cuba won re-election to the U. N. Human Rights Commission despite its jailing and executions of political opponents, prompting the U.S. delegation to walk out of the U.N. session in protest.

The White House deplored Cuba's re-election, noting it comes weeks after it imprisoned 75 opposition leaders, including librarians and journalists, and executed three men who tried to hijack a ferry to the United States. The re-election adds fuels to Washington's criticism of the world organization after the failed U.S. effort to win Security Council support for the war on Iraq. The Bush administration is also still smarting from its loss of the commission seat the United States held since 1947. It lost the seat two years ago, but regained it last year.

—*News Services*, April 30, 2003

See if any of this sounds familiar: An oppressive dictator who's an international pariah; a totalitarian regime with an abysmal human-rights record; secret police who harass and imprison local journalists; and the ubiquitous presence of CNN—cozily ensconced in the capital, blandly repeating the government's pronouncements, while doing little to highlight the plight of repressed citizens.

Thinking of Iraq under Saddam Hussein? How about Fidel Castro's Cuba, the only communist dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere? In 1997, CNN became the first U.S.-based news organization with a fulltime news bureau in Cuba in nearly 30 years. As an independent news organization, CNN had a chance to show Americans the reality of Mr. Castro's dictatorship. On her first day, incoming Havana bureau chief Lucia Newman promised viewers that "we will be given total freedom to do what we want and to work without prior censorship."

Mr. Castro shouldn't have lost much sleep worrying whether CNN would reveal the awful details of his dictatorship. Last year, Media Research Center Senior News Analyst Geoff Dickens and I reviewed five years of CNN's Cuba news, from March 17, 1997, the date the Havana bureau was established, through March 17, 2002. Instead of exposing the regime, CNN had allowed itself to become another component of another dictator's propaganda machine.

Rather than promoting a diversity of opinion, CNN mainly gave the communists a chance to promote their agenda to an international audience. Yes, the network aired a few sound bites from catholic church leaders (a total of 11 on-air quotes) and peaceful

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

dissidents (12 quotes), but these voices were swamped by quotes from Fidel Castro and smooth English-speaking propagandists like National Assembly President Ricardo Alarcon, the Tariq Aziz of the Caribbean (76).

CNN's audience also heard from everyday Cubans, but few were shown saying anything disagreeable to Mr. Castro. CNN showed 61 Cuban citizens praising the communists, compared with only 11 who dared to dissent. To give the misleading impression that Castro's regime is hugely popular among the Cubans is intellectually dishonest, but there it was.

Only once did we notice CNN acknowledging the consequences of candor. On December 13, 1998, reporter Susan Candiotti showed a communist youth rally. A bystander complained to CNN: "Cuba means one party. You see how fanatic the people are." Ms. Candiotti related what happened next: "As he spoke with CNN, a crowd gathered around him. Moments later, as he tried to leave, a group swept around him. Then, two men hustled him down the street. We were prevented from following by several who waved the Cuban flag and chanted, 'Fidel.'" CNN's pictures showed the man being whisked away, his feet barely touching the ground. Ms. Candiotti followed up, but to no avail: "A government spokesperson said he knew nothing of the incident and insisted all Cubans are guaranteed fundamental human rights made possible by the revolution."

CNN broadcasts almost nothing about Mr. Castro's awful human-rights record, a deliberate and shameful omission. Just seven of 212 stories (or 3 percent) focused on the regime's treatment of dissidents; only four stories (2 percent) concerned themselves with the lack of democracy; and only two stories

(less than 1 percent) spotlighted the intimidation of journalists. So much for the "truth."

Instead, CNN's coverage focused on everyday life, giving the sense that Cuba is just a normal country. In stories that could have originated from Cleveland or Atlanta, CNN profiled a promising young ballerina, interviewed a 94-year-old guitar player and toured a historic hotel. One August day in 1998, reporter John Zarrella talked to Cubans waiting for hours in the sun: "The eventual reward, way up at the head of the line, is a bowl of summer-heat-quenching, palate-pleasing, cover-your-face-in-it-ice cream."

This month, Cuban authorities held sham trials for 28 independent journalists arrested in a crackdown that began March 18. For the "crime" of trying to report the true story of Castro's thugocracy, the Cubans were sentenced to between 14 to 27 years in prison. Secretary of State Colin Powell called the new repression "despicable." Although CNN did report Cuba's quick execution last Friday of three men who hijacked a boat, the network has not reported the imprisonment of these journalists.

CNN's presence in Cuba could have bolstered local reporters. CNN could have used its unique bureau to dig out stories that revealed the brutal nature of the regime. CNN could have embarrassed Mr. Castro by frequently demanding access to imprisoned dissidents. But rather than exposing Mr. Castro, CNN gave him an international platform.

Given the awfulness of the secrets we now know CNN was hiding for Saddam, it's fair to ask whether CNN is doing the same for Fidel.

—*The Washington Times*, April 17, 2003, p. A21

## Castro's Heavy Communist Hand, Part I

by Bart Gobeil

With the one-year anniversary of former President Jimmy Carter's trip to Cuba fast approaching, we realize that history has repeated itself and Cuba's brutal dictator has played Mr. Carter once again as a fool.

The first time was in 1980, when after relations (or in the diplomatic speak, "interests") were established with Mr. Castro, then-President Carter saw over 124,000 Cuban immigrants leave Mr. Castro's island-fortress on shabbily constructed rafts in an effort to build a better life in the United States. Many—if not most—of these immigrants left Mr. Castro's brutality and successfully became part of the American dream. However, a small amount of these immigrants were sent to the United States directly from Cuba's jails and mental institutions. Sending these

individuals to the United States not only freed Mr. Castro from having to provide appropriate services to these people but it also allowed him to laugh at how he just duped Mr. Carter into believing that his agreement to have relations with the United States was well-intended.

Today, we again see Mr. Castro laughing at Mr. Carter and his nescient ways. The brutal dictator not only has cracked down on free speech and actions, but has also demoralized and segregated those individuals who peacefully have strived to lead others in Cuba to the warmth of freedom.

Specifically, the Castro regime has recently sentenced journalists, economists and other human-rights activists to prison for 27 years for doing what many of us do on a daily basis in the United States: speak freely to our fellow citizens and petition our own government.

A case in point is Hector Palacios, a leader and organizer of the Varela Project, who was recently sentenced to 25 years in prison. The Varela Project is an effort to use consti-

tutional avenues to bring actual freedoms of speech and association, amnesty for political prisoners and leeway for free enterprise and the citizens of that nation. While most of us in the United States will agree that these are basic rights, it has taken Mr. Palacios and his patriots much sacrifice to garner the 11,600 signatures that were part of this petition filed with the Cuban government. While the government has sat idly on the petition, its actions toward those who have brought it forward have been anything but idle. This has clearly been demonstrated by the recent crackdown on those who wish to bring freedom to a nation and its people, who are suffocating in a desert of oppression.

While Mr. Castro has initiated this sea of brutality, Mr. Carter and his Nobel Peace Prize have remained silent. This is despite the fact that his op-ed piece published in *The Washington Post* upon his return from the communist island stated

that, “there are indications of openness and reform in Cuba” as well as Cubans being “permitted to hear a clear voice calling for freedom of speech and assembly, the organization of labor unions and opposition political parties.”

During his visit to Cuba, Mr. Carter publicized the Varela Project during his speech to the Cuban people and even met with Mr. Palacios. Mr. Castro’s actions contradict Mr. Carter’s assertions about Cuba. And accordingly, Mr. Carter should either retract his precious words or issue a new statement expressing his outrage over Mr. Castro’s action.

Otherwise Mr. Palacios and his band of visionaries will continue to sit in jail cells for promoting freedom and ask themselves, “Mr. Carter, where is the outrage? Where is the outrage, you fool?”

—*The Washington Times*, April 18, 2003, p. A21

## Castro’s Heavy Communist Hand, Part II

by Amy Fagan

The Cuban government has “carried out its most significant act of political repression in decades,” arresting more than 100 people since mid-March as the world was focused on the war in Iraq, a State Department official told a House panel yesterday.

“Dissidents were imprisoned for writing ‘counterrevolutionary articles,’ running independent libraries and belonging to ‘illegal’ groups of independent journalists,” J. Curtis Struble, acting assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, told the House International Relations Committee.

The Cubans faced “spurious charges” of subversion and treason, and 75 of them were sentenced to long prison sentences after secretive trials, said Lorne W. Craner, assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor.

Cuba’s actions have drawn outrage from many countries, the European Union and international human rights organizations. President Bush, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell and John D. Negroponte, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, all made strong statements condemning the arrests.

The U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva is considering a resolution that urges Cuba to allow a human rights envoy to visit the prisoners. The resolution was introduced by Costa Rica, Peru and Uruguay, and is supported by the United States. Cuba denied a similar request in 2002.

Many of the arrested dissidents faced charges of conspiring with U.S. diplomats at the United States Interests Sec-

tion in Havana, Mr. Craner said.

Fidel Castro’s government has long claimed that the only opposition to the Cuban government has been “created” by the U.S. government through the interests section, said Mr. Struble. The office promotes democratic change in Cuba and distributes information about the United States.

Rep. Christopher H. Smith, the New Jersey Republican who chaired yesterday’s hearing, said Mr. Castro was “shifting the blame” and that Congress demanded “immediate release” of the prisoners.

Mr. Struble said the real reason for Mr. Castro’s crackdown was “because the homegrown opposition is losing its fear of the regime and growing in strength and credibility.”

Twenty of those arrested had supported the Varela Project, a group working for a national referendum on political and economic reforms in Cuba, which has grown sizably, obtained more than 11,000 signatures and received international praise and recognition.

The leader of the group Asamblea, which seeks to create nationwide organizations to pursue political reform, was sentenced to 20 years in prison. Cuba’s most prominent independent labor leader was given 25 years.

Some were arrested for running independent libraries of uncensored books or for being independent journalists.

Karen A. Harbert, deputy assistant administrator for Latin

*continued on Page 7*

# The Gathering Storm

by Steven C. Baker

In its National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (Feb. 2003) the White House outlined a policy that calls for “direct and continuous actions against terrorist groups, the cumulative effect of which will initially disrupt, over time degrade, and ultimately destroy the terrorist organizations.” The plan also recognizes that “the more frequently and relentlessly we strike the terrorists across all fronts, using all the tools of statecraft, the more effective we will be.”

If this is to be the measure of an effective counter-terror policy, then the Bush Administration must begin to apply its tenets more aggressively against the increasing number of terrorist organizations—either indigenous groups with global reach or international entities such as Hizballah, Islamic Jihad, or al-Qaeda – that have begun to operate in the Western Hemisphere with the acquiescence of various anti-U.S. regimes.

The current governments of Brazil (da Silva), Cuba (Castro), and Venezuela (Chavez) are each home to the sort of anti-American fervor that forms the foundation for most terrorist safehavens. Even more worrisome, they stand poised to remake South America in their image through a well-organized strategy that brings to power — via legitimate means (i.e. elections) — other leftist leaders whose political agendas and support for terrorist organizations will undermine U.S. interests and the overall security of the Western Hemisphere. There will be serious long-term implications if the U.S. does not develop a more efficacious strategic policy to deal with the growing influence of these communist devotees.

On 7 August, 2002 Former National Security Council member and senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, Dr. Constantine Menges wrote in the *Washington Times* that a “Castro-Chavez-da Silva” axis could directly threaten the security of the United States. Among other points, he argued that this axis would link “43 years of Fidel Castro’s political warfare against the [U.S.] with the oil wealth of Venezuela and the nuclear weapons/ballistic missile and economic potential of Brazil.”

Dr. Menges has identified the Brazilian leader Luiz Inacio “Lula” da Silva as a key player in the axis and he has warned that Lula’s stewardship of the Forum of Sao Paulo – the progeny of Castro’s “Tricontinental Congress” which helped transnational terrorist organizations synchronize their efforts during the late 1960s to undermine U.S. national security—will help pro-Castro candidates mount strong political campaigns throughout South America. Furthermore, he notes in a 10 December, 2002 *Washington Times* article that the Fo-

rum of Sao Paulo includes “all the communist and radical political parties and armed communist terrorist organizations of Latin America together with terrorist groups from Europe (IRA, ETA) and the Middle East (PFLP-GC), as well as participants from Iraq, Libya, Cuba and other state sponsors of terrorism.”

Similarly, the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Henry Hyde, in a letter to President Bush dated 24 October 2002, described Lula da Silva as a “pro-Castro radical” and cautioned that a new “axis of evil in the Americas” could be afoot. Congressman Hyde also detailed Brazil’s experiment with a nuclear weapons program (1965-1994) and its success in creating a “30 kiloton nuclear bomb, which could be quickly tested if the program were revived.” In all likelihood this will occur if Lula’s stated intention to withdraw Brazil from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is not contravened sharply by the United States.

President da Silva’s involvement with the Forum of Sao Paulo may also explain his refusal to classify the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC) – a communist insurgency whose goal it is to destroy the democratically elected government of President Alvaro Uribe – a terrorist organization. Instead, on 4 March 2003 the *Latin American Weekly Report* noted that Brazil’s Foreign Minister Celso Amorim felt that labeling the FARC a terrorist organization was more about “semantics” than terrorism. Not so for Colombia’s embattled President, who could not disagree more with the Brazilian government’s position. He told *United Press International* on 7 March 2003 that it is more than appropriate to designate as “terrorists” those groups that detonate car bombs. “It is not a value judgment,” he argued, “it is terrorism.”

As for Fidel Castro, it is important to mention his trip to the Islamic Republic of Iran in May 2001 where, according to *Agence France Presse*, he declared that “Iran and Cuba, in cooperation with each other, can bring America to its knees.” Could this portend the formation of a terrorist-WMD nexus in the Western Hemisphere?

It is a well established fact that Iran funds, trains, and provides safehaven for notorious terrorist organizations Hizballah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad – an entity that Attorney General John Ashcroft has described separately as “one of the most violent terrorist organizations in the world.” It is also recognized that Iran is trying to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. *The Washington Post* reported on 10 March, 2003 that by 2005 Iran could “be capable of

producing enough enriched uranium for several nuclear bombs each year.” Therefore, any affiliation between Cuba and Iran should be treated as a direct threat to the security of the United States. It may also forewarn of the likelihood that pro-Castro leaders – some of whom already show a tolerance for terrorist organizations and a penchant for nuclear weaponry – will join with other state sponsors of terrorism around the world to threaten the security of the United States.

Finally, the rule of Venezuela’s current President Hugo Chavez is even more problematic now that he has, for all intents and purposes, an ally in ‘Lula’ da Silva. In the same aforesaid October 2002 letter to President Bush, Congressman Henry Hyde also warned that Chavez’s rule threatens “the well-being and security of people in neighboring democratic countries as well as to the United States.” He charged that Hugo Chavez “forged public alliances with states sponsors of terrorism including Cuba, Iraq, and Iran...” and “supported terrorist organizations” including the FARC in Colombia.

There is a larger point to make regarding the subject of state-sponsorship of terrorism. Many Western Hemispheric states employ condemnatory language to distance themselves from specific acts of terror while the groups that are responsible for such ignoble behavior escape serious rebuke. It has become an internationally accepted practice to exploit vacuous rhetoric in such a manner that a state can appear “with” the United States while acting “against” its struggle to root out terrorists. The United States must insist that opposition to terrorism begin with a denouncement of those who carry out such acts. Without taking this basic first step any subsequent action to combat international terrorism will be disingenuous.

For instance, the Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States met on 21 September, 2001 to reaffirm “the absolute rejection by the people and governments of the Americas of terrorists *acts* and *activities*, which endanger democracy and the security of the states of the Hemisphere.”

Almost one month later, on 15 October, 2001, the Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism (CICTE) promulgated a declaration that expressed its “most vigorous condemnation of the terrorist *acts* that occurred on the United States territory” on 11 September, 2001.

The Inter-American Convention Against Terrorism (adopted on 3 June, 2002) reaffirms two interesting points. It says that the parties (including Brazil and Venezuela) recognize “the need to adopt effective steps in the inter-American system to prevent, punish, and eliminate *terrorism* through the broadest cooperation.” Furthermore, it expresses the “commitment of the states to prevent, combat, punish and eliminate *terrorism*.”

The aforementioned examples constitute a counter-terror paradigm that is weak and illusory. No state can be permitted to focus the majority of its attention and resources on the symptoms rather than the sources of the terrorist problem. Moreover, there is a dearth of anti-terror phraseology to address the problem of regimes that support terrorist groups in other countries. The Convention only exhorts each state to deny sanction to terrorist groups “within their territories” (read: “within their [respective] territories”).

The United States is now at a crossroads.

First, the United States must buck what is becoming a trend in the Western Hemisphere; namely, that democratic means are being manipulated by leftist leaders to preclude the United States from affecting or supporting “regime change,” lest it appear to subvert the democratic process. To this end, the removal of Fidel Castro from power could provide a benchmark against which all pro-Castro leaders can judge their future behavior.

Moreover, a congressionally approved regime change in Cuba could at this moment accomplish three other important tasks: One, Fidel Castro’s absence would have a detumescent effect on those leftists who exhibit a penchant for Castroism. Two, a positive regime change would eliminate Fidel Castro’s ideational inspiration, which serves as the greatest source of intellectual, ideological, and political anti-Americanism in the region. Three, the United States would destroy one of the most powerful logistical infrastructures for supporting terrorist movements. Cuba’s military and intelligence advisors would no longer be able to assist anti-U.S. regimes or terrorist organizations.

Second, The United States must demand that Brazil abandon any material attempt to obtain weapons of mass destruction. Any evidence to the contrary should result in devastating consequences. On the terror front, the United States can test the veracity of Brazil’s numerous pledges to fight terrorism by requesting an unequivocal denunciation of the FARC and an exhibition of the appropriate legal measures to support this rhetorical decision.

Third, without Fidel Castro’s intellectual, ideological, and political influence, Hugo Chavez would assume the status of an unimpressive despot akin to Saddam Hussein’s Yasser Arafat. At that point he might be more easily contained until a future date when the people of Venezuela can be encouraged to elect someone more competent to lead that great country.

Unless the United States government adopts a coherent Western Hemispheric strategy to counter the influence of the Castro-da Silva-Chavez tripartite, one can expect to witness the growth of this “axis” and a concomitant rise in terrorist-

*continued on Page 7*

# Castro, Human Rights and Latin Anti-Americanism

by Michael Radu

Recently, following a pattern understood by all but American liberals, Fidel Castro again did something he always does in response to U.S. efforts to improve relations with Cuba. He answered renewed congressional efforts to weaken the embargo by cracking down on the opposition. In the past, when then-President Jimmy Carter tried to improve ties, we wound up with the Mariel exodus and the emptying of Cuba's jails through migration to the U.S.; when Bill Clinton tried to improve relations, it ended up with American citizens being blown out of the skies by Castro's fighter planes and yet another mass send-off to Florida. This time, when a combination of greedy Republicans from farm states and leftist Democrats tried to weaken the embargo in the name of free trade, Castro answered by jailing 79 dissidents for sentences totaling over 2,000 years.

Even the communist, Portuguese José Saramago, Nobel laureate in Literature and supporter of any leftist cause this side of the Milky Way, declared in an interview with Spain's *El País* that "This is my limit." ("Saramago critica ejecuciones en Cuba," AP, April 14). This reminds one of the late 1960s, when Castro's Stalin-like purges of intellectuals forced Jean-Paul Sartre, another lifelong fellow traveler, to reach his limit with Fidel. And Miguel Vivanco of Human Rights Watch, whose goal seems to be indirectly helping the Marxist-Leninist terrorists/drug traffickers of Colombia's Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) by blasting every effort of that country's democratic government to fight FARC, also seems to have seen the light. He criticized the UN Human Rights Commission's proposed resolution condemning Castro's persecution of dissidents and demanding that they be released as "weak . . . a slap on the wrist."

Those conversions, along with the fact that the UN resolution was submitted by Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Uruguay and Peru, are the good news from a UN organization now improbably chaired by Libya. Costa Rica aside, the Latin sponsors have paid heavy prices in fighting and defeating Marxist-Leninist insurgencies over the past few decades. They know what communism is, does, and may lead to.

There is another, less symbolic but darker side to the issue. Argentine president Eduardo Duhalde, a lame duck but nonetheless representative of his people's feelings, declared that Argentina will abstain from voting on the Resolution, calling the timing of the vote "inopportune" given the "unilateral

war [in Iraq] that has violated human rights." Brazil will also abstain and in Mexico some 50 leftist intellectuals and the majority in the Mexican Congress have asked President Vicente Fox to abstain as well. They could not bring themselves to support Havana, but, again using Iraq as a pretext, claimed that abstention is the best way to deal with Castro. As Mexico's human rights ombudsman stated, regretfully, "only poor countries are condemned" and thus, in his logic, condemning Cuba is unfair—in effect asking for some kind of proportional condemnation, regardless of realities.

Ultimately it comes down to fundamental differences among the Latin countries. The politics of most of the larger of them vis-à-vis the United States are adolescent, based on the desire to demonstrate independence from Washington. Nowhere is this more evident than in Mexico. To support the U.S. position on any matter, from the treatment of rocks on Mars to dissidents in Cuba, is politically dangerous, opening a leader to accusations from the intellectual elites of being a "gringo puppet." These elites have a disproportionate, and usually nocive impact on politics. In Brazil those sentiments are enhanced by most Brazilians' emotional belief that their country, by virtue of its size and relative economic power, is entitled to a leading role that Washington unfairly challenges.

It was the very same adolescent politics that led the left-of-center governments of Brazil, Ecuador, and Venezuela to recently refuse to do the obvious, common-sense thing: to declare as terrorists the three irregular forces—FARC, the smaller, also communist National Liberation Army (ELN), and the anti-communists of the United Self-Defense of Colombia (AUC)—that are trying to destroy or avoid the democratic government of neighboring Colombia. They refused to do so despite the fact that FARC at least, and certainly soon enough the AUC, which is hunting them, operates across the borders in Panama, Ecuador, Brazil, and especially Venezuela, whose government is openly supportive of the insurgents.

In the case of Mexico, which has a seat in the UN Security Council (likely to the chagrin of President Fox), not supporting the U.S. approach to the Iraq issue was not a foreign policy or national interest issue, but one of national identity. Supporting the United States is a "sell—out to the gringos." Teenagers of the world, unite!

In Chile, the most rational and pragmatic country in Latin America and certainly the most successful in economic, free-market terms, the story is the same, and equally depressing. President Lagos, a Socialist leading a coalition with the Christian Democrats, had never behaved as a socialist in either economic or political terms until Iraq, when he had Chile withhold support for the United States in the Security Council. Why? Because of anti-Americanism. It does not cost much, it

is popular—especially in a country where hating capitalism and the United States is still popular among elites and the small (3 percent in the last elections) but organizationally effective Communist Party. Likewise with enthusiastically supporting whatever Havana does. Furthermore, Santiago, like Ciudad de Mexico, Brasilia, and Buenos Aires, still has difficulty understanding that Washington is less tolerant of adolescent games now than prior to 9/11. When President Bush stated that “those who are not with us are against us” in the war on terror, most Latins did not take it seriously. They may well have to now.

Ultimately, abstaining on or voting against a largely meaningless UN criticism of Cuba is itself irrelevant. However, a combined accumulation of Latin American positions suggests that when it comes to choosing between the obvious violations of freedom by one of their own (Havana) and supporting anything proposed by the United States, most Latin American governments will choose opposing Washington.

Understanding this, now let’s consider both Castro’s recent summary execution of the ferryboat hijackers and the broader issue of how these Latin American attitudes toward U.S. global positions will affect their U.S. relations.

On the first issue, there is only one thing to say: a hijacker is a hijacker, period. As for capital punishment, it remains what it always was—a matter of political culture. Lat-

ins are fast to condemn US executions, especially when they involve their own citizens, but have little or nothing to say when Castro sentences people to death.

As to the price Latin America will pay, some sort of price for their recent behavior? Mexico is clearly doing its best to diminish, if not destroy, whatever support there was in Congress for the legalization of millions of its nationals living illegally in the United States. Chile was a legitimate applicant for NAFTA membership and possessed all the right social, economic, and political credentials, but it has how raised questions about its belonging there. Instead of facing Congressional opposition only from U.S. Democrats opposed to free trade, it will also now face opposition from Republicans, whether they are for or against free markets.

Washington must make clear that being “anti-gringo” just on principle cannot continue in the age of international terrorism. Behavior should cost in terms of how many benefits one can expect to continue from Washington. Opposing the United States on matters of American security should have a cost in that regard, and Washington should impose it. Mexico, Chile, Brazil, and Argentina should be convinced that the cost is real and immediate.

—FrontPageMagazine.com, April 21, 2003

---

### continued from Page 3-Castro’s Heavy Communist Hand, Part II

America and the Caribbean at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), said the Cuban government is “desperate and afraid” because “thousands of new voices throughout the island now call for democratic change, and their numbers are increasing every day.”

USAID grants money to organizations that provide guidance and resources to Cuban activists, journalists, librarians and others. It plans to step up efforts to provide food and medical assistance to the families of the jailed dissidents. Sometimes families are denied work and assistance by the government.

Mr. Bush last year challenged Cuba to undertake political and economic reforms and promised that if that happened, he would work with Congress to lift the embargo and travel restrictions.

—*The Washington Times*, April 17, 2003, p. A3

---

### continued from Page 5-The Gathering Storm

related activity in the region. As an example of things to come the *Washington Times* reported on 7 April, 2003 that Al Qaeda terrorists had plans to enter the United States illegally through Mexico to carry out attacks against various targets. It is wholly conceivable that these terrorists could one day commence operations from secure locations in the Western Hemisphere and given enough time they may even attain a nuclear weapons capability courtesy of an anti-U.S. regime.

To borrow a phrase from the Bush Doctrine: “...the United States cannot remain idle while dangers gather.”

—FrontPageMagazine.com, April 28, 2003

# The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

- *Beating the Unbeatable Foe*, Fred C. Schwarz.....\$25.00
- *You Can Trust the Communists... to be Communists*, Fred C. Schwarz.....\$5.00
- *Mind Seige: The Battle for Truth in the New Millenium*, Tim LaHaye and David Noebel.....\$15.00
- *Understanding The Times: The Religious Worldviews of Our Day and the Search for Truth*, David A. Noebel.....\$25.00
- *Understanding The Times* (abridged), David A. Noebel ... \$14.95
- *America's 30 Years War*, Balint Vazsonyi ..... \$24.95
- *Another Gospel: A Confrontation with Liberation Theology*, Paul C. McGlasson. .... \$7.99
- \* *Architects of Victory: Six Heroes of the Cold War*, Joseph Shattan.....
- *Baker Encyclo. of Christian Apologetics*, N. L. Geisler .....\$49.95
- *Beyond Liberation Theology*, Ronald H. Nash..... \$12.95
- *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, Stephane Courtois, ed..... \$37.50
- *Body and Soul*, James Porter Moreland, Scott B. Rae. ....\$22.99
- *China: Debates the Future Security Environment*, Michael Pillsbury.....\$25.00
- *The China Threat: How the People's Republic Targets America*, Bill Gertz.....\$27.95
- *Chinese Views of Future Warfare*, Michael Pillsbury.....\$25.00
- *The Creed*, Michael Bauman.....\$9.99
- *A Christian Manifesto*, Francis A. Schaeffer.....\$9.95
- *Cloning of the American Mind*, B.K. Eakman.....\$22.00
- *Commies: A Journey Through the Old Left, the New Left and the Leftover Left*, Ron Radosh (hardcover).....\$24.95
- *Communism, the Cold War, and the FBI Connection*, Herman Bly .....\$12.95
- *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael J. Behe (hardcover).....\$25.00
- *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael J. Behe (paperback).....\$13.00
- *Dictatorship of Virtue*, Richard Bernstein..... \$12.95
- *God and Man: Perspectives on Christianity in the 20th Century*, Michael Bauman, ed. .... \$9.95
- \* *The Gulag Archipelago Vols. I, II and III*, Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, .....
- \* *The Harvest of Sorrow*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *Hollywood Party: How Communism Seduced the American Film Industry in the 1930s and 1940s*, Kenneth Lloyd Billingsley.....
- *Is the Comminern Coming Back?*, Wallace H. Spaulding....\$38.00
- *Joseph McCarthy: Re-examining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator*, Herman Arthur.....\$26.00
- \* *Koba [Joseph Stalin] The Dread: Laughter and the Twenty Million*, Martin Amis.....
- \* *Kolyma: The Arctic Death Camps*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *The Long War Against God*, Henry M. Morris.....
- *Morality and the Marketplace*, Michael Bauman, ed. .... \$9.95
- *The Noblest Triumph*, Tom Bethell..... \$29.95
- *None Dare Call It Education*, John Stormer.....\$21.00
- *Postmodern Times*, Gene Edward Veith, Jr.....\$14.95
- *A Program For Conservatives*, Russell Kirk .....\$3.00
- \* *The Quest for Cosmic Justice*, Thomas Sowell.....
- *Radical Son*, David Horowitz.....\$27.50
- *Red Cocaine: The Drugging of America*, Joseph D. Douglas....\$14.95
- *The Redhunter: A Novel Based on the Life and Times of Senator Joe McCarthy*, William F. Buckley .....\$25.00
- \* *Reflections on a Ravaged Century*, Robert Conquest.....
- \* *The Russian Revolution*, Richard Pipes.....
- *The Secret World of American Communism*, Harvey Kiehr, John Earl Haynes, Fridrikh Firsov.....\$24.95
- *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Richard Milton.....\$24.95
- \* *Stalin: The Breaker of Nations*, Robert Conquest.....
- *Tenured Radicals*, Roger Kimball.....\$18.95
- *Troublemaker: One Man's Crusade Against China's Cruelty*, Harry Wu ..... \$25.00
- \* *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*, John Earl Haynes, Harvey Klehr.....
- \* *The Venona Secrets: Exposing Soviet Espionage and America's Traitors*, Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel.....
- *Warranted Christian Belief*, Alvin Plantinga..... \$24.95
- *Why the Left is Not Right*, Ronald H. Nash.....\$10.99
- *Workers' Paradise Lost*, Eugene Lyons.....\$9.95
- *Year of the Rat*, Edward Timperlake, William C. Triplett II....\$24.95
- Video, *Clergy in the Classroom*.....\$19.95
- Video, *The Marxist/Leninist Worldview*.....\$19.95

\* Not available from CACC. Check your favorite book-seller for purchase or your local library.

"An authentic section of the Berlin Wall, donated in April 1990 to President Reagan for his unwavering dedication to humanitarianism and freedom over communism throughout his presidency." Reagan Library and Museum, Simi Valley, California

You may order these materials for your own Schwarz Report Bookshelf by calling (719) 685-9043, or by writing the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. **Payment must accompany your order. For shipping, please add \$5.00 or 12 percent of total order, whichever is greater.** Allow 3-4 weeks for delivery.