



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 45, Number 10

October 2005

Our 51st Year!

Inside

United Churches of Castro-Part II

by Mark D. Tooley, Page 3

Friend of Castro, the National Council of Churches loses members.

Castro's Gulags-Part I

by Nat Hentoff, Page 4

Cuban democrats converge to challenge Castro.

Castro's Gulags-Part II

by Nat Hentoff, Page 5

Read of Castro's victims and enablers.

Shades of Red

by Marvin Olasky, Page 6

Historian Ronald Radosh traces moviedom's left from the Popular Front to pop stars today.

United Churches of Castro-Part I

by Johannes L. Jacobse

The National Council of Churches (NCC) suffered a stinging rebuke last month when the North American Archdiocese of the Antiochian Orthodox Church decided to sever all ties to the organization. "It got to be too much," said Antiochian spokesman Rev. Thomas Zain. "They have an almost politicized agenda... that opposes conservative Christianity."

Zain was being generous. The NCC plays a duplicitous game. Its public statements are laced with the language of Christian benevolence but its policies read like a laundry list of hard-Left causes. It's a pattern that took a while for the Orthodox to see.

Disguising a Marxist past

NCC cooperation with the far-Left began in the last century. In the 1950s and 1960s, the NCC was one of the leading contributors to the Program to Combat Racism (PCR) created in 1939 by the World Council of Churches (WCC), an NCC affiliate. PCR subsidized revolutionary Communist governments in the Third World, shuffling more than \$5 million to 130 organizations in 30 countries—all under the guise of Christian charity.

When *Reader's Digest* exposed the ruse in 1982, they reported more than half of the money that went to the PCR wound up in the hands of Communist guerillas. In the 1970s alone: in excess of \$78,000 went to the Cuban sponsored MPLA fomenting Communist revolution in Angola; \$832,000 to Nambia's Communist regime; and \$108,000 to the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe (then Rhodesia) to support a Communist guerilla force responsible for a campaign of terror that killed 207 white civilians, 1,721 blacks, and nine missionaries including their children.

NCC contributions toward the PRC were collected from member churches and funneled through the NCC treasury. When the *Reader's Digest* report was published, the WCC frantically tried to cover the paper trail and to this day refuses to release the names of contributors and beneficiaries.

The fall of the Soviet Union and subsequent exposure of the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of Marxism caused donations to dry up. Throughout the 1990s the NCC teetered on the edge of bankruptcy. A last minute cash infusion by a wealthy benefactor saved it from ruin.

The fall also forced the NCC to account for past sins and it fell to Rev. Joan Campbell, NCC president during the early 1990s, to offer the *mea culpa*. "We did not understand the depth of the sufferings under Communism," Campbell said. "And we failed to really cry out under the Communist oppression."

Social(ist) Justice

Like many of its left-wing counterparts, the NCC displayed a slavish devotion to

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

Marxist ideas and anti-American cant. It strove to become the official dispenser of religious respectability to those who adopted either. Dispensing respectability made NCC bureaucrats feel important and offered the rationale that justified the NCC's existence.

“Liberation Theology” was the dominant fad in the late 1960s and 1970s—a patchwork of ideas that claimed that the Christian obligation to care for the poor was synonymous with Marxist social dogma. Liberation Theology dressed Marxist ideas in the Christian moral lexicon convincing gullible activists that Christ was really a crypto-Marxist. The ideology swept through the religious left like wildfire. The NCC was front and center.

Pope John Paul II fought Liberation Theology tooth and nail in Catholic circles (his first public rebuke being the scolding of an El Salvadoran priest). “Christian” Marxists would have none of it. Substituting Marx's secular millennialism for the Gospel, these religious Marxists did what all Marxists do: they refused to take any responsibility for the suffering their ideas generated. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.

Campbell was no exception. Her apology was a lie. The NCC not only understood the suffering caused by Communist oppression, it funded and gave religious cover to the oppressors. The NCC wants us to believe that when it crawled into bed with Marx the affair was not consummated, when in fact it adulterated the Christian Gospel and thereby joined the ranks of those who foster evil in the name of religion.

The NCC continues the affair even today, mostly with Fidel Castro, revealing that the utopian delusion is as strong as ever. Castro's seduction of the NCC goes back decades.

The NCC wrote educational tracts for American children that praised Cuban totalitarianism. It lauded Cuban health care. It was a front man for the deportation of Elian Gonzalez. It condemns the American economic embargo on Castro's behalf.

Several years ago, NCC operatives exploited a visit to Cuba by Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I by protesting American policy at Guantanamo, but refused the pleas of an Orthodox delegate to protest Castro's human rights abuses at a Cuban prison. The list goes on and on. It is impossible to find any substantive criticism of Castro's brutal regime in nearly three decades of NCC documentation.

Orthodox participation

Given this history, why did the traditional and conservative Orthodox Church sign on with the NCC in the first place? The Orthodox Church, the second largest church in the world, with 216 million adherents, was long divided in North America along ethnic lines. Only three American jurisdictions — the Antiochian Orthodox, which is primarily composed of Arab

Christians; the Orthodox Church in America, which is of Russian heritage; and the Greek Orthodox—have belonged to the NCC. The answer is that most Orthodox in these jurisdictions were unaware of the NCC's activist past. Despite having a presence on American soil for more than 200 years (through Russian missionary work in Alaska that spread to California, then New York), the American Orthodox are only now coming into their own. The majority of Orthodox Christians came to America during the great waves of immigration early in the last century and it took several generations for assimilation to take place. Only recently have American converts joined the ranks.

The fall of Communism prompted an NCC makeover that obscured their leftist orientation. Brown's *mea culpa* was part of this effort, as was the toning down of radical language and the relative silence on divisive moral issues that threatened to alienate a more conservative constituency. The NCC went shopping for social respectability at the same time that the Orthodox sought a venue to make their faith more visible in American society. Each found the other and decided to give union a shot.

It was an uneven marriage from the start, with the NCC acting as hen-pecked suitor. The Orthodox contribute no funding to the NCC; a problem the NCC overlooks because Orthodox history and tradition lend an air of moral legitimacy and authority that the NCC could never muster on its own. Clearly the NCC needs the Orthodox a lot more than the reverse.

Most informed Orthodox have always been uneasy of the relationship with the NCC but reasoned that an imperfect relationship might be better than none at all. However, when word got out that NCC President Rev. Bob Edgar was actively courting George Soros and other like-minded benefactors, the Antiochian Orthodox Church took notice and began to ask questions.

Then Edgar signed a declaration against gay marriage along with the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the National Association of Evangelicals, causing outrage in his Lesbian, Gay, and Transgender delegation. They demanded he change his tune, and Edgar dutifully complied. He apologized, removed his signature, and assured the delegation that the NCC stands behind gay marriage. That proved the last straw for the Antiochian Orthodox.

The dustbin of history

The Antiochian withdrawal may be a sign of things to come. Within the Orthodox communion, only the Orthodox Church in America (OCA – formerly Russian Orthodox Church) and the Greek Orthodox remain NCC members. The OCA is debating the issue behind closed doors, with

some rancor if reports are correct. A parliamentary maneuver narrowly avoided a vote at their national assembly earlier this summer that observers say would have resulted in an NCC ouster. Given that many OCA families have first hand experience with Communist oppression, the exposure of the NCC as a Communist fellow traveler should help close the question.

Complete Orthodox withdrawal leaves the NCC be-

holden to the declining mainstream of American Protestantism. (Catholics and Evangelical Protestants refuse to join.) NCC member churches comprise about a quarter of American Christians and their numbers decline every year. Only the conservative churches are growing. The Antiochian Orthodox decision pushes the NCC one step closer to the dustbin of history—where it belongs.

—*FrontPageMagazine.com*, August 25, 2005

United Churches of Castro-Part II

by Mark D. Tooley

Last month, for the first time in years, a member denomination withdrew from the National Council of Churches (NCC). The spunky 400,000-member communion is the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America, and its decision to quit the reflexively left-wing NCC was based on a unanimous vote of clergy and lay delegates.

According to one church spokesman, a recent NCC fundraising letter helped spark the departure. It asked supporters to fight “right-wing attacks” on the controversial church agency. The letter named President Bush, Rush Limbaugh, James Dobson, and the Heritage Foundation as insidious forces that must be opposed.

“It got to be too much,” Antiochian spokesman Rev. Thomas Zain told *Ecumenical News International*. The NCC, said Zain, has “lost its goal of Christian unity on a doctrinal basis. The goal seems to be including everybody and [promoting] niceties.”

Homosexuality, increasingly the bellwether issue that divides religious traditionalists from liberals, was also a big factor for the Antiochians. The Episcopal Church and United Church of Christ, both pillars of the NCC, have largely accepted same-sex unions and openly gay clergy.

Officially, the NCC does not have a stance on homosexuality. But NCC chief Bob Edgar, a former Democratic congressman and liberal Methodist seminary president, leaves little doubt that he favors same-sex unions. “We just feel we don’t have much in common with the churches” in the NCC, said Rev. Zain on behalf of the Antiochians.

Historically comprising mostly Syrian-American Christians, the Antiochians have in recent years attracted a number of Protestant converts impressed by the history and mysticism of Eastern Orthodoxy. These newcomers are especially anxious not to follow the liberal path of mainline denominations.

The NCC’s preference for liberal politics, and its indif-

ference to Christian doctrine, have made it unappealing to the Eastern Orthodox for some time. Mainline Protestants founded and dominate the 55-year-old NCC. The Orthodox originally saw the group as an avenue for integrating their ethnic communions into America’s religious mainstream. But the mainline is no longer mainstream. Only about a quarter of America’s church members belong to NCC denominations now, as Methodists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians shrink in numbers, and conservative churches grow.

The NCC’s relations with its own more conservative churches have been increasingly cool for several years. When the NCC nearly went bankrupt in the late 1990s, the wealthy Orthodox churches—the Russian, Greek, Serbian, and Ukrainian, along with other Eastern communions like the Armenians and Copts—declined to come to the rescue in any significant way. Although NCC members from nearly the beginning (the Antiochians were a founding NCC member), the Orthodox churches provided almost no funding to the NCC. Most of its denominational support comes from United Methodists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians.

The mainline Protestants bailed out the NCC and installed Edgar as the new general secretary six years ago, hoping he could work fundraising magic. Although the NCC’s income has fallen from over \$10 million to \$6 million, Edgar erased the deficit-spending that was choking the NCC.

Aware that the denominations would provide no more financial rescues, Edgar changed the NCC’s system of financial support. Instead of depending on the churches, the NCC is increasingly funded by left-wing philanthropies, like the Tides foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and political advocacy groups, like the Sierra Club and MoveOn.org.

From the start, Edgar also stressed outreach to non-NCC constituencies, such as Roman Catholics, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals, groups that, unlike the NCC churches, are actually growing. But the outreach stumbled five years ago when

Edgar quickly withdrew his signature from an ecumenical “Christian Marriage Declaration,” which defined marriage as the union of one man and one woman, and which was endorsed by the Roman Catholic bishops and the National Association of Evangelicals.

Under pressure from the NCC’s gay caucus, Edgar explained, “I support more than marriage—the love between two people—and I don’t differentiate whether it is between a man and a woman, or a woman and a woman, or a man and a man, or whatever.”

Edgar’s backflip on marriage was not forgotten by the Eastern Orthodox and was among the reasons for the Antiochian decision. The delegates cheered as the hierarch of the church, Metropolitan Philip Saliba, announced withdrawal from the NCC.

“It’s the liberalization of the mainline Protestant denominations over the last several years,” explained the Antiochian interfaith affairs spokesman Rev. Olof Scott to a radio interviewer. “Their agendas are driven by gay issues, the radical feminist agenda, same-sex marriage. They compromise so much. Our voice has been totally lost.”

Scott complained that the NCC under Bob Edgar has adopted a “politicized agenda” that “we feel should not be part of the proclamation of the church.” Edgar’s “liberal-left agenda” doesn’t appeal to “people who live in flyover country who are conservative Christians,” noted Scott, who called the NCC’s latest fundraising letter the “straw that broke the camel’s back.” The letter, although sent to churches, says little about Christianity and a lot about fighting the “right.”

With the NCC increasingly reliant on liberal foundations and direct-mail campaigns for funding, Edgar is unlikely to let up on the shrill political rhetoric. Meanwhile, the Antiochian withdrawal could have a ripple effect on other Orthodox churches in the NCC.

The 1 million-member Orthodox Church in America (Russian Orthodox) convened its All American Council last month in Toronto, where it received a proposal to withdraw from the NCC. “The very politically-oriented theologies of many Protestant denominations have often threatened to derail the agenda of the councils away from dialogue and unity, and towards political advocacy and activism,” said the report from the church’s ecumenical affairs committee. Bishops of the church will deliberate over the proposal this fall.

“We don’t need the NCC,” the Antiochian Church’s Rev. Scott told a radio interviewer. “We are strong. We are vibrant. We are growing.” That is considerably more than Bob Edgar can say about the troubled NCC and its declining mainline members.

—*The Weekly Standard*, August 29, 2005

Castro’s Gulags-Part I

by Nat Hentoff

Despite Fidel Castro’s prisons holding ever more dissenters in foul conditions, courageous Cubans will be in Havana on May 20 for a general meeting of the Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba, a force for democracy encompassing 365 Independent groups. Its members are still free in mind and spirit, and aware they too may wind up behind bars for coming.

Among the delegates to that May 20 meeting are two librarians from eastern Cuba, Elio Enrique Chavez and Luis Elio de la Paz. They cannot attend, however, because in a secret trial they were sentenced to prison on a charge of ‘dangerousness’ (peligrosidad). Mr. Castro does indeed see the attendees to this assembly, as well as other resisters across the country, as a danger to his brutal regime.

In a statement on the librarians’ imprisonment, the executive committee of the Civil Assembly reports to the world: “This case demonstrates that Fidel Castro and his regime are employing all their resources and methods to frustrate the preparations and ultimately prevent the General Meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on May 20th.”

“We are calling the attention of the international organizations and community in general to the risk facing the participants of the Assembly.” As is his practice, Mr. Castro has undoubtedly inserted spies among the planners of, and delegates to, the assembly, with the obvious intentions of limiting the attendance and spurring the fear of resistance throughout the country.

Mr. Castro still fears hostile international reaction, especially from the European Union, to the savagery of his dictatorship. In the May 6 *Wall Street Journal*, Mary Anastasia O’Grady, a ceaseless recorder of Mr. Castro’s cruelties, quotes an example of that savagery as reported in the March 30 *Toronto Globe and Mail* by Marcus Gee: “Amnesty (International) says prison guards beat one handcuffed dissident by stomping on his throat till he lost consciousness.”

But Mr. Castro’s continuing sensitivity to international disapproval of his thuggery has been revealed in a letter smuggled out of their prison by Messrs. Chavez and de la Paz. As reported on the Web site www.friendsofcubanlibraries.org: “The police told the defendants that their prison terms would be publicized as a government work/study program rather than a form of punishment.” According to the prisoners, the colonel said ‘it would be made known that we are not prisoners, that [their detain-

ment] was for a work/study program of the Revolution; we told him we did not agree, that we weren't going to work or study but that they were sentencing us for our political position.... We're going to serve our sentence behind bars."

Their refusal to be broken by Castro is also exemplified by others in the dictator's gulag, and by those who, as of this writing, will be facing his police, overt and secret, on May 20. Oswaldo Paya, whose Varela Project got more than 10,000 brave Cubans to sign his petition for democracy, told the Associated Press in March: "When Cubans are capable of saying that, beyond our fear, we want change, that hits the nucleus of power." What also can cause Mr. Castro more fear is if the international media covers the May 20 Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba. Though time is short, surely the resourceful executives at American television and cable networks can try to get their cameras into Havana by that fateful day.

It would also be a great impetus to the further dissipation of what Mr. Paya calls "the culture of fear" in Cuba if the world can see on television what Miss O'Grady describes in the *Wall Street Journal*: "For more than two years now, Fidel Castro has faced a frightening scene in Havana every Sunday. Some 30 women dressed all in white meet at St. Rita's church; when Mass is over they form a silent procession and walk 10 blocks to a nearby park. This is the kind of stuff that keeps dictators up at night.

"They are the Ladies in White, wives of prisoners of conscience doing time in Castro's gulags. The ladies are appealing for the release of all political prisoners, in the name of justice and humanity. Their pleas go unheeded. But that doesn't mean that their act of defiance hasn't been effective. Indeed, sources say that similar groups of women decked out in white have begun forming processions in other cities around the country." What a wonderful, liberating final chorus it would be for Ted Koppel's "Nightline" (soon to be banished by ABC in an act of non-public service) to be in Havana on May 20, with Koppel on site reporting live on the assembly, or the assault on it by Mr. Castro's hoodlums.

Maybe some of the American entertainment and literary elite, who have basked in Fidel's glowing presence, will also be there to provide the maximum leader with their amoral support."

—*The Washington Times*, May 16, 2005, p. A21

Castro's Gulags-Part II

by Nat Hentoff

For years, Ray Bradbury's novel, *Fahrenheit 451... the temperature at which books burn*, has been an inspiration to me and other millions around the world who believe in the freedom to read—very particularly in those countries whose dictators forbid dissenting books.

"We were talking about Fidel Mr. Castro's recurring crack-downs on those remarkably courageous Cubans who keep working to bring democracy to that grim island where dissenters, including independent librarians, are locked in cages, often for 20 or more years. Mr. Bradbury knew about the crackdowns, but until I told him, was not aware of Mr. Castro's kangaroo courts (while sentencing the "subversives") often ordering the burning of the independent libraries they raid, just like in *451*. For example, on April 5, 2003, after Julio Valdes Guevara was sent away, the judge ruled: "As to the disposition of the photographic negatives, the audio cassettes, medicines, books, magazines, pamphlets, and the rest of the documents, they are to be destroyed by means of incineration because they lack usefulness." Hearing about this, Mr. Bradbury authorized me to convey this message from him to Fidel Castro: "I stand against any library or any librarian anywhere in the world being imprisoned or punished in any way for the books they circulate.

"I plead with Castro and his government to immediately take their hands off the independent librarians and release all those librarians in prison, and to send them back into Cuban culture to inform the people." Among the books destroyed throughout the years by Fidel's arsonists have been volumes on Martin Luther King Jr., the U.S. Constitution, and even a book by the late Jose Marti, who organized, and was killed in, the Cuban people's struggle for independence.

"Whether or not the Cuban dictator ever heard of Mr. Bradbury's message to him, Mr. Castro is resolute in his repression of his people. As Human Rights First (formerly the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights) reports: "In a renewed government crackdown on dissidents in Cuba, authorities arrested at least 57 peaceful democracy and human rights advocates," between July 13 and July 22. Three of those still imprisoned will be prosecuted under Mr. Castro's notorious Law 88, which mandates up to 20 years in prison and possible confiscation of property.

continued on next page

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman with the assistance of Dr. Ronald H. Nash. 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 (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.

Meanwhile, Nebraska Gov. David Heineman conducted a trade mission to Havana in August that was, as the Aug. 10 *New York Sun* reported, “to negotiate the purchase of Nebraska-grown dry beans one of the state’s largest exports by the Cuban government.” Republican members of the Congress Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen wrote to Mr. Heineman, telling him his mission would be “sending the appalling signal that the cash of tyrants is more important than the lives of pro-democracy leaders.” These members of Congress asked the governor to at least meet with leaders of the pro-democracy movement, as well as some of the political prisoners.

Mr. Heineman’s spokesman, Aaron Sanderford, told Meghan Clyne of the *New York Sun*, one of the few American newspapers keeping tabs on the story of this heroic resistance to Mr. Castro, that the governor would not meet with any dissidents, and would “certainly not engage in the politics of the day.” Replied Lincoln Diaz-Balart: “It’s like saying politics is not part of the trip to Hitler’s Germany in the 1930s. It’s not a question of politics; it’s a question of elemental human decency.”

Now that China has become a strong supporter of Robert Mugabe, the tyrant of Zimbabwe, and is bolstering the economy that Mr. Mugabe shattered, maybe Mr. Heineman can lead a trade mission to that brutalized nation and sell more Nebraska-grown dry beans. How about a side trip to the Sudan government in Khartoum? The governor could take a

world tour, boosting sales to Iran, North Korea, and other totalitarian countries whose politics are of no concern to him.

Not all Nebraskans share their governor’s views. There is one librarian who is very concerned with Castro’s crack-downs of conscience, free speech, and the freedom to read. Robert Boyce at the reference department in Lincoln City Libraries in Lincoln, Nebraska tells me that he hopes to adopt a suggestion I made in previous writings on Castro: Every fall, libraries across America display during Banned Books Week actual volumes that have been banned. Why not include books banned by Castro? Boyce writes: “We are going to be putting together a very small display of banned books for the fall of 2005 Nebraska Library Association Conference in late September,” and he wants to include some titles forbidden in official Cuba libraries.

This will be a significant reaching out to Cuba’s imprisoned librarians by an individual American library state association – the first time it’s happened. Yet, the national Governing Council of the American Library Association continues to refuse to ask Mr. Castro to release the independent librarians in his prisons. Admirers of Mr. Castro on that governing body have blocked that clear support of the freedom to read, the very credo of the ALA.

Perhaps, in tribute to free trade if not free ideas, Mr. Heineman will send a supply of Nebraska-grown dry beans to the governing council of the ALA.

—*The Washington Times*, August 22, 2005, p. A19

Shades of Red

by Marvin Olasky

The significance of *Red Star Over Hollywood* (Encounter, 2005) lies in its subtitle: *The Film Colony’s Long Romance with the Left*. Authors Ronald and Allis Radosh concentrate on the 1930s and the 1940s, but their work is relevant to the present because the tryst has been so protracted, with moviedom’s leftists (such as Jane Fonda a generation ago and Tim Robbins or Sean Penn today) repeating the mistakes of their forebears: hating America, cheering for militants from other countries who would destroy us, and forgetting that talent in role-playing does not equal political discernment.

Ronald Radosh is the author of numerous books about American Communists, and in *The Rosenberg Files* he was the first writer to establish the guilt of nuclear bomb spy Julius Rosenberg. Mr. Radosh has looked extensively at records of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), a group much reviled by the left and in today’s standard history texts.

WORLD: How important was the Communist Party in Hollywood during the 1930s and 1940s, and who were some of the best-known leftists at that time?

RADOSH: The Communist Party was small in numbers. The Hollywood branch only had about 300 members. Yet its activism and diligence allowed it to create numerous front groups that had vast influence and thousands of members. The Anti-Nazi League, which the Party created with the guidance of Comintern agent Otto Katz, had as members a who’s who of the Hollywood elite. Its members included studio chiefs, actors, writers and directors. At its fundraising dinner even the Archbishop of Los Angeles sat on the stage. Well-known leftists of the day included Lillian Hellman, James Cagney, John Garfield, Budd Schulberg, Maurice Rapf and, of course, writers like the future “Hollywood Ten,” including Ring Lardner Jr., Dalton Trumbo, Adrian Scott, Alvah Bessie, and Albert Maltz.

WORLD: Did the Hollywood left succeed in influencing the content of films? Is today’s Hollywood left more successful in that regard?

RADOSH: More so than is usually conceded. In our book, we talk about numerous wartime films in which Party writers, directors and actors appeared in films that could appear to be patriotic (intent on winning the war against Germany) while being pro-Soviet and pro-Communist at the same time. We have a chapter about the 1943 film *Mission to Moscow*, in which writer Howard Koch and “technical advisor” Jay Leyda assured that the film would be done in such a way to prove to American audiences that the victims of Stalin’s great 1936 purge trial were all guilty as charged. We are the first writers to show how these two men—Koch and Leyda—were American Stalinists loyal to the Soviet Union, not apolitical men as they have usually been portrayed.

Today’s Hollywood left has no obstacles in its path. Back in the ’40s sometimes the producers vetted the films and took out the worst Communist attempts at influencing films. Today Tim Robbins—a major star—can produce a big-budget film glamorizing the old Communist left, as he did in *The Cradle Will Rock*. And in our book, we include an appendix of all the films that have been made since the 1970s to the present that portray a Communist view of the blacklist and the *Hollywood Reds*. The most vile was *One of the Hollywood Ten*, in which Jeff Goldblum plays the most Stalinist of them all, Herbert Biberman.

WORLD: How was the Hollywood left defeated during the late 1940s?

RADOSH: It was defeated when Stalin moved toward waging Cold War. Honest liberals who let themselves align with the Communists during the wartime Popular Front left in disgust when the Communists began to attack any and all American administrations as fascist and imperialist. Melvyn Douglas advised people that liberals like himself should break all ties with the Reds, and Olivia de Havilland, given a pro-Soviet speech to read by writer Dalton Trumbo at a rally, tore it up and gave a tough anti-Communist speech. It was only HUAC’s hearings that allowed the Reds to portray themselves as adherents of free speech and democracy, and allowed them to show themselves as innocent martyrs.

WORLD: What was the role of a future U.S. president in stopping Communists within the Screen Actors Guild?

RADOSH: Ronald Reagan cut his teeth in fighting Communism in his earliest experiences in Hollywood. Coming out of the U.S. Air Corps film division, Reagan, like others, joined

one of the major Communist front groups. He soon would learn that it was secretly run and controlled by the Communists. When the Communists waged violent post-war strikes in an attempt to control the unions in Hollywood, Reagan led the Screen Actors Guild to vote against endorsement of the strikes.

WORLD: Historians often lump the activities of HUAC, 1947-1950, with those of Sen. Joseph McCarthy, 1950-1954. What were the differences in approach?

RADOSH: McCarthy was chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Government Operations; HUAC was a committee of Congress that investigated what it perceived as “un-American activities.” McCarthy was loose with his charges, a major demagogue, and his hearings only gave anti-Communism a bad name. HUAC’s major triumph was the exposure of Alger Hiss as a Communist spy. Some of its members were unsavory and demagogic; Parnell Thomas, its chairman during the Hollywood hearings, was himself sent to jail for payroll padding, and like the Communists, he took the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify about his corrupt activities. Others on the Committee were racists and anti-Semites, a fact that hurt its credibility. In reality, HUAC was careful and all it called to testify were actually Communist Party members or fellow travelers.

WORLD: How did Elia Kazan, now remembered as the director of fine films like *On the Waterfront*, act heroically, and how did many of Hollywood’s leading lights treat him at the time and at the Oscar ceremonies in 1999?

RADOSH: Kazan and writer Budd Schulberg realized that the real victims of Red politics were those facing death in the gulag. As Schulberg said time and time again, he didn’t worry about what happened to Ring Lardner Jr.; he worried about the Soviet writers he once supported who were all put to death by Stalin. Both Kazan and Schulberg testified before HUAC on the nature of Communist activity, and how the Party was a threat to democracy and the freedom of artists. Since today’s Hollywood left only wants to glamorize the old Reds, many of them refused to stand and applaud when Kazan finally received honors from the Academy, and others picketed him outside.

WORLD: You write that once Hollywood Communists lost their battle against the HUAC in 1947, “the romance was over and would never be the same again.” The Communist

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.

Party itself certainly doesn't play the role in Hollywood it once did, but does the love affair with leftist ideas remain? If so, are there organizational expressions of it?

RADOSH: The left today carries on the agenda in new ways. There is no more Stalin or Soviet Union to love, but so many of Hollywood's elite swoon over Fidel Castro and Communist Cuba. The list includes the likes of Steven Spielberg, Robert Redford, singer Bonnie Raitt, and others. The left now has scores of Hollywood activist groups that concentrate on single issues. Many of them are led by the children of old Hollywood Reds.

WORLD: Does Mel Gibson's breakthrough indicate any

change in Hollywood, or do you think that was merely a blip in the charts?

RADOSH: Clearly change is underway. Tom Hanks stated a short time ago that it's about time a good anti-Communist film be made, and announced his intention to do so. *Team America* made fools of the Hollywood left; in that film they were all blown up while attending a peace conference convened by Kim Jong Il. Michael Moore, Alec Baldwin, and Co. didn't know what hit them, and Sean Penn openly attacked the movie. As the bard once said, "the times they are a-changin'."

—*World Magazine*, September 3, 2005, p. 32-33

September 8, 2005

Dear Dr. Noebel:

We are just back from an extensive trip to Russia, including a tour to historical Solovietsky Island, site of the first Gulag Archipelago camp. Organized by MIR Corporation (85 S Washington St, Seattle, WA 92104, Tel: 800-424-104), the trip was an eye opener.

This evidence-based trip that included Moscow and St. Petersburg, easily shows that Russia is NOT in denial of its Communist past. Every city still has a tower statue of Lenin. Across the Bolshoi Theater, in Moscow, the well kept statue of Marx is still summoning the proletarians of the world to unite.

The KGB headquarters still is adorned by the hammer and sickle at regular intervals (but a uniformed guard will not let you take a photograph of it), but Lubyanka Square is spared of the monument to A. Dzerzhinsky, the first Commissar of the feared CHEKA, which is currently kept, with the other statues of the leaders of the USSR in the park between the Moscow River (by the statue to Peter the Great) and Gorki park.

There is a tacit "live and let live" understanding between the State (Putin) and Patriarch Alexey of the Russian Orthodox Church, to minimize the polarization of the Russian people between former Communists and their victims, by limiting the evidence of the past that includes the closure of Museums dedicated to and by the victims of Communism, including the Museum that had been created by the prisoners on Solovietsky, on the site of their captivity, well described by A. Solzhenitsin. There is more merit for Christians to forgive and to forget. "It is not the first time that excesses occurred in Russian History."...

In spite of the current positive financial bonanza provided by the price of oil, the State is privatizing all that the Soviet Government offered "free", —such as guaranteed employment, universal health care (which is currently in a state totally unacceptable in a Western nation), free transportation, education, etc., making sure that the elderly are witnesses that "it was better when it was worse." People used to entitlements are hard pressed to switch to Capitalism. Retirement revenues for the elderly and disabled, at less than \$50 a month, are not sufficient to provide for the necessities needed to survive independently and the high earners are not trusted: "How can they be honest and make money?"

There is an interesting historical twist accepted by a considerable number of Russians, that Stalin really was a true believer because he had been in a seminary and his mother was a believer. He was the great savior of Russia, maligned by Jewish Zionists and Americans. His "so called" excesses are greatly exaggerated!...

Russians are great patriots and have grounds to suspect the motives of others: there is a great challenge to get an objective knowledge of truth.

Keep up with the good work and best regards!

O. D., M.D.

San Diego, CA