



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 49, Number 11

November 2009

STORM, IPS, and Van Jones

by Cliff Kincaid

If the Van Jones resignation is blamed on his statements about Republicans and 9/11, a great lesson will have been lost. As we argued in a previous column, “It’s the communism, stupid.” If people don’t recognize the dangers of having a communist in the White House, then the nature of the scandal will not have been understood. Blogger Trevor Loudon of New Zealand broke the story on April 6 and has some thoughts on what happened and where this story is heading.

His main point is that Van Jones and Barack Obama share the same Marxist ideology and background. Obama, however, is more careful and clever.

There’s an old saying, “If you don’t know where you’re going, it doesn’t matter which road you take.” As Trevor Loudon argues, Jones and Obama know precisely where they’re going. And the Jones resignation doesn’t mean that Obama will take a detour from the road that he wants to take the country on. Indeed, as Loudon explains, they are both on the same road.

The development of the scandal, which was seized upon by *World Net Daily*, Glenn Beck, and other media outlets and personalities, began in Loudon’s research into the existence of communist networks. Loudon blogs at www.newzeal.blogspot.com. A compilation of his most important articles on Jones can be found there.

Loudon tells me, “I began to investigate Van Jones after seeing several separate pieces of information. I first came across the name in the mid 1990s in a New Zealand socialist publication which had a small clip about Van Jones, a Yale educated lawyer involved in STORM—Standing Together to Organize a Revolutionary Movement. The name stuck.”

While researching the far-left think tank Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), which Loudon considers the Obama administration’s “ideas bank,” Loudon found a piece by IPS staffer Chuck Collins recommending Van Jones for a top government job. A September 26, 2008 article, posted on the IPS website by Chuck Collins, offered 22 names they thought would make suitable appointments for an Obama administration. He included, “Van Jones, of the Ella Baker Center, to direct the Commerce Department’s new ‘green jobs initiative.’”

Remember that this was before the election.

“I researched Jones again at that point and found he was a fellow at the Center for American Progress,” Loudon says, referring to the George Soros-funded entity.

Then, a few days after the election, he found a statement from former Weather Underground terrorist leader Mark Rudd, who was trying to ease fellow leftists’ concerns at some of Obama’s so-called “moderate” or “conservative” appointments, mostly in the economic realm. Rudd declared: “Obama plays basketball. I’m not much of an athlete, barely know the game, but one thing I do know is that you have to be able to look like you’re doing one thing but do another. That’s why all these conservative appointments are important: the strategy is feint to the right, move left. Any other strategy invites sure defeat. It would be stupid to do otherwise in this environment.

“Look to the second level appointments. There’s a whole government in waiting that [John] Podesta has at the Center for American Progress. They’re mostly progressives, I’m told (except in military and foreign policy). Cheney was extremely

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. 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.

effective at controlling policy by putting his people in at second-level positions.”

Podesta was co-chair of the Obama-Biden Transition Team.

When Jones was appointed “Green jobs Czar” in March 2009 at the White House Council on Environmental Quality, Trevor got serious. His first article about Jones’ communist connections appeared on April 6, prompting me to file a series of Freedom of Information Act requests into the question of who recommended and hired Jones. I reported the results, which amounted to Obama Administration stonewalling, in an August 25 column.

Loudon explains how relatively easy it was to ascertain the basic facts about Jones: “It didn’t take more than a few keystrokes to realize that STORM was very influential in the San Francisco Bay Area and had ties to both the Cuban and South African Communist Parties. Jones’ group—and particularly Jones himself—had ties to two former Weather Underground supporters—Jon and Nancy Frappier and the Bay Area branch of the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism. Jones was the keynote speaker at a CCDS fundraiser in Berkeley as late as February 2006.”

This Bay Area branch of the CCDS is basically the same “alliance” of former Weathermen, 60s Maoists, and modern communists who supported Obama in Chicago, Loudon explains.

Explaining more of the connections, Loudon goes on, “Two of Jones’ Bay Area radical friends, Betita Martinez (a former Maoist and CCDS member) and Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (a former Maoist and one-time Weatherman supporter), served on the board of Movement for a Democratic Society, along with Weather Underground leaders Mark Rudd and Bernardine Dohrn.”

He adds, “Obama’s old friend Bill Ayers was also involved, as were leaders of CCDS, including Angela Davis, who works with several Bay Area STORM alumni, leaders of the Communist Party USA, Democratic Socialists of America, and several Institute for Policy Studies trustees and personnel, including E. Ethelbert Miller, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Bill Fletcher, Jr. The last two are members of Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) and founders in 2008 of Progressives for Obama.”

Obama’s socialist backing goes back at least to 1996, when he received the endorsement of the Chicago branch of the DSA.

Now that Jones has resigned, Loudon says that “the focus needs to go on who hired him and why an easily identifiable communist revolutionary with a police record could serve as a presidential adviser.”

He explains, “The Obama administration boasted of its extreme vetting procedures, so I find it unlikely that if a blogger from New Zealand could identify Jones as a communist militant that the White house didn’t know.”

In terms of the evidence about who recommended and hired Jones, Loudon says that the focus that Accuracy in Media has put on far-left Oakland Democratic Rep. Barbara Lee is correct, since she was “almost certainly complicit in getting Jones hired.” Lee is chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, was a presidential campaign adviser to Obama, and is a friend of Jones and Obama. Jones and Lee worked together on “green jobs” in Oakland.

At the same time, Obama’s “brain” Valerie Jarrett is on tape as saying “they” have been watching Jones for years and were happy to recruit him. Since Jarrett is in the White House, “the spotlight must go on Jarrett,” Loudon argues. “But eventually it must come back to the president himself.”

He explains, “Jones and Obama have worked with the same people all the way.”

For example, Loudon notes that, “In 1999 Obama was called to New York to set up a left-wing think tank called Demos. He served for a time on the Demos board of trustees. Jones is still listed a member of the Demos board. Demos is a partner organization to the Institute for Policy Studies and also works closely with ACORN and Project Vote—names very familiar to any Obama watcher.”

Explaining the rise of Van Jones, Loudon says, “Seven years ago Van Jones was a Bay Area Alinskyite street communist. After hooking up with the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, Democratic Socialists of America, former ’60s Maoists, Weather Underground supporters and Demos, he managed to land a job in the White House.”

By comparison, “Twenty-two years ago Barack Obama was a Chicago Alinskyite ‘community organizer.’ After hooking up with the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, Democratic Socialists of America, former ’60s Maoists, Weather Underground supporters and Demos, he managed to land a job in the White House.”

Just a coincidence?

Loudon concludes, “Jones’ resignation is a blow for the left and a victory for freedom, but it is only the beginning in unmasking a whole series of White house radicals. They may not have been as loud mouthed and indiscrete as Van Jones, but that makes them more dangerous, not less. Millions of Americans now have some inkling of what is happening to their country. Now is the time to

amp up the pressure and research.”

Note: Trevor Loudon is the same researcher who originally unearthed the fact that Obama’s mysterious mentor “Frank” in Obama’s book *Dreams from My Father* was Communist Party member Frank Marshall Davis. We confirmed that identification with a separate source and ran with the story last year, even obtaining the 600-page FBI file on Davis. It also came out that Davis was a sex pervert, dooper, and pornographer. The Obama campaign eventually confirmed Frank’s identity, but tried to play down his relationship with Obama. Most media gave the scandal a ho-hum.

Obama associate, Marxist, and former SDS activist Carl Davidson, writing on the Rag Blog site, said that a Cliff Kincaid column posted on Saturday night, September 5, hours before Jones resigned, was the “motherlode,” meaning that we had connected the dots between Jones and Obama himself, and that scrutiny of Jones would lead to Obama.

Here’s what Davidson said: “Here’s the motherlode piece fueling the rightwing blogosphere that helped bring down Van Jones. The text will show you that it won’t stop here. They will use everything they can to cripple and take down Obama from the right, and will use more and more sham ‘connections,’ such as with me, to do it.”

It’s hardly a “sham connection” when Davidson, a Marxist and former SDS activist, has a history of working with Obama and was a member of the “Progressives for Obama” network.

—America’s Survival Inc., www.usasurvival.org, October 2009

Van Jones, Glenn Beck, and Color of Change

by Cliff Kincaid

“Is Glenn Beck finished?” is the headline over an article on a left-wing website, insisting that a campaign against Beck’s Fox News Channel program has cost him 36 advertisers and that his show may be cancelled as a result. The campaign against Beck is being waged by a group called Color of Change, whose co-founder, Van Jones, [was] Obama’s green-jobs czar.

Trevor Loudon, who deserves far more credit than he gets for smoking out the communists in and around the Obama Administration, broke the Van Jones story back

on April 6 and has run several follow-ups. Among other things, he revealed that Jones was a leading member of a Marxist organization known by the acronym STORM, which means Standing Together to Organize a Revolutionary Movement. A 96-page history of the organization mentions how several STORM members had traveled to Cuba in the summer of 1999 as part of the Venceremos Brigade. This is the group that was originally sponsored by the Castro regime and the Weather Underground.

To add to the mystery, it turns out that “Van” Jones is not even his real name. His real first name is Anthony; he says he changed it because “Van” sounded cool. Various accounts say that he has been arrested twice.

Aaron Klein of *World Net Daily* then wrote a story on Jones, citing Loudon’s work. Since then, Beck and others have seized on it. Now, some more of this fascinating story can be told. I have been engaged for months in a series of Freedom of Information Act requests with the Obama Administration for information about Jones and how he was hired.

It seems clear that Jones has undergone, with powerful sponsors and benefactors, an extreme makeover. Beck, to his credit, is trying to peel away the protective cover. He needs our support to remain on the air and pursue this story. The trail will most certainly lead beyond Jones himself.

Who Wrote His Book?

Whatever his real name, he was praised by actor Leonardo DiCaprio in an April 30, 2009, *Time* magazine article as someone who is “redefining green.” This is one of several sympathetic stories about him.

His book, *The Green Collar Economy*, includes only the name of “Van Jones” as the author on the cover. But it appears that the book was largely written by Ariane Conrad, an activist and writer whose name appears on the inside, as in, by “Van Jones, with Ariane Conrad.” The use of “with” is morally obligatory and suggests that she helped out in some way with the actual writing.

She says on her blog that she “helped Van write his first, *New York Times* bestselling book” and describes herself as someone who has “specialized in working collaboratively with authors, especially first-timers, to produce non-fiction books.”

However, the Jones book relies on discredited “experts” such as Rachel Carson and Paul Ehrlich, who exaggerated environmental dangers and ushered in stronger government controls and regulations. The book denounces the “Indian-killing Teddy Roosevelt,” nuclear power, and the Iraq War and, sounding like Obama, Jones says

that “we will have to fundamentally restructure the U.S. economy.” He urges a new global warming treaty.

Ironically, the book was published by Harper One, an imprint of Harper Collins, a division of the same company, News Corporation, which now employs Glenn Beck. The foreword to the Jones book by Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. describes his revolutionary plans for a “brave new world” and proclaims, “Let the revolution begin.”

In addition to being one of Ariane Conrad’s successful “first-timers,” Van Jones’ meteoric rise was assisted by many different liberal-left foundations, including the Open Society Institute of George Soros, which helped finance his “Green for All” organization. His book includes endorsements from Thomas L. Friedman of the *New York Times*, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, TV host Tavis Smiley, former Senator Tom Daschle, Arianna Huffington, and Larry Brilliant of Google.

I visited one of his organizations in Oakland, California, the Ella Baker Center, and discovered a photograph of Communist Angela Davis on the first floor. Ella Baker worked with Communists such as Anne Braden. This fact is noted on the official Baker bio distributed by the organization named in her honor. They are proud of this fact, although they claim that “she had mixed feelings about communism” and only embraced socialism “as a more humane alternative to capitalism.”

Jones shows up on a list of “veteran activists” attending a conference in the summer of 1998 at the University of Illinois at Chicago, the same place where Bill Ayers is now a professor. The purpose was to plot the “Black Liberation Agenda for the 21st Century” under the auspices of the Black Radical Congress. Angela Davis participated and the Communist Party USA helped organize the event.

One of Jones’ sons is named Cabral, in honor of Amilcar Cabral, the African Marxist who spoke to Castro’s Tricontinental Congress in 1966 and concluded with these words: “Our wish is that every national liberation movement represented here may be able to repeat in its own country, arms in hand, in unison with its people, the already legendary cry of Cuba: *Patria O Muerte, Venceremos!* Death to the Forces of Imperialism! Free, Prosperous, and Happy Country for Each of our Peoples! *Venceremos!*”

Stonewalling

The Obama transition project developed a seven-page questionnaire that included 63 questions about an applicant’s background and qualifications for a federal job. The document was supposedly for “every candidate for

Cabinet and other high-ranking positions in the incoming administration,” as CNN put it. But there is no indication at this point that Van Jones ever filled out such a form. At the very least, it can be said that I have not been able to obtain a copy of it—and I have asked for any such document.

I have been engaged for months in a series of communications with the White House Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ), where Jones work[ed], in an attempt to discover who hired Jones and why, and what was known about Jones when he was appointed. I have had to resort to using the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) on several occasions to attempt to get answers. But the answers have not been satisfactory.

However, there is every reason to believe, in this case, that where there is smoke, there is fire. The still-untold story is where the Van Jones trail leads. It obviously leads to the White House. But to whom?

Definitive answers will require that the media stop running puff pieces about Jones and start investigating his background. Glenn Beck should not carry this load alone.

On Fox News, Glenn Beck has raised the question of who “vetted” Van Jones for a job and whether the FBI was bypassed. This is a legitimate area of inquiry. But if Beck’s show is forced off the air, because of advertiser pressure, Jones and his patrons in the White House will have won. And freedom of information and transparency in government will be the losers.

I haven’t reported the answers to my queries until now. But since Glenn Beck’s show could rise or fall, depending on the outcome of his battle with Jones, I believe what is known, or is not known, should now be put on the record. It is clear that Beck is on the right track and he deserves enormous credit for tackling this important story. It may be as important as the Frank Marshall Davis scandal.

What remains to be determined is what personal relationship, if any, there is between Jones and Obama. If Obama didn’t select him for a post in the administration, who did?

I began this quest, after Trevor Loudon and *World Net Daily* ran their stories, with telephone calls and emails to Van Jones himself, his assistant, and the press representative for the CEQ. None of these calls or emails was returned.

—America’s Survival Inc., www.usasurvival.org, September 2009

California: Green on the Outside... Red...

by Arthur B. Robinson

In “Leaping the Efficiency Gap: Experience has shown that there is more to saving energy than designing better light bulbs and refrigerators. Researchers say it will need a mixture of persuasion, regulation, and taxation,” Dan Charles, *Science* 325, 804-811, brings word that ending American prosperity and completing the bankruptcy of the United States will require further increases in regulation and taxation—and that the Obama Administration has appointed just the right people to do this.

California, it turns out, has increased its electricity consumption in parallel with the rest of the United States over the past 30 years. California per capita consumption, however, has stayed level, while elsewhere in the country per capita consumption has risen 40%.

Steven Chu, now Obama’s Secretary of Energy, and John Holdren, now Obama’s Science Advisor, say that this lowered per capita energy use was mostly due to wonderful conservation measures that they helped to pioneer in California. Steven Chu was recently referenced in *Access to Energy* after he falsely claimed in a Caltech commencement address that sea levels are now rising five times faster than they were in 1870. Actually, the rate of rise is unchanged, but that did not fit in with Chu’s harangue in favor of the Obama “cap and tax” energy rationing bill.

Other efficiency scientists disagree, Alan Sanstad at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory points out that California electricity usage grew as fast as the rest of the country, while California population grew much faster. James Sweeny at Stanford attributes only one-fourth of the per capita electricity savings to state government energy policies—taxation and regulation. The other three-fourths he attributes to mild weather, increasing urbanization, larger numbers of people in each household, and high prices for energy and land that drove heavy industry out of the state.

Charles chronicles the switch of state government energy policy in California under Governor Jerry Brown. California canceled planned nuclear power plants, passed efficiency regulations for refrigerators and buildings, and ordered electricity companies to spend money persuading their customers not to use their product.

During the succeeding decades, California became the nation’s leading importer of legal and illegal foreign immigrants—mostly poor people without technological

skills who cannot afford to use much electricity per capita. Simultaneously, California became the nations’ leading exporter of affluent, productive, technologically skilled American immigrants to other states and countries, who escaped California’s excessive taxation and regulation and took many of California’s electricity-requiring industries with them.

Throughout the world, per capita electricity use is an excellent measure of prosperity and quality of life, and rise in electricity use reliably indicates increases in these positive accomplishments. Conversely, decrease of electricity use indicates falling prosperity and decreased quality of life. American and Chinese electricity use has fallen, for example, during the recent economic decline. Per capita electricity use and per capita prosperity in California have not increased in 30 years—and the state is now bankrupt.

It has taken several decades for California to squander the riches bequeathed to it by previous generations of citizens working in a free-enterprise economy. Even the electronics revolution has not been enough to save it.

While the remaining adults in Sacramento are trying to cut costs in the state’s various socialistic enterprises, they are having only marginal success. California continues to pile up enormous debts, which are beginning to perilously degrade its credit ratings.

The cancellation of those nuclear power plants in California has raised electricity prices and helped to bankrupt the state. In its rush to be “greener” than the rest of the country, California now classifies nuclear energy as a green energy source, and its utilities dutifully brag about their increase in use of green energy—primarily nuclear energy that they are now buying from power plants in other states.

So, now Obama has chosen two of the architects of California’s energy experiment, Steven Chu and John Holdren, to the nation’s science and energy programs. One object, no doubt, is to stop the growth of per capita electrical energy use in the United States. Then we will not need to decipher arcane financial indicators to learn the health of our economy. Simple reference to decline in electricity usage will quantitatively chronicle our descent into poverty.

Obama has promised sharply higher electricity prices, and this is one promise that he obviously intends to keep. The cap-and-trade bill is the first installment. Taxation, regulation, and government-sponsored litigation will be the mechanisms. As “experience has shown,” according to the title of the Dan Charles article, “regulation and taxation” will be required. “Litigation” is often omitted

from media discussions of this triumvirate of tyranny because it draws attention to the privileges of the nation's lawyers—an essential large source of cash for the Democratic Party.

The California accomplishment is well-encapsulated by a drive along Interstate 8 from Southern California to Arizona. One drives through forests of turning windmills—typically many are not turning at all, with tiny power lines emerging from their underbrush. These advertise California's "green agenda." Through the same corridor run huge power transmission lines carrying electrical energy, costing only 1.65 cents per kilowatt hour, from the Palo Verde nuclear power station near Phoenix—energy that powers Los Angeles.

California now brags that it will convert to electric cars. Regardless of even the most draconian increases in taxation and regulation, California will not be able to energize those cars without increasing per capita electricity use. How will the state find entrepreneurs crazy enough to build electrical generating capacity in California or to accept California IOUs to send power from other states?

California may be leading the nation in future energy policies. Certainly Obama's appointees indicate that it is. The question is, where is it leading us, and are we foolish enough to follow?

—*Access to Energy*, May 2009

Fidel and the Kennedys

by Humberto Fontova

The secret history of how Communist Cuba danced its way to survival in America's shadow.

"The Kennedy family, in particular the assassinated President, John F. Kennedy, were representative of a new generation of Americans confronting the old and dirty politics of men in the mold of Nixon. . . . The Kennedy family's (role) in Barack Obama's electoral victory should not be overlooked. Without that moral, political, and financial support, the dirty saga of the Bush and Nixon clans would be continuing."

That was a portion of an editorial last week in Stalinist Cuba's version of Nazi Germany's *Der Sturmer* regard-

ing the passing of Senator Kennedy. But no one familiar with Cuban history should doubt the editorials' sincerity. Fidel and Raul Castro, after all, owe much to the Kennedy family. And very early in the game, Castro got Nixon's number as shrewdly as Nixon had gotten Castro's.

"We'd better hope Kennedy wins this election," Fidel Castro confided to a subaltern in 1960. "If Nixon wins our revolution won't last."

"Nixon was determined that the invasion succeed," recalls Marine Colonel Robert Cushman, Eisenhower's senior military aide in 1960. "Nixon was the White House action officer for the anti-Castro project, the main booster."

"Do whatever is necessary in Cuba," Eisenhower counseled JFK when handing over the reins. "We simply cannot allow that regime to go on. Help the Cubans to the utmost."

Well, we all know the rest of the story.

"Kennedy pulled defeat out of the jaws of victory," Nixon wrote about the Bay of Pigs and Missile Crisis. "Then gave the Soviets squatters rights in our backyard."

"We ended up getting exactly what we'd wanted all along," snickered Nikita Khrushchev in his memoirs, confirming Nixon. "Security for Fidel Castro's regime and American missiles removed from Turkey. Until today the U.S. has complied with her promise not to interfere with Castro and not to allow anyone else to interfere with Castro. After Kennedy's death, his successor Lyndon Johnson assured us that he would keep the promise not to invade Cuba."

"We locked Castro's communism into Latin America and threw away the key to its removal," growled Lyndon Johnson's opponent in 1964, Barry Goldwater. "I would help Cuban exiles OPENLY. I'd give them the guns and ammunition to blast Castro out of his island stronghold now defended with Soviet arms."

Then the Butcher of Budapest twisted the knife and snickered yet again: "It would have been ridiculous for us to go to war over Cuba—for a country 12,000 miles away. For us, war was unthinkable. So the threat that so rattled the Knights of Camelot and inspired such cinematic and literary epics of drama and derring-do by their court

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.schwarz-report.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

scribes and cinematographers, were pure hooley.

So the feats of courage, coolness, and resolve that inspired Camelot apologist Arthur Schlesinger to hyperventilate that: “the whole world saw . . . American leadership unsurpassed in the responsible management of power. . . a combination of toughness, nerve, and wisdom, so brilliantly controlled, so matchlessly calibrated that it dazzled the world!” It was in fact the craven succumbing by America’s Best and Brightest to a schoolyard bully issued by a shoe-banging Ukrainian peasant.

Not that Kennedy was above a swindle himself — but these he aimed against his own countrymen and at the expense of his country's national security. To wit:

“The Republicans have allowed a communist dictatorship to flourish eight jet minutes from our borders,” accused Kennedy right before his famous debate with Richard Nixon during the 1960 presidential campaign. “We must support anti-Castro fighters. So far these freedom fighters have received no help from our government.”

Two weeks before that crucial debate in October of 1960, JFK had been briefed by the CIA (on Eisenhower’s orders) about Cuban invasion plans (what would later be known as the Bay of Pigs invasion). So JFK knew perfectly well the Republican administration was helping Cuban freedom fighters. But since the plans were secret, he knew perfectly well Nixon couldn’t rebut.

Which is to say, to blindside his Republican opponent Kennedy relied on that opponent’s patriotism. Let’s face it, Republicans are at a woeful disadvantage here. Nixon bit his tongue. He could easily have stomped Kennedy on it. But to some candidates, national security (and those Cuban freedom-fighters’ lives) outweighed debating points.

Castro/Che groupies all love to gasp: “Oh Gosh! Gee Whiz! Isn’t it exciting how Castro has defied ten U.S. Presidents! . . . Oh he is just so *dreamy!*” And, if you think I exaggerate, here’s some fully documented quotes:

“Fidel lets the gun drop to the ground, slaps his thigh and stands erect. He is like a mighty penis coming to life!”—activist Abbie Hoffman

“You are the first and greatest hero to appear in the world since the second world war! It’s as if the ghost of Cortez had appeared in our century riding Zapata’s white horse!”—novelist Norman Mailer

“One of the most charming men I’ve ever met! . . . Castro is personally overpowering. It’s much more than charisma. Castro remains one of the few truly electric personalities in a world where his peers seem dull!”—Former Robert Kennedy press Secretary and Democratic campaign operative, Frank Mankiewicz

“As Fidel spoke I could feel a peculiar sensation in

his presence. It’s as if I am meeting with a new force of nature! Here is a man so filled with energy he is almost a different species! Power radiates from him!”—Filmmaker Saul Landau

Well, as usual, when it comes to media and scholarly depictions of anything relating to Castro/Cuba, the truth is not just different—but the total opposite of what you get in the mainstream media and college textbooks.

In fact, after Camelot’s “combination of toughness, nerve and wisdom, so brilliantly controlled, so matchlessly calibrated that it dazzled the world!” the “plucky” Castro’s “defiance” of the U.S. took the form of the U.S. Coast Guard and even the British Navy (when some intrepid exile freedom fighters moved their operation to the Bahamas) shielding him from exile attacks. Far from “defying” a superpower, Castro hid behind the skirts of two superpowers, plus the British Empire.

And at least in this case, as evidenced by the recent editorial, we cannot accuse the Castro brothers of ingratitude.

—*Frontpagemagazine.com*, September 7, 2009

Communism in the Classroom

by Gary Feuerberg

Most people aren’t aware of the full extent of the brutality and deaths under communist rule, according Dr. Paul Kengor, executive director of the Center for Vision and Values and anti-communist expert.

“The grisly history of Red Terror is too often neglected in the modern classroom at the typical American university,” he said, speaking at the news conference “Communism in the Classroom” at the National Press Club on Aug. 20.

The ideological struggle between the West and the Soviet Union was dominant for four decades following World War II. Many intellectuals in the West, however, still fail to acknowledge the Soviet Union’s concentration camps (the gulags), artificial famines, purges, deportations, executions, and its hatred for anything that resembled religious devotion, Kengor asserts. Such reluctance continues into the 21st century in the case of China, North Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba, he says.

Kengor is professor of political science at Grove City College, Pennsylvania. He concerns himself with how communism is regarded in universities, and the trickle-

down effect this has when professors write history and civics textbooks for U.S. high school students. He cites a 2002 study of 20 textbooks representative of the phenomenon used in Wisconsin.

“I could not find a single text that listed figures on the total number of deaths by communist governments, even though the data was provided in categories, such as war-time deaths,” he says, even though data is readily available in works like *The Black Book of Communism*.

The Black Book of Communism, first published in French in 1997, states that the number of deaths caused by communism in the 20th century was at least 100 million—a figure more than double the combined losses of World War I and II, and far greater than the 25 million attributed to the Nazis.

“Right-wing dictators like Cuba’s Batista and Chile’s Pinochet were treated far more harshly than [communist] Fidel Castro, who generated far more victims and was still in power,” he asserts.

Treatment of Chinese Communists in High School Texts

Kengor was appalled at the uncritical view and, he says, tacit approval in high school texts of the communist regime that has ruled China since 1949. Not only are there no condemnations of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)’s human rights violations, he says, but the texts offered “rosy descriptions of life in the contemporary Chinese classroom and of youth groups like the Young Pioneers.” The Young Pioneers are the branch of the CCP targeted toward the young generation, aged 6-14 years.

One text, *Global Insights: People and Cultures*, described the purpose of the Young Pioneers as “to train children to be good citizens,” according to Kengor. The Communist Youth League, the next rung up on the Party ladder, is described as “an honor organization for high school students.” The section contains neither critical examination nor explanation, said Kengor, and “literally reads like official agitprop from the Chinese Central Committee.”

Outside critics generally regard the Young Pioneers and the Communist Youth League as tools for the CCP to indoctrinate children and inculcate them with Party doctrine. The Great Leap Forward, where between 20 and 43 million Chinese starved to death from 1959-61 as a result of Mao’s policies, is also described in glowing and wildly inaccurate terms in this textbook, said Kengor.

Anti-Anti-Communism

Professor Kengor’s lectures about the “savagery of communism” on campuses around the U.S. receive tremendous interest from young students, he says.

Today’s undergraduates are too young to have a strong impression of the falling of the Berlin Wall, and have not lived through the Cold War. Learning about “communist barbarism” for the first time is an eye opener,” he says. Some professors, however, are contemptuous toward this particular lecture, and regard it as somehow going too far.

Why is it then that professors at universities can be quite severe on the Nazis, say on Auschwitz, but not the Soviet gulags (or China’s Re-education Through Labor camps, to use a more contemporary example)? Why the double standard by many intellectuals with respect to the Nazis and Soviets (or Maoists)? The answer says Kengor is not that the professors are Marxists (though some may be) or that they harbor Marxist utopian ideas (though many do), but that they “despise” the anti-communist.

Kengor says they are “anti-anti-communist more so than pro-communist.”

Their dislike for the anti-communist may be a hold-over of negative sentiments from the McCarthy era, when public witch hunts of suspected communist sympathizers were in vogue. Latent utopian Marxist ideals still floating around academic circles may also cause some scholars to not want to hear about the atrocities, Kengor says.

Two notable victims of “anti-anti-Communism” are the Harvard professors of Russian history, Professor Richard Pipes and his younger colleague, Vladimir Brovkin.

Pipes, who regarded communism as “sheer barbarism,” was consistently attacked by liberal colleagues for being too harsh on communism. Fortunately for Pipes, he was given tenure early in his career and his colleagues couldn’t threaten his job.

Brovkin, on the hand, who came 40 years after Pipes arrived in the U.S., got into trouble for being “too passionately anti-communist” and for “demonizing the Soviet regime.” Lacking the shield of tenure and black-listed by academic Sovietologists, he wound up teaching high school in Florida, said Kengor.

—*Epoch Times*, August 27, 2009

