



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 53, Number 4

April 2013

Honoring Vladimir Bukovsky

by Vladimir Kara-Murza

On Sunday, December 30, Vladimir Bukovsky—writer, scientist, human rights campaigner, and one of the founders of the dissident movement in the USSR—celebrated his 70th birthday. IMR Senior Policy Advisor Vladimir Kara-Murza recalls the milestones in Bukovsky’s life—and urges the present-day Russian opposition to heed his advice.

Vladimir Bukovsky does not like to be called a politician, preferring to be known as a neurophysiologist, writer, or, at the very least, civic activist. In truth, he never engaged in politics: he merely realized, at an early age, that he could not reconcile himself to live quietly with a criminal and mendacious regime that sought to make millions of people its silent accomplices. Bukovsky’s protest was a moral one. “We did not play politics, we did not draft programs for the ‘people’s liberation,’” he recalls in his memoirs, *To Build a Castle* (a must-read for anyone interested in Russian history). “Our only weapon was *glasnost* (openness). Not propaganda, but *glasnost*, so that no one could say ‘I did not know.’ The rest is a matter for each person’s conscience.”

“I did not know” was a popular answer among members of the older generation when asked by the youngsters of the 1950s about Stalin’s times. The public condemnation of Stalinist crimes at the 1956 Communist Party congress and (almost immediately) the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution, which showed that the nature of the regime has not changed, were formative events for Bukovsky. His protest activity began literally during his school days: he joined a clandestine anti-Soviet group and published an underground satirical journal. In response, he was expelled from school, summoned to a dressing-down by the Moscow City Communist Party Committee, and barred from studying at university (he nevertheless won admission to Moscow State University, only to be discovered and expelled a year later).

Vladimir Bukovsky is one of the founders of the Soviet dissident movement, which was born in the fall of 1960 on Moscow’s Mayakovsky Square. There, a group of yet-unknown young activists, poets, and actors (including Yuri Galanskov, Eduard Kuznetsov, Vladimir Osipov, Ilya Bokshtein, and Vsevolod Abdulov) held public readings of banned poetry—Akhmatova, Pasternak, Mandelstam, Tsvetaeva. They also read from their own works and the works of their contemporaries, which would soon be disseminated as samizdat (literally “self-publications,” the clandestine reproduction and distribution of banned literature). Samizdat, too, was born on Mayakovsky Square. The authorities responded in their usual manner: with dispersals of the meetings by bulldozers and snow ploughs; provocations by Komsomol (Young Communist League) operatives; beatings and arrests. Yet the “seditious” meetings continued in the heart of the Soviet capital for almost two years:

That amazing community, which would later be called a ‘movement’, was being born. It had no leaders or followers. . . . Each of us, like a nerve cell, participated in this amazing orchestra without a conductor, compelled only by his or her sense of self-respect and personal responsibility for what was happening.” (Vladimir Bukovsky, *To Build a Castle*)

Vladimir Bukovsky was one of the organizers of the unofficial poetry readings on Moscow’s Mayakovsky Square, the birthplace of the Soviet dissident movement.

The Mayakovsky readings were only the beginning: one can study the history of dissent in the Soviet Union by reading Bukovsky’s biography. He was involved in organizing the December 1965 “Glasnost Rally” on Pushkin Square (Moscow’s first opposition demonstration in four decades); the January 1967 rally against political arrests (also on Pushkin Square); and, probably his most important endeavor, the public campaign against “punitive psychiatry” used by the KGB against

dissenters. After his first arrest in 1963 for “possession of anti-Soviet literature,” Bukovsky (then 20 years old) was brought to the office of Lieutenant-General Mikhail Svetlichny, the head of the Moscow KGB. “Svetlichny said a very simple thing,” Bukovsky recalls in the documentary *They Chose Freedom*. “Here is the arrest warrant. If you honestly tell us everything—where you got this book, who gave it to you, to whom you gave it [to read], I will not sign it, and you will go home. If you refuse, I will sign it, and you will go to jail.’ . . . I found such a formulation insulting, and cursed at him. He did not say anything, just shook his head, signed the warrant, and said ‘Take him away.’”

Vladimir Bukovsky paid for his refusal to go along with the regime’s lies with 12 years in prisons, labor camps, and “special psychiatric hospitals.” Not once did he admit his guilt, ask for clemency, disown his words, or betray his friends. “We fought desperately against this regime of scoundrels. We were a handful of unarmed people in the face of a mighty state with the world’s most monstrous machine of repression. And we won. The regime had to retreat. And even in prisons we proved too dangerous for them.” (Vladimir Bukovsky, *To Build a Castle*) On December 18, 1976, a handcuffed Bukovsky was driven to Chkalovsky military airfield and, accompanied by a convoy from the KGB’s elite Alpha unit (that was its first operation), was flown to Zurich’s international airport. Communist Party Central Committee documents referred to this as “measures relating to the liberation of Comrade L. Corvalan.”

In the end, the regime was unable to defeat its enemy inside the country. In the early 1990s, Vladimir Bukovsky and Member of Parliament Galina Starovoitova tried to convince the Russian leadership to conduct a trial of the Communist regime and the KGB in order to help the country comprehend its past and avoid repeating it.

The next time Vladimir Bukovsky came to Russia was at the invitation of Boris Yeltsin in 1991, before the attempted August coup d’état—and again just after the coup, when barricades were still being dismantled near the Moscow White House, and when the empty pedestal from the toppled statue of KGB founder Felix Dzerzhinsky was still hand-painted with a swastika and hammer-and-sickle—with an equal sign between them. “Let us not flatter ourselves—the dragon is not yet dead. He is mortally wounded, his spine is broken, but he still holds human souls in his clinging paws,” Bukovsky said at a rally on Mayakovsky Square in September 1991. “The Lubyanka [KGB] archives, seized by the Russian government, contain secrets of dreadful crimes. Only by

making them public, by handing them over to an objective international commission, will we be able to cleanse ourselves from this filth.” Unfortunately, Bukovsky’s call was not heeded. The new Russian authorities, unwilling to “rock the boat,” refrained from fully opening the archives, from officially condemning the Communist Party and the KGB for their crimes, and from introducing lustrations for those who had participated in the crimes. A genuine moral renewal of society never took place. Russia’s young democracy was not protected from a comeback by the ideological successors of Yuri Andropov and Vladimir Kryuchkov. This comeback came just eight years after the democratic victory of August 1991. As Bukovsky had warned, “it is like dealing with a wounded beast—if you do not finish it off, it will attack you.”

Today, Bukovsky is not retiring or leaving public life—and his upcoming 70th birthday will do nothing to change that. His experience in fighting the KGB system is too relevant; his advice too valuable; his standing among the leaders and supporters of the present-day Russian opposition too high. During the frozen (in all senses of the word) winter of 2007, at the height of Putin’s power, Bukovsky was nominated for president by the democratic opposition as a symbol of moral protest. The line of people wishing to sign his nomination papers extended for seven hours; the Sakharov Center could not accommodate everyone, and people had to wait outside in Moscow’s freezing temperatures.

In December 2007, Vladimir Bukovsky was officially nominated for president of Russia by an assembly of voters in Moscow. The Central Electoral Commission headed by Vladimir Churov denied him access to the ballot.

“The opposition needs a candidate for president—strong, uncompromising, decisive, with irreproachable political and, more importantly, moral authority,” read the statement of the Initiative Group that nominated Bukovsky, “Russia needs its own Vaclav Havel, not a new successor from [the KGB].”

Vladimir Bukovsky was exchanged for Chilean Communist Party leader Luis Corvalan, who had been jailed by General Augusto Pinochet.

There are few people like Vladimir Bukovsky in any society—let alone Russian society, which has been wrecked by decades of Soviet dictatorship, and by 13 years of Putin’s cynical authoritarianism. It is likely that the coming years will bring significant changes to Russia. During this critical period, Bukovsky’s words will be very important. This time, they must be heard.

—*FrontPage Magazine*, December 31, 2012

Giving the Chinese Communists the Store

by Phyllis Schlafly

The China problem is not just that China is raking in trillions of dollars because of Obama's spending and borrowing binges, and it's not just that government policies encourage well-paying US manufacturing jobs to move overseas. An even bigger problem is that the Obama administration is about to give Communist China some of our most precious and up-to-date military technology.

This particular chicanery started when the Obama administration foolishly tried to use taxpayers' money to force green energy to replace fossil fuels. But green energy can't compete in the free market because it's so much more expensive to produce.

Obama gave a half-billion US tax dollars to Solyndra to subsidize making solar panels, yet the company promptly went bankrupt. Then Obama awarded a grant of \$250 million of Stimulus money to a firm called A123 to make batteries for electric cars, which also went bankrupt and now is trying to pay off its investors by auctioning the company.

The high bidder at \$256 million in a December auction was the Wanxiang Group, which has close ties to Communist China's government. Its chief executive is one of the wealthiest men in China, a prominent figure in the Chinese Communist Party.

This sale is dangerous to US security because it involves the transfer of advanced battery technology using lithium iron phosphate, which produces longer life, lighter weight, higher power, and more stable batteries that can operate in both very low and very high temperatures. In China's hands, the new A123 technology will threaten US electrical power and communications grids.

China is eager for this acquisition because of its potential use in space weapons, anti-satellite missiles, lasers, and counter-space systems. Retired Navy Vice Admiral Barry Costello, former commander of the Navy's Third Fleet, says the sale of A123 will give a big boost to China's military expansion and warfare capability in space, cyber warfare, and unmanned vehicles, all of which rely on battery power.

One option considered is to sell only the commercial technology to Wanxiang and sell its US defense contracts to a US firm, Navitas Systems. But pretending that A123's advanced technology can be sold to China only for business purposes is a pipe dream.

A123 employs more than 100 scientists and engineers working on sensitive materials that are part of what is scheduled to be sold to Wanxiang. If China gets access to A123's commercial applications, it will be easy for China to reverse-engineer the military applications.

If Wanxiang owns A123's intellectual property and highly skilled technicians, that means controlling today's battery technology plus a 10-year leap in development. Republican Senator John Thune of South Dakota and Chuck Grassley (Iowa) warn that the deal could give Wanxiang "access to these defense contracts and technology used by multiple branches of the US military."

This giant and valuable gift would give Communist China cutting-edge, military-grade technology and control of the future supply chain. China would be able to use all this technology to continue its rapid buildup of a military to achieve dominance in the Pacific.

The US military has made a big investment in A123's technology, which the Army's chief of technology acquisition has called the "technology of the decade." To develop it, the Air Force spent \$4 million, the Navy spent \$700,000, and the Army spent \$21.8 million.

This technology is critical to many US military operations, proprietary applications for underwater vehicles, shipboard advanced systems, unmanned ground and air systems, and portable power in satellites, combat vehicles, and precision munitions. It is valuable to support soldiers in unfriendly ground conditions and excessive heat, and can lighten their heavy loads.

More than two-dozen members of Congress have spoken out to oppose the sale of A123. Letters have been sent to the Secretaries of the Treasury, Defense, Energy, and Homeland Security urging consideration of the "potential harmful consequences, including any threats to domestic security, innovation leadership, and job creation."

US Trade Representative Ron Kirk, in his year-end report to Congress, accused China of flouting World Trade Organization rules and misusing the complaint procedure to retaliate against other countries. Kirk's report also ac-

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.

cused China of violating WTO rules by forcing other firms to give their trade secrets to China.

Especially since US taxpayers funded the development of these assets, it is contrary to common sense to transfer this cutting-edge battery technology to China and disadvantage US national security. Whether we will allow Wanxiang to buy A123 with its new battery technology is now under review by CFIUS (Committee on Foreign Investment in the US).

Tell your Members of Congress to stop this giveaway of US technology to Communist China.

—Townhall, January 15, 2013

From Capitalism to Communism

by Oleg Atbashian

In the libertarian sci-fi classic, *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress*, Robert A. Heinlein describes a successful revolution of the individualistic, free-market-oriented residents of the Moon against the Earth's tyrannical big government. The ins and outs of agitating and organizing the masses to fight the oppressive Authority feel just as realistic as the finer points of everyday life in the underground Lunar cities of the future.

The proposed revolutionary scenario could even serve as a workable model for similar real-life endeavors, if only the renowned futurist author hadn't neglected to factor in the immanent function of any oppressive regime: systemic brainwashing of its subjects through the media, education, and entertainment channels.

If the tyrants on Earth were worth their salt, all the freedom-loving colonists would be subjected to an intense, manipulative indoctrination, which would shape their self-image as small and sinful "little guys" vis-à-vis the powerful, virtuous government that serves the powerless and protects them against all enemies, including themselves.

Thus, the government's propagandistic narrative would establish the illusion of a society divided into three major classes: the ruling government class, endowed with benevolent powers to guide or punish; the majority class of hapless losers, whose survival depended on the government's largesse and protection; and an unquantifiable class of demonized mysterious enemies of the government and, by extension, of the people, who would be the perceived

culprits of all failures, hardships, and misery of the little guys' everyday existence.

The majority class would itself be divided into an assortment of narrow-interest groups, held together only by the glue of government's redistributive, pacifying, and equalizing powers, as well as by their shared hostility towards the designated "enemies."

The prevailing feelings in such a society would be the collectivist fervor, envy of individual achievers, fear of chaos in the absence of the government's protection, hatred of anti-government elements, and hope for a better future once all the hidden enemies are unveiled and eliminated.

This makes Heinlein's scenario of a free-market revolution highly unlikely. No self-respecting oppressive regime would start a crackdown on the rebels without priming the population with a mass-media campaign that would show how big government benefits most of the people, and how the resistance is destroying the lives of the common folk. As a minimum, the government would parade a poor little girl crying on camera because she and her family suffered from the hands of the rebels. Even those who didn't hate the rebels before would hate them now.

In a society shaped by the government's mind games of manipulative illusions, a dissenter sticks out like a sore thumb. Once the resistance has been demonized, its members will be quickly identified and denounced by the compliant citizenry, labeled as the enemy, and be dealt with by law enforcement.

In the end, the self-preservation of modern-day totalitarianism is ensured, not so much by the secret police with its army of snitches and brutal enforcers, as by modern technologies of psychological manipulation through the media, education, and entertainment.

Perhaps, Heinlein's tyrannical regime came off so hapless because the author had had no experience of living in a totalitarian statist system. Writing *The Moon* in the early 1960s, he likely modeled the actions of the Lunar Authority on the methods used by the US government against the Communists. And, as we now know, the US government failed that mission, just like the Lunar Authority did in Heinlein's novel.

The FBI mostly relied on surveillance, infiltration, and recruiting of informants. Occasional amateur propaganda designed to immunize Americans against the seductive statist rhetoric turned out to be a flash in the pan. It was child's play compared to the vast arsenal deployed by the KGB and its affiliates in Communist countries.

The United States at the time didn't have an all-

encompassing, totalitarian propaganda machine like its enemies did. State-enforced mind control, by definition, is incompatible with the principles of living in a free world. Statists, by contrast, have no such limitations; playing mind games for them is a way of life. This makes it asymmetrical warfare.

Statists, of course, would like to have everything shared—except their power. In free democracies they always demand their share of political power—and always get what they want. However, once they are in power, they keep it to themselves and demonize the opposition.

The Marxist ideal of Communism is an altruistic collectivist society of the future, in which there will be no need for government, family, or private property. Freed from capitalist exploitation, people are expected to unleash their full potential and create unprecedented material abundance. The selfish notion of the pursuit of individual happiness will wither away. There will be no money, no greed, no deprivation, and, therefore, no crime.

However, since a society can't directly leap from capitalism into communism, Marx reasoned that a dictatorial socialist state would be a necessary transition in order to develop the required material base, help to spread the revolution around the world, and to condition the people's minds by uprooting greed and selfishness (or to eliminate those individuals who can't be conditioned).

Leaving the debunking of utopian follies for another time, let's just say that the totalitarian socialist state is where they always get bogged down. Despite their ideal of a stateless future, the leftists invariably become ruthless and uncompromising statists. It no longer matters whether it's a doctrinaire Marxist socialism or "corporate" fascism; if the end result is evil, original intentions don't count.

In Russia, the communists used to demonize their opponents long before the Revolution, which made it easier for them to physically eliminate the opposition later. As soon as they were in full control of the government, they began to demonize entire segments of the society, subcultures, and classes of people whom they deemed incapable of change.

Observe a visual example of communist demonization: an agitprop poster titled "Enemies of the 5-Year Plan," more broadly interpreted as "enemies of socialism" and, by extension, "enemies of the people."

A disparaging verse at the bottom describes who the enemies are:

The wealthy landowner

The kulak (a pejorative term for a wealthy farmer who "exploits" hired labor)

The drunk

The clergy (a Russian Orthodox Priest)

The bourgeois press (a non-compliant, independent journalist)

The capitalist (a banker, industrialist, merchant)

The Menshevik (a political opponent from a different communist faction)

The surviving remnants of the pre-revolutionary law enforcement and the military

The wealthy farmers, being the most numerous group and the most likely to resist the collectivization of agriculture, were subjected to the most vicious dehumanization reminiscent of the anti-Semitic propaganda in Nazi Germany.

Note this Lenin quote on another dehumanizing poster: "The kulaks are the most bestial, brutal, and savage exploiters, who in the history of other countries have time and again restored the power of the landlords, tsars, priests, and capitalists."

The demonization of the kulaks laid the groundwork for their subsequent annihilation. Facing a peasant rebellion, Lenin sent the following telegram to his henchmen: "Hang publicly (in full view of the people) no fewer than one hundred known kulaks, rich men, bloodsuckers. Make their names public. Take away all their grain. Make a list of the next group of hostages. Do it in such a fashion that for hundreds of miles around the people might see, tremble, realize, and scream: 'they are strangling, and will strangle to death, the bloodsucking kulaks'."

Other non-compliant citizens were dealt with in a similar fashion. "Statements from the few survivors, published in émigré newspapers the following year, describe Sevastopol, one of the towns that suffered most heavily under the repressions, as 'the city of the hanged.' 'From Nakhimovsky, all one could see was the hanging bodies of officers, soldiers, and civilians arrested in the streets. The town was dead, and the only people left alive were hiding in lofts or basements. All the walls, shop fronts, and telegraph poles were covered with posters calling for 'Death to the traitors.' They were hanging people for fun." —*The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* by Stéphane Courtois et al, pg 107

These were not aberrations, but logical consequences of the Marxist theory. According to Karl Marx, "there is only one way to shorten and ease the convulsions of the old society and the bloody birth pangs of the new—revolutionary terror."

—*American Thinker*, January 21, 2013

Communizing Central

America

by Humberto Fontova

Say what you want about Senator John Kerry, nobody ever called him lazy. He landed in Congress and immediately rolled up his sleeves and spat on his hands. The Nicaraguan people must end up like the Cuban and Vietnamese! Toward this end the man was tireless. The vision inspired him to such a staggering work load, energized him to such a frantic pace, and propelled him to such legislative feats, that his colleagues—even the pinkiest—gaped in envy and awe.

Back in the mid 80s Nicaragua was the pinkos' latest City on a Hill, Daniel Ortega their latest Sir Galahad/Robin Hood. Many of Kerry's Democratic congressional colleagues were content to flutter their eyelashes at the Communist cutthroat and pedophile from afar. Others, including Democratic majority leader Jim Wright, courted him with a perfumed love letter. Kerry naturally signed it.

"Dear Comandante," the love letter began, "We want to commend you and the members of your government for taking steps to open up the political process in your country. The Nicaraguan people have not had the opportunity to participate in a genuinely free election for over 50 years. We support your decision to schedule elections this year, to reduce press censorship, and to allow greater freedom of assembly for political parties."

In fact Nicaragua was then being Stalinized, with Fidel Castro's help: wholesale theft of private property, murder, exile, and mass-jailings of anti-Communists opponents. This process had John Kerry in such a rapt and giddy condition that he apparently found the Democratic majority leader's love note insufficiently adulatory. He yearned for a more intimate approach. So mere weeks after entering office in 1985 he set off for Managua with fellow freshman Tom Harkin of Iowa for a chummy face to face session with the Communist pedophile and Castro-proxy.

They returned rapt. Cuban and Soviet ties with the Sandinistas? Baseless rumors—"Mc Carthyism" in fact—Kerry and his Democratic colleagues insisted. Kerry stood

before Congress and waved a list of heart-warming liberal reforms that Ortega promised him were imminent. ("I hold here in my hands!") Actually he called it, "a wonderful new opening!" The Massachusetts senator insisted that Nicaragua would soon blossom into tropical Sweden.

The most vital stanza of Daniel Ortega's Sandinista anthem (Latin American leftists catch an extra breath and sing it with all the fervor we use for 'Ban-ner ye-et WA-A-VE!') bashes the US as "El E-NE-MIGO de la HU-MA-NI-DAD!" (the enemy of humanity!) The line was probably lifted from a Che Guevara speech. Naturally the authors of such an anthem stole the heart of many Democrats, including the Majority leader, future Speaker of the House, and our future Secretary of State.

Upon his return from Nicaragua, Congress swallowed the Castro-Ortega propaganda line parroted by Kerry in one mighty gulp and killed the Contra aid bill. For the brain dead: this was Kerry's (and Castro and Ortega's) goal all along. Then it took an entire week after the Congressional vote killing all aid to his anti-Communist opponents for Ortega to fly to Moscow, flout his Soviet ties for all the world to see, and return with a \$200 million Communist aid package.

So Congress, rotten egg dripping slowly off their face, actually reversed itself and approved Reagan's Contra aid.

But Kerry was undaunted. Castro and Ortega must prevail, he fumed! Soon he was chairing "The Senate Subcommittee on Narcotics, Terrorism, and International Operations" quickly dubbed "The Kerry Committee" by his media cronies and soulmates. Soon it was boasting, "77 instances where the Reagan Administration misled Congress about its policies in Central America!" (I hold here in my hands!)

Lest we forget, it was here that the famous "Iran-Contra investigation" actually started. Soon the lurid accusations spawned an "Iran-Contra Committee" of its own and Kerry pressed ahead with his.

The Democratic crusade to throttle the Nicaraguan freedom-fight was now under full steam. One Cuba wasn't enough for these people. They were The Best and Brightest of a new generation. They'd picked up the torch from Camelot. The honor demanded that they pledge themselves

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009) has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman and is offered free of charge to anyone asking for it. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is 719-685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at www.schwarzreport.org. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address.

to creating another tropical Gulag and slaughterhouse on our doorstep. If Latin freedom fighters battled desperately in the field against a Soviet-supplied enemy—if these freedom-fighters had their backs against the wall—if any looked northward through sweat-stung eyes and blood-drenched bandages for an ally—if hundreds were dying in freedom's cause with gritted teeth in a desperate and uneven struggle against a Communist common enemy—then these freedom-fighters MUST be stabbed in back! The legacy of Camelot DEMANDED it!

Towards that noble goal John Kerry committed himself body and soul. Soon his Committee was leaking lurid details of a nefarious CIA/Contra drug smuggling plot with a Cuban-American named Felix Rodriguez as the bagman and Vice President George Bush as a silent partner. The commie-crackpot Christic Institute and Institute For Policy Studies served as the Kerry Committee's advisors. The latter had arranged his Nicaragua trip.

The freshman senator from Massachusetts was on a serious roll that summer of 1987. His very own Congressional Committee subpoenaing, questioning, holding open sessions, closed sessions—and most importantly, leaking salacious tid-bits of their proceedings to their cronies and soulmates in the liberal media.

As a (sympathetic) *Boston Globe* article on John Kerry says about his famous Subcommittee: “Several committee members were wary of Kerry's reputation for self-promotion; one griped aloud that the senator's staff was always leaking to the press.”

The Kerry Committee finally subpoenaed Felix Rodriguez himself. And here, amigos, John Kerry finally stepped in it. He started messing with the WRONG dude.

—Townhall.com, December 29, 2012

Trusting Fidel Castro

by Humberto Fontova

“Elian is now where he belongs.” (Senator Chuck Hagel after Elian Gonzalez was shanghaied at US gunpoint from his American family at Fidel Castro's command and without a warrant.)

“To me,” wrote Hagel in a *New York Times* Op-Ed just after the armed raid on the Gonzalez family's Miami home, “this case has always been fundamentally about

a father-son relationship. . . . the point of the raid—to reunite Elian with his father when those housing him had repeatedly refused to hand him over. . . . The boy is where he belongs.”

Why did this Republican Senator accept the word of a Stalinist dictator whose lifelong dream was to nuke Hagel's homeland over that of the most loyal Republicans in modern US history: Americans of Cuban heritage?

Some background:

During the dawn of April 22, 2000 on the orders of Janet Reno—acting on the orders of her Commander-in-Chief Bill Clinton, acting under the threat of blackmail by Stalinist dictator Fidel Castro—armed INS agents maced, kicked, and gun-butted their way into Lazaro Gonzalez's Miami home, wrenched a bawling 6-year-old child from his American family at (genuine) assault weapon-point and bundled him off to Castro's Stalinist fiefdom, leaving 102 people injured, some seriously.

Thanks to the ritual Media-Democratic-Castroite collusion most people forget (or missed) the crucial legal and ethical details of this circus/tragedy—which were mostly established during the first week after Elian's rescue at sea, after his heroic mother's drowning. The “son-belongs-with-his-father” crowd, for instance, “missed” that Elian's father was initially delighted that his motherless son was in the US and in the loving arms of his uncles and cousins.

The evidence—frantically buried by the Media-Democratic-Castroite complex—was overwhelming. Mauricio Vicent, a reporter for Madrid newspaper *El Pais*, wrote that during that first week he'd visited Elian's home town of Cardenas and talked with Elian's father, Juan Miguel, along with other family members and friends. All confirmed that Juan Miguel had always longed for his son Elian to flee to the United State. Shortly after Elian's rescue, his father had even applied for a US visa!

Elian's Miami uncle, Lazaro, explained it repeatedly and best: “I always said I would turn over Elian to his father, when Juan Miguel would come here and claim him. But I (along with practically everyone with experience under communism from Cambodians to Hungarians and from Lithuanians to Cubans) knew such a thing was impossible. He couldn't do that. I knew it wasn't Juan Miguel requesting Elian—it was Fidel.”

The legal-weasels forgot (or missed) that on December 1, 1999, the INS asserted that Miami-based uncle Lazaro was indeed Elian's legal custodian and Florida's family court, indeed, the place to arbitrate further issues.

Then on December 5, 1999, Castro clapped his hands

and his US media minions, along with the Clinton administration, snapped to attention.

“Bill Clinton was terrified of Castro,” later explained Dick Morris. “Clinton looked over his shoulder for rafters the way Castro is always looking over his shoulder expecting an invasion of marines.”

The Mariel exodus of Cubans in 1980, you see, had cost Bill Clinton the only electoral loss of his life. Some of the Cuban criminals Castro sent over (a small portion of the refugees, actually) had been held in Fort Chafee Arkansas, as agreed by Governor Clinton acting on Jimmy Carter’s request. Shortly after, the criminals rioted, and many horrified Arkansans blamed the governor, and Bill Clinton lost the next elections.

Point is, the Clinton team who ordered the Elian raid knew exactly what was going on behind the scenes and were simply reacting to Castro’s blackmail. They knew Elian’s father wanted Elian to remain in the US. They knew Juan Miguel would have defected to the US in a nanosecond if given half the chance. They knew Castro held a gun to Juan Miguel’s head. How could they not? Bill Clinton’s lawyer and chum Gregory Craig, who had sprung him from the Lewinsky rap, now represented Elian’s father (i.e. Fidel Castro behind the façade.) Craig even traveled to Cuba and met with the Stalinist dictator himself to batten down the details of his (Potemkin) client’s visit to the US.

Some of these details were uncovered during the US visit by an alarmed Pedro Porro during the taping of Juan Miguel’s father 60 Minutes “interview” with Gregory Craig’s other chum, Dan Rather.

“Juan Miguel Gonzalez was surrounded by Castro security agents the entire time he was in the studio with Rather.” This is an eye-witness account from Pedro Porro, who served as Dan Rather’s translator during the famous 60 Minutes interview. Dan Rather would ask the question in English into Porro’s earpiece whereupon Porro would translate it into Spanish for Elian’s heavily-guarded father.

“Juan Miguel was never completely alone,” says Porro. “He never smiled. His eyes kept shifting back and forth. It was obvious to me that he was under heavy coercion. I probably should have walked out. But I’d been hired by CBS in good faith and I didn’t know exactly how the interview would be edited—how it would come across on the screen.

“The questions Dan Rather was asking Elian’s father during that 60 Minutes interview were being handed to

him by attorney Gregory Craig,” continues Pedro Porro. “It was obvious that Craig and Rather were on very friendly terms. They were joshing and bantering back and forth, as Juan Miguel sat there petrified. Craig was stage managing the whole thing—almost like a movie director.”

So whatever else can be said, the Clintons weren’t ignorant. They were cowing to Castroite blackmail. So let’s call them something else; perhaps “ethically-challenged” and/or “cowardly.”

But how can a Republican who came of political age during the Cold War, and who actually fought Communists in Vietnam, have been unaware that Communist regimes can apply unseen pressure to their inmates? Can a prospective US Secretary of Defense have taken at face value the word of the same Stalinist dictator who declared:

“Again I stress I am not a Communist. And Communists have absolutely no influence in my nation!” (Fidel Castro, April 1959)

“Political power does not interest me in the least! And I will never assume such power!” (Fidel Castro, April 1959)

“What!” Nikita Khrushchev gasped, as recalled by his son Sergei, “Is he (Fidel Castro) proposing that we start a nuclear war? That we launch missiles from Cuba?”

“Of course I knew the missiles were nuclear-armed,” responded Fidel Castro to Robert McNamara during a meeting in 1992. “That’s precisely WHY I urged Khrushchev to launch them.”

But it appears that we’ll soon entrust our nation’s security to a US Secretary of Defense who wholeheartedly trusted Fidel Castro.

—Townhall.com, February 3, 2013

Don’t miss a minute of the news and analysis by David Noebel.

Check out our blog at:

www.thunderontheright.wordpress.com