The Schwarz Report

Dr. Fred Schwarz | Volume 51, Number 6 | Dr. David Noebel

June 2011

Communism and the Intellectuals

by Michael Bauman

When debating communism, I often encounter those who do not know exactly what it is. My answer is the one known by millions and millions: arrest, purge, gulag, death.

But the knowledge of communism gained by those who live under it (that is, those whom communism has not murdered) is vastly different from the communist fantasies of Western intellectuals. While millions under communism's icy hand starve and die, Western intellectuals tout it as a laudable alternative to the system under which they now exist and flourish—as if Lenin, Stalin, and all who follow in their train did not hate intellectuals; as if nothing horrible ever happened to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn—whom Western intellectuals despise as often as do their communist idols.

Intellectuals are not valued by communism even though some intellectuals ridiculously and inexplicably value it. "Intellectuals," Lenin said in a letter to Maxim Gorky, are not the nation's brains, "They're its shit." For that reason, Lenin drew up lists of intellectuals who were suitable only for deportation, internal exile, or death. To lose them, Lenin deduced, was to lose almost nothing at all. Despite all their boot-licking toadyism, the intellectuals fared no better under communism than the kulaks and the Cossacks, who perished for no better reason than that they simply fell afoul of the sinister policy called "death by quota." Communism dealt death so often that one of Stalin's most stunning and disgusting achievements might be called "the necropolis," or city of death, meaning mass graves for 100,000 to 200,000 persons all at once. As Stalin himself said on so many occasions: "Death solves all problems."

Intellectuals are not held in high esteem by communism because communism knows that, by and large, intellectuals are what Lenin called "useful idiots." Those "idiots" are "useful" because they seem never to notice that communism everywhere and always must be a conspiracy to violence. From its historical record, we know that communism is gangsterism imposed by the power of the state. We know that it requires repression to survive. Communism is a derelict and destructive delusion. Not co-existence or tolerance, but victory over this evil must always be our unwavering intention. Communism is a wicked idea leading to a miserable existence. It deserves no quarter. Like trying to make peace with cancer rather than eliminating it, co-existence with communism is worse than surrender; it is death. You cannot live with communism; you can live only without it.

Yet, even caught as we are in this on-going life or death struggle with communism, Americans (both the intellectuals and others) remain addicted to half-way measures—and halfway measures cannot keep communism from re-emerging. As often as we kill the monster, it must be killed again. Communism does not stay dead. Even when no one else is, Western intellectuals themselves keep conjuring it back to life. Those intellectuals are proof that evil ideas do not die simply because those ideas have been conclusively and repeatedly refuted. Refutation and truth are not the friends either of communism or of the intellectuals who fawn over it.

Lenin publically declared that communism, to survive, must be a dictatorship. Dictatorship, he said, was not an organization for order, much less for freedom—but for war. Where freedom reigns, communism cannot survive. Communism is at war. Communism sees free human beings as the enemy. Know this: If you are a free human being, communism wants you dead. It wants to add your name to the more than 50 million other names it has enrolled on the rosters of extermination. If you think that half-way measures are the order of the day, you will die. Indeed, you are half-dead already.

Interestingly and ironically, communists today also employ half-way measures. They know that their bizarre economic system cannot possibly produce the goods and services necessary for prosperity, so they permit capitalism a foothold, a half-way entrance into their jurisdiction. Even under those half-way measures, capitalism works better than commu-

nism. Half-way capitalism in communist countries like China provides the prosperity not otherwise available. That prosperity feeds the expansionistic fervor native to communism. By means of their half-way capitalistic policies, the Chinese communists make enough to fuel their diabolical engines of destruction.

In other words, to free persons, half-way measures are the very definition of danger, whether we ourselves employ them or the communists do. Because communism's objectives are limitless, our opposition to it must never be half-way.

When faced by colossal evil, indifference and half-way measures are never a suitable response. Yet judging from American apathy and compromise, one would think Ronald Reagan never lived.

Communism is theft. It steals property; it steals livelihoods; it steals lives; it even steals nations. Communism is synonymous with theft because communism is anti-God. It is atheism applied to political ethics, the inevitable result of which is nihilism and tyranny. Communism is the enemy of God, therefore, it is the enemy of humanity, too.

Anything that will not submit to truth is the enemy of God and of us. Truth, you will recall, is a He, not an it (John 14: 6). Communism will not submit, either to Him or to it. Communism wants truth to submit, so it tries to steal the past too. Every time a new communist regime comes to power, those new powers require their historian lackeys—ostensible intellectuals—to re-write the history books, removing the old heroes and replacing them with a coterie more amenable to the regime. Communists know that whoever controls the past controls the present; so they set about to control the past, no matter what the truth of the past really says. We have it on the Highest Authority that the truth sets us free (John 8: 32). Truth is liberating. For that reason, communism hates truth and will not tolerate it. Truth has few more resolute enemies than communism and its sycophantic Western intellectuals, under whose insidious influence every academic discipline is now in hopeless confusion. Of that confusion and its consequent famine of truth, communism has absolutely no fear.

Here is my point: With the death of learning and of truth comes the death of all other things, first to those persons and things not useful to the regime. Therefore, whenever a human institution or movement actively resists the truth, intellectuals—of all persons—ought to beware, ought to sound the alarm with clarity, purpose, and courage. They must do so because, where there is a famine of truth, famines of other sorts soon follow: famines of food, famines of freedom, and famines of life.

—Dr. Bauman is Scholar in Residence at Summit Semester, faculty member of Summit Ministries and Professor of Theology and Culture at Hillsdale College.

China's Military Buildup

by Robert Maginnis

Red Alert: China is sending misleading messages about its massive military buildup.

Last week China's Communist regime published the every-second-year edition of its defense white paper, "China's National Defense in 2010," which claims to promote transparency in its defense planning and deepen international trust, and asserts that its security policy is defensive in nature. But the paper's messages are not supported by the facts.

Consider five of the many misleading messages imbedded in the 30-page defense white paper.

First, "China attaches great importance to military transparency," the paper claims. The Pentagon takes issue with that view in a report, stating, "The limited transparency in China's military and security affairs enhances uncertainty and increases the potential for misunderstanding and miscalculation."

China fails the transparency test by understating its defense spending. The Pentagon's 2010 report on China's military estimates Beijing's total military-related spending for 2009 was more than $150 billion, but the white paper claims it spent about half that amount, $75.56 billion (495.11 billion RMB). The difference, according to the Pentagon, is due to the fact that China's defense budget "does not include major categories of expenditure," but the report fails to identify those categories.

China's defense spending increased annually for more than two decades, but the white paper stays, "The growth rate of defense expenditure has decreased." That statement is refuted by China's official 2011 defense budget, which is $92 billion, up 12.7% from 2010, which grew from 7.5% during the previous year.

The Pentagon report also states China isn't transparent regarding its growing force-projection capabilities. For example, the so-called transparent white paper does not mention Beijing's plan to deploy an aircraft carrier known to be under construction. A question about the carrier was

posed at the press conference announcing the white paper, but was never answered.

Second, "The Chinese government has advocated from the outset the peaceful use of outer space, and opposes any weaponization of outer space," according to the white paper.

China's anti-space weaponization view hasn't stopped it from developing its own space weapon, however. The white paper makes no mention of China's 2007 successful direct-ascent anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons test, which destroyed its own satellite in space. "The test raised questions about China's capability and intention to attack US satellites," according to a Congressional Research Service (CRS) report.

The Pentagon's report states, "China continues to develop and refine this [ASAT] system, which is one component of a multidimensional program to limit or prevent the use of space-based assets by potential adversaries during times of crisis or conflict." The report also indicates China is developing kinetic and directed-energy weapons for ASAT missions.

Gen. Xu Qiliang, commander of China's air force, appears to confirm the Pentagon's analysis. He said in 2009 that military competition extending to space is "inevitable" and emphasized the transformation of China's air force into one that "integrates air and space" with both "offensive [read ASAT] and defensive" capabilities, according to the Pentagon's report.

Third, "China firmly opposes the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction [WMD] and their means of delivery." The paper also states "nonproliferation issues should be resolved through political and diplomatic means" and then cites as examples the nuclear crises with North Korea and Iran .

Even though China is a signatory to various nonproliferation treaties, it is arguably the world's biggest WMD supplier. A March 2011 CRS report states, "China has been a 'key supplier' of technology . . . providing nuclear and missile-related technology to Pakistan and missile-related technology to Iran ."

CRS documents China's proliferation activities beginning in 1982. It transferred sensitive material and tools for making atomic bombs to Pakistan such as uranium hexafluoride gas, ring magnets, and "high-tech diagnostic equipment." Pakistan then sold that technology to Iran, North Korea, and Libya, according to then- CIA Director George Tenet.

Fourth, "China pursues a national defense policy which is defensive in nature." The white paper also claims, "China unswervingly takes the road of peaceful development." But China's weapons-building spree confirms it seeks a significant offensive capacity, and its military action identifies it as a regional hegemon, not a peaceful neighbor.

Three weapons platforms strongly suggest China seeks a robust offensive capacity. In January, while Secretary of Defense Robert Gates visited Beijing, the Chinese military tested a J-20 fifth-generation stealth fighter. That sophisticated platform is primarily for undetected, long-range offensive operations and shares state-of-the-art technology with the F-22 Raptor, America's best fighter.

In December, Adm. Robert Willard, the commander of US Pacific Command, told the *Asahi Shimbun*, a Japanese newspaper, China is developing an anti-ship ballistic missile (ASBM) known as an "aircraft carrier killer." The 1,500-mile range DF-21 ASBM is an offensive platform that uses a space-based maritime surveillance and targeting system that permits it to strike moving warships at sea.

China also plans to build a fleet of aircraft carriers this decade, according to the Pentagon report. It already has the ex-Varyag—a former soviet Kuznetsov class aircraft carrier in the Dalian shipyard—and a program to train pilots operating fixed-wing aircraft from a carrier.

China is using its sophisticated blue-water navy, which numbers 260 vessels, including 75 major warships and more than 60 submarines, to expand its sphere of influence through intimidation, especially in the South China Sea, which some Chinese officials label a "core interest." Last year, the New York *Times* reported Chinese officials told Deputy Secretary of State James Steinberg that China would not tolerate "foreign interference" in the South China Sea, and its actions back up that view.

China's navy aggressively seizes fishing boats near contested South China Sea islands hundreds of miles from the mainland and harasses Japanese aircraft and ships in the East China Sea near Japanese islands. That aggression is not limited to regional players, however.

Starting in 2000, China became provocative toward American naval forces. In 2001, a Chinese fighter collided with a US Navy aircraft, forcing the American crew to land at China's Hainan Island.

Harassment on the sea is more common. From 2001 to 2009, Chinese warships and aircraft harassed and threatened the USNS *Bowditch*, USNS *Sumner*, USNS *Impeccable*, and the USNS *Victorious*. In 2006, a Chinese Song-class submarine surfaced dangerously near the aircraft carrier USS *Kitty Hawk*. In each case, China violated international law.

Fifth, "China maintains that the global missile defense program will be detrimental to international strategic balance and stability [and] no state should deploy overseas missile defense systems [ballistic missile defense] . . . " This hypocritical comment is targeted at the US, which has both land- and sea-based systems. America's sea-based Aeigis ballistic missile defense (BMD) systems often sail near North Korea's coast, protecting our allies from China's rogue partner.

Apparently China wants to limit America's BMD capability until it can acquire one of its own. Currently China has a limited capability against tactical ballistic missiles with ranges up to 300 miles. But the Pentagon report states China is "proceeding with the research and development of a missile defense 'umbrella' consisting of kinetic energy intercept at exo-atmospheric altitudes, as well as intercepts of ballistic missiles and other aerospace vehicles within the upper atmosphere."

China's 2010 white paper is chock-full of misleading messages that deny transparency, promote distrust, and demonstrate the regime's hegemonic ambitions. Unless China changes its actions, America has no choice but to conclude Beijing's intent is to become the world's dominant military power.

—*Human Events*, April 11, 2011, p. 8

Tax the Rich

by Ann Coulter

When Wisconsin Democrats fled the state in order to avoid voting on splendiferous public sector union contracts, did they happen to notice that the rest of the country is in the midst of a massive recession?

For years, Democrats have been using taxpayer money so that their buddies in public sector unions never have to know when there's a recession. People who are already suffering have to suffer more so that those who are doing pretty well don't have to suffer at all.

The high salaries and magnificent benefits paid to government employees are used to fund the public sector unions, which then funnel a portion of that money back to the Democrats, who vote for the pay packages of government workers. The unions function as a pass-through from the taxpayers straight to Democrats running for re-election.

As a result, taxpayers are paying people to continually raise their taxes.

In 2010, three of the five top campaign contributors to the Democrats were public sector unions. Service Employees International was No. 2 at $11.6 million in campaign contributions to Democrats, the National Education Association was No. 3 at $8 million, and the American Federation of Teachers was No. 5 at $7 million. To put that in perspective, that's even more than the $1 million given to Obama in 2008 by his second-largest contributor, Goldman Sachs!

Liberals don't love big government because they think it's efficient, compassionate, fair, or even remotely useful. They support big government because they are guaranteed the support of nearly everyone who works for the government.

Public sector employee contracts are written by the union and rubber-stamped by Democrats—and the taxpayers only find out years later that public school teachers are allowed to get a full year's pay for 30 days' work over three years after they retire—as is the case in Green Bay, Wis., where one out of every 12 teachers retired this year to take advantage of the "emeritus" scam.

This is what all the commotion is about in Wisconsin. Republican Gov. Scott Walker isn't even trying to eliminate collective bargaining for government workers' salaries. He only wants to eliminate collective bargaining over their conditions of employment, which has led to massive inefficiencies.

Thanks to union grievance procedures, the union representing school crossing guards filed a formal complaint over a sweet old man volunteering to get the kids across the street in Wausau, Wis. Warren Eschenbach, an 86-year-old retiree, had been volunteering each morning as a crossing guard at a school near his home. But according to the union, only a highly paid government employee should be permitted to do that job.

Fifth-grader Megan Sichterman, told WAOW, an ABC affiliate, "I was really sad because all the kids really like him. He's really nice to everybody, and I was kind of scared at the same time that we wouldn't see him on the corner anymore."

Even in the middle of the battle over collective bargaining rights for government unions, just last month the snowplow operators' union filed a grievance against Racine, Wis., to demand paid days off for snowplow operators . . . after a snowstorm.

After a massive storm shut down the city for two days, snowplow operators thought they deserved two paid days off on account of all the snow, like other government employees got.

The snowplowers' union also filed a grievance against the city for hiring private plowing services to help with the snow removal. Perhaps it was that troublemaker Warren Eschenbach showing up with a snow shovel and volunteering to help clear the streets.

No government snowplow operators were laid off and plenty of them worked overtime after the blizzard—but the union thought Racine should remain immobilized by snow for a week so that government snowplow operators could get even more overtime.

In the private sector, a company that capitulated to such ludicrous union demands would go out of business—as would have happened to General Motors if the government hadn't taken it over. Offered substandard products at exorbitant prices, the consumer would buy from a competitor.

But with government, the consumer has no choice: We have to buy from the company store. Government employees will always have more passion and commitment about increasing their own salaries and perks than will the taxpayers, who have to worry about their own jobs and salaries. The public—especially the taxpayer—will always lose.

That is simply a fact about government jobs that can't be avoided. What doesn't make sense is to implement a system that invites this kind of mutual back-scratching between the Democrats and public sector unions—to wit, collective bargaining where there is no "management," but only co-conspirators against the taxpayers on both sides of the bargaining table.

—*Human Events*, April 11, 2001, p. 15

Al-Jazeera: Voice of the Terrorists

by Cliff Kincaid

President Obama hosted Emir Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani of Qatar, otherwise known as the Boss of Al-Jazeera, for a meeting in the Oval Office. Obama called him "Your Highness" and "His Highness," even though the Emir dropped his robes of royalty for a business suit. Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani financially sponsors Al-Jazeera and its most famous personality, anti-American and anti-Semitic cleric Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, who has just returned to Egypt from Qatar to supervise the transformation of that one-time US ally into an Islamic state.

"In addition to our efforts in Libya," Obama said, "we have a strong relationship between our two countries. It is an economic relationship. It is a military relationship. It is a cultural relationship. And obviously, Qatar has done very well under His Highness's leadership, but his influence extends beyond his borders. And so we've had discussions about how we can continue to promote democracy, human rights, increased freedom, and reform throughout the Middle East."

The influence "beyond his borders" could be a reference to Al-Jazeera, described in one of the WikiLeaks cables from the US as an instrument of foreign policy for the Qatar regime.

The Emir gave an interview to CNN's Wolf Blitzer the same day he met with Obama, and made the rather absurd comment that even though he, and the government of Qatar, finances Al-Jazeera, "it is impossible for me to have influence to tell Al-Jazeera what to do. Because they are journalists, and they will understand if the Emir of Qatar is interfering in their—in their job. They will not respect the job they are doing. Even internationally, Al-Jazeera will not be respected."

This is laughable, of course. In addition to the WikiLeaks cable about the regime using Al-Jazeera as a foreign policy instrument, the US State Department's own human rights report on Qatar notes, "Al- Jazeera and the government claimed that the channel was independent and free of government influence, but the government exercised editorial and programmatic control of the channel through funding and selection of the station's management."

Maybe Blitzer believed the Emir—he certainly didn't challenge him—but the idea that Al-Jazeera's journalists won't respect him if he influences their reporting, and therefore he doesn't, does not pass the laugh test. The Emir pays the bills—and the salaries of the journalists who work there.

Although Obama talks about human rights and democracy in the Middle East, the White House report on the meeting said nothing about the imprisoned Qatari blogger, Sultan al-Khalaifi, who was apprehended on March 1 by Qatar's security forces and has not been heard of since. His detention is further proof of how the Emir controls the media in that country.

The White House said, "Qatar's location in the Persian Gulf has made it an important ally in a region vital to US economic and security interests. As democracies continue to grow and flourish throughout the Arab world, working with nations like Qatar will become ever more

important."

In fact, Qatar is a dictatorship with no freedom of the press. It is also a state sponsor of terrorism, though not officially designated as such, even while hosting a US military base.

As we have noted, " . . . the 9/11 commission demonstrated (page 90) that Qatar has been protecting terrorists, including the mastermind of 9/11, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. A recently released cable from WikiLeaks goes further, saying that Qatari nationals were involved in 9/11 and may still be on the loose." One cable released by WikiLeaks said that the regime has "adopted a largely passive approach to cooperating with the US against terrorist financing" and that terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda "exploit Qatar as a fundraising locale." The cable adds that Qatar's security services "have been hesitant to act against known terrorists out of concern for appearing to be aligned with the US and provoking reprisals."

An AP story said, "Obama said afterward he appreciated the Emir's leadership in Libya, where rebels, spurred on by popular uprisings elsewhere in the region, are trying to force Gadhafi to step down." The story made no mention of reports that the rebels include members of al-Qaeda.

The story noted a moment of levity, saying, "Obama also congratulated the Emir on Qatar's selection as host of World Cup soccer in 2022. He noted he'll be an ex-president by then and made a pitch for good seats."

"I will not forget to send your tickets for the World Cup," the Qatari dictator said. Obama replied, "Thank you, my friend."

Once again, the United States is getting rolled by an Arab dictatorship, this time Qatar, and the major media pretend not to notice.

As I noted in a recent column for the Pittsburgh *Tribune-Review*, " . . . Qatar's Arab monarchy cultivates good public relations by spending lavishly on American politicians and congressional staffers—as well as journalists and academics—to come to the capital of Doha for junkets and opulent conferences. The tours usually include visits to Al-Jazeera."

Qatar is represented in Washington, D.C. by Barbour, Griffith & Rogers, a Republican-oriented lobbying firm that worked with the staff of Barack Obama on behalf of Qatar when he was a Senator.

The money also continues to flow to the media. Former CNN anchor Tony Harris has joined Al-Jazeera English in search of the petro dollars flowing from its owner, "His Highness" the Emir. Roberts, however, is not the first journalist to bolt from CNN to Al-Jazeera. Lucia Newman, who is based in Buenos Aires for Al-Jazeera English, had been CNN's Havana bureau chief and correspondent.

It is significant that Al-Jazeera is a member of the U.S.-Qatar Business Council, which includes several major US oil companies, Qatar Petroleum, Qatar Airways, and Brown Lloyd James, the public relations agency trying to get more carriage for Al-Jazeera in US media markets. Brown Lloyd James also represents the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Qatar.

Another former CNN journalist working for Al-Jazeera is Riz Khan, who wrote a fawning biography of the Saudi billionaire Prince Alaweed bin Tala.

Al-Jazeera began in 1996, the same year bin Laden declared war on America. They have been working together ever since. In addition to the numerous al-Qaeda videos and statements aired by the channel, its anchors openly refer to suicide bombers as "martyrs" for the cause. In other words, it actively recruits Muslims to kill Americans and Israelis. Being a terrorist channel, however, does have its advantages. Al-Jazeera reporter Yosri Fouda was singled out to obtain exclusive interviews with the al-Qaeda architects of 9/11, who wanted credit for killing almost 3,000 Americans. Such terrorist "exclusives" are what Al-Jazeera specializes in.

The channel's first managing director was booted after evidence emerged that he was a lackey of the Iraqi dictator's son Uday Hussein. Captured film footage shows him acting like a lapdog of the notorious murderer and sadist.

No serious observer of the global media disputes the fact that Al-Jazeera has had an anti-American and anti-Israel bias and has been encouraging jihad against the West. The debate has been over what kind of approach the US should take toward it.

The Arabic Al-Jazeera has to be dealt with if America wants to win this war, but the immediate problem is to make sure the threat doesn't get worse with Al-Jazeera

English taking a place alongside CNN, Fox News, and MSNBC on your cable or satellite system.

Strangely, however, while Congress erupted in anger over an Arab-owned firm taking over some American ports, the prospect of an Arab-financed "news" channel directly broadcasting al-Qaeda propaganda into American homes has failed to make it on the list of top congressional priorities. But if the analogy to World War II is appropriate, we should take some time to consider that America's "greatest generation" would never have tolerated the prospect of fascist and Nazi agents and sympathizers getting access to America's airwaves. That would have been unthinkable, even treasonous. Americans knew that we had to win in the media and on the battlefield and that the enemy could not be permitted to use our own media against us.

The national uproar over an Arab company buying those US port operations forced cancellation of the deal. But when a controversial Saudi Prince spends $40 million to promote himself and his views through two major US universities and takes out a two-page ad in the Washington Post highlighting his efforts, hardly anyone in the media bats an eyelid. Perhaps that's because the Saudi Prince, Alwaleed Bin Talal, is an investor in US media companies like Time Warner and News Corporation.

It might look hypocritical for the media to highlight his manipulation of academia while staying mum about his expanding press operations. Perhaps many of our Big Media companies are anxious for giant infusions of Arab oil dollars.

Alwaleed is expanding in the media field, having announced the launch of an Islamic satellite channel "to project Islam as a religion of moderation and tolerance."

The two-page ad in the *Post* carried the headline, "We share the same world" and promoted the "Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Islamic Studies Program" at Harvard University and the "Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding" at Georgetown University. He gave them the money. They named the places after him.

Meanwhile, in France, Alwaleed spent $20 million to create a special exhibition space for the new department of Islamic arts at the Muse du Louvre in Paris. He was bestowed the medal of "Legion of Honor," with the rank of Commander, by French President Jacques Chirac in an official ceremony.

His biography, published by Harper Collins (a News Corp. company) and simply titled *Alwaleed*, is written by Riz Khan, the former CNN journalist now with Al-Jazeera English. In the book, Alwaleed says he gave $500,000 to the Council on American Islamic Relations, the group that specializes in getting conservatives kicked off the radio if they criticize Islam. Michael Graham was fired from WMAL in Washington, D.C. for offending CAIR.

He used to be a correspondent for Al-Jazeera English in Communist Cuba, reporting "objectively" on what is happening in Castro's island paradise. Now, Juan Jacomino is the Second Secretary of the Cuban Interests Section in Washington, D.C., where he is coordinating "solidarity" activities for the regime. This means that he is organizing support on US soil for Marxist governments and movements in Latin America.

His transition from Al-Jazeera to official Castro mouthpiece and "diplomat" demonstrates that the news channel has extremely low standards for deciding who is fit to be a "journalist." It is another major embarrassment for Al-Jazeera, which wants to be taken seriously as a professional news organization.

But that's not all. It turns out that Jacomino also worked for a news agency that supplied news and information to CBS News, National Public Radio, and Fox News Radio in the US.

The Cuban Interests Section, featured on Jacomino's business card, is considered Castro's embassy in Washington, D.C. since the US and Cuba do not have diplomatic relations. But it is known to be a nest of spies for Castro. The Miami *Herald* has reported that Cuban spies based in the United States operate from the Cuban Interests Section in Washington and the huge Cuban mission to the United Nations in New York City.

An Al-Jazeera story about Cuba quoted "Al-Jazeera's Juan Jacomino" as commenting about the introduction of some free enterprise in Cuba. The story added, "Our correspondent said that Cuba will continue to provide its citizens with free health care and education: social programs which are widely seen as hallmarks of the 1959 revolution."

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. 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.

So despite the introduction of some capitalism designed to stave off the bankruptcy of the regime, the Cuban people will continue to enjoy "free" health care and education. The cost of these "free" services, of course, is the lack of freedom to choose.

It turns out that Jacomino, who has his own Facebook page, worked for the Cuban government before he became a correspondent for Al-Jazeera. Back in 1997, during an on-line discussion of a US academic trip to Cuba, Jacomino was described as "a journalist at Radio Havana Cuba who specializes in the economy and was previously a functionary at the Foreign Ministry." This trip was being arranged by the pro-Castro group Global Exchange, headed by Medea Benjamin of Code Pink. Typically, these visits are arranged to expose American academics and journalists to propaganda from communist officials.

Radio Havana Cuba is the official government-run international broadcasting station of Cuba.

Jacomino has apparently "returned" to official government employment, a topic I raised when I came upon Jacomino and got his business card while covering the Latin American Solidarity Coalition conference in Washington, D.C. Jacomino assured me that Cuba's recent decision to fire hundreds of thousands of government workers did not mean the regime was going capitalist.

Jacomino has also worked for Global Radio News, which describes itself as a network of free-lance reporters. "Juan Jacomino is our full time guy in Havana always reachable when a story, or a Cuban interest situation develops," GRN says. It goes on, "Juan has worked as a radio journalist in Cuba for the past 13 years. For many years, he was the head of the English Language Service at Radio Havana Cuba, Cuba's international short-wave radio station, acting as the station's deputy director."

Here is where it gets real interesting. The list of GRN clients includes Al-Jazeera, ABC Australia, BBC World Service, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CBS, CBS News, CBS Radio, Fox News Radio, Fox TV, ITN, National Public Radio, Russia Today, Radio Live New Zealand, Sirius Radio, and Sky News, among others.

An example of how it operates can be seen in this April 15, 2010, NPR report on how "Cuba's government has taken another step toward modernizing its Soviet-style economic model." Juan Jacomino, identified as a correspondent for Global Radio News in Havana, told Michel Martin that barber shops and beauty salons were now private businesses and that everybody was extremely happy with Castro's changes.

Martin asked, "Are the barbers and the stylists happy about it and what about the customers?" Jacomino replied, in part: "To be true, they're very optimistic. My beauty parlor on the corner here, they're all very happy."

So everything was just fine in Communist Cuba.

In Washington, D.C., Jacomino was telling the assembled "solidarity activists" about the Cuban communist spies known as the "Cuban Five" that Castro wants released from US prisons. I used the occasion to question him about human rights in Cuba, particularly the case of the American, Alan Gross, who has been imprisoned by the regime on trumped-up charges of being an American spy. I was also seeking a comment on Assata Shakur (aka Joanne Chesimard), the cop-killer who escaped from prison in the US and fled to Cuba with the help of the Weather Underground. He said he had nothing new on those cases, other than what the Castro government had already said.

His panel at the "solidarity conference" was titled "Cuban Sovereignty and the struggle to free the Cuban Five" and also featured Banbose Shango, Nalda Vigezzi, and Alicia Jrapko of the International Committee for the Freedom of the Cuban 5 and the National Network on Cuba.

While Jacomino has left Al-Jazeera, the anti-American bias will remain. Consider this one-sided Al-Jazeera story featuring Gloria La Riva of the "National Committee to Free the Cuban Five." La Riva, an official of the US-based communist group known as the Party for Socialism and Liberation, was considered an objective source by the "news" channel and no other view was presented.

It stands as an example of the anti-American bias that infects Al-Jazeera and which incorporates the Marxist mentality and the propaganda of the Castro regime.

The fact that an agent of Castro wormed his way into the channel and became a source for a news agency supplying American news organizations with information from around the world is even more alarming.

But don't look for any investigations by the media into how they were duped by a mouthpiece for the Castro regime.

—America's Survival Inc., April 15, 2011