

The WASHINGTON LOBBY on LATIN AMERICA



by
Allen Brownfield

**The Washington Lobby
On Latin America**

by
Allen Brownfield

Published by the Council for Inter-American Security
305 4th St. N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Washington Lobby On Latin America

Policy in Washington towards Fidel Castro's Cuba, and towards Castroite elements in Latin America and around the world, has become increasingly cordial. This is so, despite the fact that within Cuba itself, oppression has in no sense diminished. Abroad, particularly in Africa and Central America, the Cuban role has been growing.

Realities that are apparently ignored or obfuscated in official Washington reveal the contradiction of current U.S.-Cuban cordiality; making it important—perhaps urgent—to know something of the objectives and orientation of those groups and persons who influence and even fashion U.S. policy towards Fidel Castro and his third world.

In June, 1978, Joshua Nkomo, the Rhodesian guerrilla leader, acknowledged publicly for the first time that the Cubans were training his 6,000-man army in Zambia. Mr. Nkomo, in an interview with the Government-owned newspaper, *THE TIMES OF ZAMBIA*, declared that he would use the Cubans and the arms the Soviet Union were supplying him to “scare away” the Western powers from Rhodesia. While lauding the Cubans, Nkomo referred to the U.S. and Great Britain as “hyenas.”

During the summer of 1978 it was conservatively estimated that at least 40,000 Cuban troops were on the African continent. Beginning with no more than fifty military advisors in May, 1977 (Fidel Castro called them “diplomats” with military experience), the Cuban presence in Africa grew rapidly, outstripping the Soviet contribution of men. At the end of 1977, 2,000–3,000 Cubans were assisting the Marxist Mengistu regime in Ethiopia in its war against Somalia. In the first two months of 1978, the Cubans increased their presence five-fold.

The use of Cuban troops has enabled Moscow to operate with impunity in Africa. In his recent book, *THE SURROGATE FORCES OF THE SOVIET UNION*, Brian Crozier, director of London's Institute for the Study of Conflict, suggests that, “the use of Cuban troops confused black Africa's perception of Soviet imperialism.” Hugh Thomas, the historian whose books have included *THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR* and *CUBA*, points out that, “the Cuban armed forces are now larger and more powerful than those of all the East European Soviet satellites except for Poland (whose population is four times Cuba's) and far more formidable than those of her Latin American neighbors—even than Mexico, Venezuela and probably Brazil . . . One obvious purpose of this substantial military investment has become clearer since 1975. Thwarted of his expressed dream in 1960 of converting the

Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the Latin American continent, Dr. Castro has been happy, after the collapse of the Portuguese Empire, to carry the idea of revolutionary struggle to Africa.”

U.S. policy appears to be based upon the notion that Castro has been acting independently in Africa. U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, for example, told NEWSWEEK magazine in March, 1978 that, “There is no doubt that Cuba is in Africa because it was ordered there by the Russians. I believe that Cuba is in Africa because it really has shared a sense of colonial oppression and domination.”

To such a view, Professor Thomas responds that, “Dr. Castro’s own speeches suggest that any difference between Soviet and Cuban policy toward Africa simply does not exist. Anyone who continues to argue that there is such a difference is telling us more about himself than the world . . . Dr. Castro may on occasion have suggested or initiated certain lines of Soviet policy. But it will remain Soviet policy. Dr. Castro may himself welcome this great new thrust for his foreign policy, but his dependence on Soviet transport, weapons, equipment and fuel prove that essentially the Cubans are Moscow’s sepoys in Africa . . . ”

If, on the one hand, Cuba’s aggressive role in the world is growing, it must not be forgotten that, on the other hand, internal government terrorism within Cuba itself has been growing in precisely the same measure.

Cuba, today, is a vast prison. OF HUMAN RIGHTS, published by a group of exiled Cuban intellectuals at Georgetown University, deals with documented evidence of executions and torture in Cuban prisons. The evidence gathered by OF HUMAN RIGHTS comes from such groups as the International Rescue Committee, the International League for the Rights of Man, Amnesty International and the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights.

The Inter-American Commission reported to the Organization of American States what it called the “inhuman treatment” of political prisoners in Cuba during the past five years. Rather than liberalizing its treatment of prisoners, says the report, the Castro regime continues “to reveal complete disdain for the dignity of the human beings.”

In an interview with Barbara Walters on U.S. television, Fidel Castro said that Cuba has between 2,000 and 3,000 political prisoners; President Carter has placed the figure at between 15,000 and 20,000; Professor Edward Gonzalez of the University of California at Los Angeles, after visiting Cuba, wrote in 1974 that Castro’s jails held between 25,000 and 80,000 political prisoners. Frank Calzon, a native of Cuba and longtime student of events in that country, wrote in THE NATIONAL OBSERVER in June, 1977, that “Official Cuban reports . . . cast doubt on Castro’s figures. For example, Havana has acknowledged that it has 56 prisons and jails, 23 work camps and 108 penal farms. If so, that would mean that by Castro’s figures each institution holds 10 to 15 prisoners.” In contrast, Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov estimates that Russia, with a population of 250 million, compared to Cuba’s 9.5 million, has about 10,000 political prisoners.

In addition to documented oppression at home and visible aggression on the African continent, Cuba is instigating subversive activity and political influence in various sections of the Western Hemisphere.

In August, 1978, the Cuban supported FSLN Sandinistas stormed the National Palace in Managua, Nicaragua demanding the release of FSLN prisoners and the resignation of President Somoza. The government partially acquiesced to their demands, and the terrorists, accompanied by their liberated comrades, sought refuge in Panama. There, they were received as "heroes of a people's struggle." Later, many of the Marxist FSLN members who participated in the Managua raid turned up in Havana.

To the south, the Uruguayan Tupamaros and the Argentine Montoneros are groups of the political left which were equipped with Cuban arms, money and training. The Tupamaros, about which more is known than any other terrorist organization in Latin America, acknowledged having had a training school for its members in Cuba.

The Castroite influence crops up again even closer to home. The Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) which looks to Cuba for support and direction, is a bridgehead for Communist penetration in the United States. The PSP readily proclaims its ties to Cuba and has repeatedly sent delegates to Communist conferences held in Cuba.

As Cuban involvement in the internal affairs of Africa and Latin American nations increases, the U.S., instead of treating Castro and his terrorist followers as formidable and aggressive foes, is taking on a posture which is more and more conciliatory. What may be called the "pro-Castro lobby," which includes both formal and informal members, is assisting the "public relations campaign" sponsored by Havana to improve Castro's image in the United States and around the world. These members operate both in important governmental positions and in a number of organizations whose primary purpose it is to influence government officials. In Washington, D.C. they are part of what is called the "Network."

Consider how well Castro is doing. When President Carter sharply attacked the Cuban role in the invasion of Zaire, he discovered that many of his own top advisors, and many leaders of his own party in the Congress, preferred to believe Castro's denials, despite the fact that the evidence was all on the President's side.

The President has repeatedly been told by many of his close advisors and other leaders of the Democratic Party that it is wrong to be too concerned about the Cuban role in Africa. U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young told the President that the U.S. should not become "panicky" about the expanding military presence in Africa. When the Cubans first arrived in Angola, Young said that he thought they were opposing racism. Later, when the civil war was over and the Neto regime installed in power, Young explained that the Cubans were "basically doing technical assistance." Whatever their motives, political expediency and aggression are not among them. "I don't believe Cuba is in Africa because it was ordered there by the Russians," Young said. Later, speaking to a group of Peace Corps volunteers in the Dominican Re-

public, Young added that Cubans in Africa were doing essentially what the Peace Corps itself was doing in the underdeveloped world.

Andrew Young's strong support for Castro is hardly an isolated phenomenon within the government. Senator George McGovern, (D-SD), who rejected CIA evidence about the Cuban role in Zaire, preferring to believe Castro's version, urged President Carter to lead the nation away from "paranoia in foreign policy." Senator McGovern criticized the fact that the President had "permitted himself to become terribly troubled by the Soviet-Cuban involvement in Africa." This, in spite of the fact that even former members of SWAPO, the leftist Southwest African independence insurgent group, say their organization is not only assisted by Cubans but has in fact become captive to Cuban and East German operational command.

Senator McGovern had been a U.S. representative at the U. N. Special Session on Disarmament and was there informed by Cuban Vice President Rafael Rodriguez that President Carter's assessment of the Cuban role in the invasion of Shaba Province was totally false. The Senator believed the Rodriguez statement completely. Who is Mr. Rodriguez? Columnist John Roche reports that he is, "A dedicated Stalinist hack. He joined the Cuban Communist Party in 1933 and rose so rapidly that when Stalin called for a united front government in 1944, Rodriguez became a member of the wicked old dictator Fulgencio Batista's cabinet! After some difficult years, resulting from Communist denunciation of Castro's 1953 attacks on the Moncada Barracks as 'dangerous and sterile,' and the personal enmity of Che Guevara, Moscow intervened to install Rodriguez as Fidel's Vice President."

Supporters of relaxed relations with Castro and his affiliates throughout Latin America (not to mention Africa) are centralized in several groups. The close connection between these groups and men and women in influential policy-making positions in Washington is the subject of this study.

North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA)

The North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) was formed in November, 1966, in which time a group of students, professors, journalists and New Left activists met in the wake of the crisis in the Dominican Republic to found a new organization. The organization described its purpose in these terms: "In order to help prevent the further Vietnamization of Latin America, the new organization sought to uncover the real forces shaping U.S. foreign operations—corporations, government agencies, foundations, churches and unions."

NACLA was described by the House Committee on Internal Security during its 1971 ANNUAL REPORT as "an offshoot of the Students for a Democratic Society." Among the founders of NACLA was Brady Tyson, now a U.N. official in the Carter Administration. Other founders were Richard Shaull, John Gerassi, Scott Robinson and Glenn Smiley. All had long records of far-left political activism.

Richard Shaull, for example, told the Catholic Inter-American Cooperation Program sessions in St. Louis in 1968 that, "For an increasing number of Catholic young people there is only one hope: the organization of armed movements of national liberation, with all the sacrifice and bloodshed that involves." A year later, speaking on the same theme, Shaull stated that, "More and more in Latin America the Christians and the Marxists are not having a dialogue but they are working together on a practical level."

In a book entitled *CONTAINMENT AND CHANGE*, Shaull spells out his support for "revolution" in Latin America. He wrote that, "I have . . . spent the greater part of two decades in Latin America in close contact with a revolutionary situation there, and have been forced to come to terms with it . . . Any hope for a significant Christian contribution to the revolutionary struggle going on around the world will depend, I believe, on the emergence of new forms of Christian community on the front lines of revolution."

John Gerassi, who once served as the Paris correspondent for *RAMPARTS* magazine, is an "advocate of guerrilla warfare." Gerassi, who taught a course, "Latin America—the Next Vietnam?" at the Free School of New York, was a sponsor of the Spring Mobilization Committee which staged the massive April 16, 1967 demonstration against the war in Vietnam. He was an advisor to the Radical Education Project of the SDS; served as director of the U.S. branch of the Bertrand Russell International War crimes Tribunal which accused the U.S. of genocide in Vietnam; and has been a regular contributor to the Communist weekly, the *NATIONAL GUARDIAN*.

Gerassi's view that the U.S. is an aggressor and is playing an imperialist role in the world is clear. In 1968 he wrote: "As a journalist and political scientist, as well as a man committed to fight imperialism everywhere in whatever manner possible to me, I came to Vietnam already convinced of two basic facts: That the U.S. was waging an imperialist war of aggression . . . and that in this war it employed all types of tactics and weapons which violated the rules of war according to international conventions and treaties . . ."

Long a supporter of Fidel Castro, Gerassi found in Che Guevara a leader worthy of adulation. In *VENCEREMOS: THE SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF CHE GUEVARA*, Gerassi declares that American political leaders cannot communicate with the nation's young people: "But Che can. He did and will continue to do so. He was a romantic. He lived and died for others—for a better world, a world where people can really love, instead of just 'coming to terms'; just compromising. That is why Che is so popular among young America. That is why he is not dead."

So devoted was NACLA to the memory of Che Guevara that it dedicated its October, 1967 newsletter to him and to "the thousands of men and women who have dedicated their lives to the struggle for national liberation."

The influence of NACLA clearly reaches within the White House itself, particularly in the person of one of its founders, Brady Tyson.

In March, 1977, Tyson, then an advisor to the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, expressed "profound

regrets" for the part he said some American officials and private groups had played in subverting the Allende government in Chile. Tyson was called home for "consultations," but his influence has not diminished. If anything, it has increased.

Brady Tyson, now a close advisor to U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, has a long record of far-left associations. An Associate Professor of Latin American Studies at American University in Washington, D.C. (currently on sabbatical), Tyson is an ordained Methodist minister who worked with Young and other leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in the 1960's. In 1966, he taught at the *Escola de Sociológica e Política* in São Paulo, Brazil. In April, 1966 Tyson publicly branded the Brazilian government as a "front" for U.S. Foreign Policy. He was subsequently expelled from Brazil by the government because he had "offended the dignity of the country" and "disturbed the social and political order."

Upon his return to the U.S., Tyson began his activities with NACLA. NACLA's draft statement of its ideology said that the organization sought the participation and support of those "who not only favor revolutionary change in Latin America but also take a revolutionary position toward their own society . . . In the context of this involvement in the revolutionary struggle at home, NACLA is exploring possibilities of maintaining relationships with Latin American organizations . . . by means of contacts with members of radical movements in various countries and through the work of the U.S. Committee for Justice for Latin American Political Prisoners."

Virtually all of NACLA's publications bear union label 209, which belongs to Prompt Press, which also prints the vast quantities of literature produced by the U.S. Communist Party and its various front organizations.

Another of Tyson's associations is with the *U.S. Committee for Justice for Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA)*, joining such sponsors as Herbert Aptheker, chief theoretician of the Communist Party, and radical attorney William Kunstler.

An article published in the December, 1973 issue of *INTERNAL INFORMATION BULLETIN*, published by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) describes the origins of the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Prisoners. It declares that, "The SWP comrades have organized and promoted the effective work of USLA, whose periodical, the *USLA REPORTER*, has carried many reports on repression in Argentina. The USAL has organized tours throughout the USA for Argentine activists to give talks denouncing Lanusee's dictatorial regime and the crimes he has committed . . ."

In 1972, a coalition of Congressmen, radical activists and some Communists began a drive for relaxing tensions with Cuba. A two-day meeting was held in the U.S. Senate Office Building under the auspices of Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MASS), and was coordinated by Michael Myerson, a secretary of the New York State Communist Party's Peace Commission. One of the most militant of the panelists was Brady Tyson, who said that public opinion in the U.S. had to be mobilized to persuade the U.S. government to ease relations with Castro.

When, in 1977, Tyson sharply criticized “human rights” violations in various friendly Latin American countries, he conspicuously omitted any mention of a “human rights” problem in Cuba. This, despite the fact that in 1976 the Organization of American States issued a 94 page report that condemned Cuba, declaring that, “Political prisoners have been the victims of inhuman treatment and many have been sentenced for acts or situations that were not defined as crimes in laws in force prior to the trial . . .” Tens of thousands of such prisoners languish in Cuban prisons, but Tyson has expressed no concern whatever.

Syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak wrote in 1977 that, “Tyson’s past, not his present, causes all the wonderment that he is now inside the governmental tent. As a founder of the pro-Castro North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA), Tyson openly supported the hemisphere’s radical left rather than democratic left . . . In naming Tyson to represent the U.S. at the U.N. Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva . . . did Andrew Young know that Tyson had been expelled by our Brazilian allies? ‘That would recommend him to me,’ Young told us. After Tyson’s groundless accusation of U.S. complicity in the Chilean coup, Young did not grasp the opportunity to get rid of him but placed him at the U.N. mission in New York as a political officer.”

Evans and Novak concluded that, “Tyson and less publicized newcomers to the foreign-policy bureaucracy may soon apply a definition of human rights popular in Havana, but not in Buenos Aires, Santiago, or Brasilia, more narrow and materialistic than Jimmy Carter ever intended.”

Rep. Robert Bauman (R-Maryland) notes, with regard to the content of Tyson’s courses at American University, that, “I have had occasion to talk to people who have heard Mr. Tyson’s lectures as well as had discussions with him, and they describe him as an ‘avowed Marxist.’”

Tyson, in addition to his activities with NACLA and USLA, has also been a sponsor of the *American Friends of Brazil*, a leftist group whose aim is the destruction of the anti-Communist regime in Brazil. One result of the implementation by the Carter Administration of the policies toward Brazil advocated by Brady Tyson has been the abrogation of Brazil’s 25 year old mutual defense treaty with the United States.

Council on Hemispheric Affairs

The Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) was started in June, 1976 by Laurence R. Birns, a professor of Latin American studies at the New School for Social Research and an associate of Chilean Marxist Orlando Letelier.

At his initial press conference, Birns declared that COHA would engage in “education, information and research activities.” Later, Birns described COHA’s purpose as “to manipulate the sophisticated political and academic communities.”

At this same press conference—Birns suggested COHA’s pro-Marxist-Lenninist stance by expressing support for the Marxist Allende Government

of Chile, Cuba, the pro-Castro Torrijos dictatorship in Panama and the then left leaning governments of Mexico and Venezuela. At the same time he attacked Brazil and the countries which are targets of the Revolutionary Coordinating Junta (JCR) united terrorist command: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Uruguay.

Three main areas of work for COHA, as set forth by Birns, are: opposition to the confirmations and activities of certain State Department officials; the removal of "disk" tax incentives from new investments made by U.S. corporations in all Latin American countries which have "massively violated the human rights of their populations"; and to "cut off from U.S. support" the "vast majority of nations that make up the Organization of American States."

One of those who has used COHA's material is reporter Ary Moleson of the Associated Press. In a letter to the Associated Press, then U.S. Ambassador to Nicaragua James D. Theberge wrote: "While few pay much attention to Mr. Moleson's stories in the U.S., it is regrettable and should be of concern to you, that he regularly misinforms your Latin American readers by citing this particular reckless and ill-informed source (COHA). Irresponsible stories may titillate some readers, and they may be easy to write since they seem to be based on press handouts, but they seriously jeopardize the well-deserved reputation of the Associated Press for objective, balanced, reliable and informed reporting."

Mr. Birns and COHA actively fought the appointment of Terence Todman as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, calling the appointment "wrong because Todman is an established old-line cold warrior." Birns went on to promote "the United Auto Workers' Esteban Torres," as a man who would carry out what Birns saw as the "required housecleaning" or purges of "cold warriors."

Birns has a long record of associations with far-left groups. In 1974 he was a speaker at a Trotskyite forum at Columbia University sponsored by the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners. Birns has also been involved with the North American Congress on Latin America and the National Coordinating Committee in Solidarity with Latin America. (The director of the latter group, Susan Borenstein, is a veteran both of the Communist Dubois Clubs of America, and the Venceremos Brigade. She was in Washington to meet with Orlando Letelier on the day of his death.) In addition, Birns was a participant in the 1976 third session of the International Commission on Inquiry Into the Crimes of the Military Junta in Chile, a creation of the Soviet World Peace Council. The Commission was headed by Hans Goran Franck, who previously headed the WPC's "Commission of Inquiry Into War Crimes in Vietnam."

COHA's Board of Trustees includes:

** Former Senator James Abourezk—(D- South Dakota)

** Richard Barnet—Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS)
(which is discussed elsewhere in this report)

- ** Ernest Chanes—a businessman and long time active leader of the pro-Communist National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. In 1974, Chanes was an active sponsor of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, a support group for the Castroite Communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP), which has maintained an office in Havana since the early 1960's. Chanes is also a sponsor for the Center for Cuban Studies, a pro-Castro Group.
- ** Richard Rees Fagan—a consultant to the Linowitz Commission; a member of the Institute for Policy Studies Transnational Institute's Ad Hoc Working group on Latin America. Fagan traveled to Cuba in July, 1969, with a group of U.S. revolutionaries, most of whom were members of the Weatherman faction of the S.D.S., to meet with North Vietnamese Communist and Viet Cong officials. In July, 1975 and again in 1976, Fagan was a sponsor of the Venceremos Brigade's yearly celebration of the Cuban Communist July 26 holiday, and in 1975 he signed a letter inviting Melba Hernandez, a Cuban Communist leader active in the World Peace Council's terrorist support programs, to speak in New York. He was a sponsor of the second Chile Solidarity Conference in 1975 organized by the Communist Party, U.S.A.
- ** Patrick E. Gorman—Chairman of the Board, Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL-CIO), a union dominated by identified Communist Party activists, including Abe Feinglass, a union vice president and key organizer in gaining union support for the Communist Party USA's NCCSC affiliates. Gorman, in 1971, was a sponsor of the People's Peace Treaty in support of the Vietcong and sponsored assorted demonstrations held by the Communist influenced People's Coalition for Peace and Justice. He is a sponsor of the Communist Party's National Committee to Re-Open the Rosenberg Case.

Included on the board of COHA are such "liberals" as Terry Herndon, executive director for the National Education Association; Leonard Woodcock, a United Auto Workers leader now the U.S. Ambassador in Peking; Rev. William Wipfler, National Council for Churches, Latin American division; and Rabby Morton Rosenthal, of the Anti-Defamation League.

The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS)

The Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) was established in 1963 by Richard J. Barnet and Marcus Raskin. Together with IPS Resident Fellow, Arthur Wasow, perhaps the best known of the IPS leadership, all three have long been active in radical movements. During the war in Vietnam, for example, Barnet traveled to North Vietnam and both he and Raskin were reported to have had contact with representatives of the Hanoi government in Paris. IPS Fellows and speakers have included members and close friends of a variety of radical

organizations, including the Communist Party, USA, the Trotskyite communist Socialist Workers Party and the radical Students for a Democratic Society.

The Institute for Policy Studies has established a variety of affiliated organizations such as The Transnational Institute which is supposedly designed to engender an awareness of American “social and political problems” from a radical standpoint and “within a global context.” In a recent paper, The Heritage Foundation declared that, “Those affiliated with the Transnational Institute are of a variety of radical types, including a leader in a Communist-oriented terrorist group and a major functionary in the Trotskyite Communist Fourth International, a world-wide apparatus that has provided active support to overt terrorist violence in several countries.”

The I.P.S. was never meant to be solely a “think tank.” Writing in the Spring, 1968 issue of *New University Thought*, Arthur Waskow states that, “. . . The Institute is not just an ordinary research center because it’s committed to the idea that to develop social theory one must be involved in social action and in social experiment. And therefore, the Institute stands on the bare edge of custom in the United States as to what an educational research institution is, as against what a political institution is. By standing on that bare edge, it creates tension.”

The result of this “tension” will, according to Waskow, be what he calls “creative disorder.” This creative disorder can be used to aid in the development of revolution on an international scale. Waskow is concerned with whether “the underclass of the world is going to be able to create an effective social technology of rebellion. The possibility exists; that is clear. Whether it works, whether it becomes real, is not clear.”

In 1961, Raskin and Waskow co-authored a paper for Rep. Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wisconsin) that advocated unilateral disarmament by the United States. Waskow later expanded this into a book. Raskin then served as group secretary for a publishing project called *THE LIBERAL PAPERS*, which called for recognition and U.N. membership for Communist China, East Germany, North Korea and North Vietnam; unilateral abandonment of nuclear testing by the U.S.; the dismantling of NATO; abandonment of Berlin; allowing the Soviet Union to plug into the American DEW early warning defense system; and neutralization of Central Europe in accordance with the Rapacki Plan—a scheme advanced by the government of Poland in line with the wishes of Moscow.

In its issue of April 11, 1972, *THE DAILY WORLD*, official newspaper of the Communist Party, noted that Raskin had recently returned from Paris where he had gone as part of the “first delegation of prominent Americans to meet with representatives of the liberation forces of Indochina since the U.S. sabotaged the peace talks. . .” While in Paris, the delegation met with Nguyen Minh Vy, Deputy Chief Delegate for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Nguyen Thi Binh, Foreign Minister of the Hanoi-run Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, the political apparatus of the Viet Cong.

Recently, Raskin has been a member of the Advisory Committee for a Fifth Estate, perhaps best known as publisher of COUNTERSPY, the anti-intelligence community publication that printed the names and addresses of several employees for the CIA. Shortly after this publicity Richard Welch, CIA Station Chief in Athens, was brutally murdered.

Another IPS Fellow is Saul Landau, well known for his many years as a pro-Castro and pro-Allende propagandist. The Communist Party's newspaper, PEOPLE'S WORLD of November 10, 1962 reported the death of C. Wright Mills and noted that Landau had been a writing collaborator of Mills and had accompanied him on trips to Europe and Cuba. Mills, long an apologist for Castro, telegraphed the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in 1961, at the time of the ill-fated U.S. invasion of Cuba, and said: "Kennedy and Company have returned us to barbarism . . . I feel a desperate shame for my country. . . . I would fight alongside Fidel."

Saul Landau's activities on behalf of Castro go back to the time Communism was first inflicted upon Cuba. On January 29, 1961, for example, Landau spoke for the student department of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee at an American-Cuban Friendship Rally in New York City. The gathering was sponsored by Advance, at that time the youth organization of the Communist Party.

In 1967, Landau attended the International Cultural Congress in Havana as a film-maker. At about this time he made two propaganda films about Cuba. The first one was entitled REPORT FROM CUBA and the second was simply called FIDEL. At its premier showing in San Francisco in December, 1969, the proceeds went to the Black Panther Defense Fund. In 1971, Landau co-produced a film called AN INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT SALVADOR ALLENDE. It is called a report about Allende's "struggle to make socialism work in his country."

Adding to the list of Castro supporters is Roberta Salper. Salper, prior to joining IPS, was member of the U.S. Zone Central Committee of the Castroite Communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP). Subsequent to the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, she arranged for private meetings at IPS with Cheddi Jagan, pro-Communist leader of Guyana. One of the reported results of these meetings was a coordinated campaign against the pro-U.S. Jamaican Labor Party.

One of the most significant IPS subsidiaries and the one with most direct concern and involvement with Latin America is the Transnational Institute (TNI). Persons affiliated with this operation include those already mentioned, such as Barnet, Raskin, Landau and Salper. Among others affiliated with the Transnational Institute are Michael Klare, Basker Vashee and Tariq Ale.

Klare has long been a leading member of the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA). Vashee works for the TNI in Amsterdam and has been described as a "member of the national executive" of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), a Communist-oriented African terrorist group operating in Rhodesia. Ali serves as head of the British section of the

Trotskyite Communist Fourth International, an apparatus that has actively supported terrorist violence in many parts of the world.

A key figure in both the IPS and the TNI effort to promote the cause of Castro and Cuba was Orlando Letelier, previously the ambassador to Washington of Allende's Chilean government. At the time of his death—which resulted from a bomb in the automobile in which he was driving—Letelier carried a briefcase with him which contained, according to columnist Jack Anderson, documents proving that he had been receiving \$1,000 monthly from Havana “for his work.” The funds were sent from Cuba by Beatriz Allende, daughter of the late Chilean president. Anderson noted that Beatriz was married to “a Cuban official” and disclosed that Letelier was “in close contact” with Julian Torres Rizo, known to be a top agent of Castro's *Dirección General de Inteligencia*, or DGI.

Letelier's “work” in Washington, D.C. was to promote Castroite causes throughout the Hemisphere. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak discovered that Letelier has actually paid part of the travel expenses of Rep. Michael Harrington (D-Mass.) to a leftist meeting in Mexico. They revealed how Letelier cautioned Beatriz Allende that a Chilean Human Rights Committee, for which liberal congressional support had been gained, should not be publicized in Havana. “You know how these ‘liberals’ are,” the column quoted from Letelier's letter, “it is possible that the sponsoring congressmen might fear to be connected with Cuba.”

Evans and Novak charge that Letelier had regularly manipulated “idealistic liberal congressmen” while concealing the “world communist support” for his activities. At Letelier's funeral, Senator George McGovern (D-S.D.) gave one of the eulogies.

Columnist Virginia Prewitt, a specialist on Latin American affairs, after examining the evidence in the Letelier case, concluded that, “The briefcase documents clearly place Letelier in this KGB-dominated world network as a key ‘agent of influence.’ The ‘Briefcase Papers’ further revealed that Havana was manufacturing propaganda on ‘human-rights violations’ in Chile for Letelier to use at the U.N. and elsewhere. . .the documents fully unmasked Letelier's work to influence legislation illegally in the U.S. Congress. They confirmed that he was indeed manipulating U.S. liberals—from whom he took care to conceal his links to totalitarian socialist international networks, activists and armed terrorists. . .Letelier had pulled off a major coup. He had influenced the U.S. Congress to pass legislation startlingly paralleling his undercover mission directive. . .imposing mandatory penalties upon nations reputed to violate human rights. . .it became U.S. law as part of no less a measure than the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act of 1976. . .”

WASHINGTON OFFICE ON LATIN AMERICA (WOLA)

Another group which may be considered a constituent element in Washington's powerful pro-Castro lobby is *The Washington Office on Latin*

America (WOLA). Vaguely connected with a number of activist Church groups, WOLA has served as a conduit through which pro-Castro personalities from Latin America have been brought to Washington to testify before Congressional Committees and to present their views in a variety of American forums. A primary goal of WOLA is the overthrow of Nicaraguan President Anastasio Somoza. One of those brought to the U.S. by WOLA is Ernesto Cardenal, a Catholic priest, self-proclaimed Marxist and admirer of Fidel Castro. In November, 1977, Cardenal revealed that he is a member of the *Frente Sandinista de Liberacion Nacional (FSLN)*, a Castro-backed, Nicaraguan terrorist and subversive organization which since 1960 has overtly sought to topple the Somoza government.

Another WOLA-sponsored Church "witness" is Maryknoll missionary Padre Miguel D'Escoto, member of the "Group of 12," the political delegates of the FSLN. In an introduction to a book on the Nicaraguan National Guard commissioned by the Maryknoll order, D'Escoto advocated a "new, non-capitalistic system for Nicaragua" which, if unobtainable through peaceful means, would justify the use of violence.

Both these representatives of the Church are actively associated with the bloodletting and Marxist aims of the FSLN terrorists, an organization which has had long-standing support of Fidel Castro. It is Castro who was responsible for helping in the formation of the FSLN in 1960 and for training and indoctrinating successive cadres of Sandinistas in Cuba, and supporting its efforts to take control of Nicaragua ever since.

The record of the Sandinistas can hardly be disputed. After years of failing to gain the support of the peasants in the countryside, the FSLN suddenly resorted to urban terrorism in 1974 with a surprise attack on the private home of a former Somoza minister. While they held 41 hostages, the Sandinistas negotiated demands which secured the release of 14 fellow terrorists then being held in prison, a million dollar cash ransom and an aircraft to fly them all to sanctuary in Cuba. In Cuba, Eduardo Contreras, leader of the assault group, was introduced over Radio Havana as "the man who will one day impose a Communist regime in Nicaragua."

On November 8, 1976, Carlos Fonseca Amador, erstwhile leader of the FSLN, was killed in a shootout with a Nicaraguan National Guard patrol. Fonseca, who attended Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow, has used Cuba as his home base of operations from 1960 onwards.

Another, Jose Benito Escobar, FSLN resident delegate in Cuba, was responsible for signing joint agreements on behalf of the FSON with the PLO (Feb. 5, 1978) and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (March 6). He was killed while resisting arrest on July 15, 1978 in the town of Esteli, Nicaragua, later to become the site of large scale terrorist action after the FSLN September 1978 campaign.

On August 22, 1978, 25 Sandinistas dressed as National Guardsmen took over the National Palace in Managua in a sneak attack. For 45 hours they held hostage almost the entire legislative assembly as well as some 1500 ordinary citizens. After their demands were partially met, the assault group,

together with 59 fellow Sandinista terrorists released from prison, were flown to Panama as they had demanded.

The terms for the \$10 million cash ransom demanded by the terrorists who seized the National Palace in Managua provided for \$3 million to go to Marxist priest Ernesto Cardenal, a half million dollars to be sent to Blanca Segovia Sandino in Havana, Cuba and another half million dollars Haydee Teran in Havana, Cuba. The remainder was to go to the Nicaraguan Solidarity Committee in Venezuela and to the terrorists themselves.

On September 10, 22 of the Sandinistas released from prison following the National Palace attack suddenly turned up in Cuba. Said one, Margine Gutiérrez Blandon, "My ideological principles are based on Marxist-Leninism. We owe ourselves to this ideology and we of the Sandinista National Liberation Front will put it into practice consistently." The most important prisoner whose release was obtained was Tomás Borge, last surviving founder and political leader of the FSLN. On September 26, 1978, Tomás Borge arrived in Havana and the next day briefed Fidel Castro on operations in Nicaragua.

Following the September terrorist uprising organized by the FSLN, the group bragged of its mass executions of Somoza supporters. In an October 22 communiqué, the FSLN recorded how it summarily executed "dozens of informers" in 10 of the 14 departments of the country. The *communiqué* was signed on behalf of the FSLN National Council by Victor Tirado López, Humberto and Daniel Ortega Saavedra, all trained in Castro Cuba.

In a February 1979 report, the Institute for Conflict and Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., stated "There is no doubt that the core membership of the FSLN is composed of die-hard Cuban-trained Marxist-Leninists such as Plutarco Elias Hernández, who regularly meets with Cuban agents in Costa Rica and Mexico City."

This same report concludes that "a victory by pro-Castro Marxist-Leninist-led guerrillas in any of the Central American countries would have far-reaching repercussions on the regional political balance in the Isthmus and on the security of all states in the wider Caribbean-Central American area." Moreover, it says that, "The Central American Isthmus, heavily under Cuban influence, could then also become a mainland base for revolutionary movements to its south and north."

Ernesto Cardenal, while in Washington, was under the joint sponsorship of the Washington Office on Latin America and the Institute for Policy Studies. Cardenal spoke at the IPS as a part of its Latin American Round Table program which it describes as designed "to aid in the formulation of alternative U.S. policy toward Latin America."

The "alternative policy" postulated by the Round Table is clearly Castroite in as much as it was formulated by the forum sponsored by the IPS/Transnational Institute which was directed by the late Cuban agent Orlando Letelier. His assistant, Roberta Salber, headed the Latin American forum itself. She, of course, has been identified elsewhere in this study as having been a member of the Castroite Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP).

Guest speakers at the IPS/TN Latin American Round Table included a number of Communist supporters and sympathizers: James Petras and Richard Fagan, American supporters of Cuban-style revolution in Latin America; Cheddi Jagan, head of the pro-Soviet Communist Party in Guyana; Julian Rizo, first secretary of the Cuban mission to the U.S. and a well known officer in the Cuban DGI secret police who was Orlando Letelier's case officer.

The Washington Office on Latin America does not hesitate to proclaim its anti-American bias. A memo from WOLA leaders Bill Brown and Joseph Eldridge, for example, told witnesses before Congressional hearings that, "It is imperative that testimony be sharp, penetrating and critical of U.S. involvements wherever necessary." Rep. John Murphy (D-NY) referred to this memo as being "couched in some of the most pejorative language I have ever seen used to prepare for an 'open and frank' discussion before a Congressional committee." Rep. Murphy, in testimony before House International Relations committee on June 8, 1976, called the Washington Office on Latin America "totally biased" and "anti-United States."

The same Ernesto Cardenal brought to Washington by groups such as the Washington Office on Latin America and the IPS has been hailed on Havana Radio and has been reported as having "expressed in San Jose, Costa Rica, his justified pride in being a member of the FSLN."

While in Havana in January, 1978, Cardenal was quoted by Cuban Radio as saying that "a single revolution is underway in America and Cuba is at the vanguard." According to the Cuban Radio, he added that Nicaragua is close to victory. Cardenal was in Havana as a member of the Casa de las Americas 1978 jury. The priest, who is also a member of the Sandinista National Liberation Front of Nicaragua, said the situation in his country is quite surprising since the Somoza dictatorship has been considerably weakened. He added that the FSLN enjoys great popularity, even in the most conservative sectors.

Not hesitating to say that Castro's form of Communism is what he hopes for in his own country, Cardenal, in February, 1968, said in Havana that, "Cuba is a model for all revolutionary Christians in our America."

In February, 1979, the Washington Office on Latin America and the Institute for Policy Studies were two sponsors of a National Conference on Nicaragua. According to the *Daily World*, one of the initiators of the Conference was the U.S. Peace Council, a "new, rapidly growing organization in the U.S. that links the struggles for peace and detente with national liberation and social justice."

Actually, the organization is a flagship Communist front, affiliated with the Moscow dominated World Peace Council. The group's 1979 action plan deserves attention because it identifies the principal targets of Communist attack.

In the words of U.S. Peace Council director Michael Myerson, a well-known Communist Party member, "there is no way to separate what is happening in Iran or Nicaragua from the crisis here at home . . ." To our grave

detriment, U.S. policy makers fail to perceive this critical linkage; to face the multifrontal and multi-faceted nature of the Communist assault.

Communists have learned that through propaganda and manipulation of what Lenin called “useful idiots” around the world, their objectives can be advanced in distant places. Remember, Communism triumphed in Indochina, first, by defeating France politically in the streets of Paris in the 1950’s, and then by defeating the U.S. in a similar fashion 15 years later.

With branches in Washington, D.C., New York, Seattle, San Francisco and other cities, the U.S. Peace Council’s 1979 program is directed towards five objectives all detrimental to U.S. strategic interests:

- Reduction of U.S. military spending and mobilization of support for the SALT II arms limitation treaty with the Soviet Union.
- Support for a national petition drive for complete military, diplomatic and economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa.
- Support for Communist Vietnam against aggression from China and Kampuchea.
- Support for the human rights of the peoples of Palestine, Lebanon and IRAN.
- Support for movements in solidarity with the people of Nicaragua, Puerto Rico and Chile.

In short, the U.S. Peace Council advances the interests and objectives of Moscow’s international Communist enterprise. Its interest in peace and human rights is highly selective.

Attended by approximately 200 persons, the Conference was called for the purpose of developing a coordinated plan to overthrow the anti-Communist Somoza government by bringing pressure through the U.S. Congress, State Department, labor unions and grass roots lobbying. Plans were laid to organize a week of solidarity April 22-28, 1979, featuring demonstrations at federal buildings, Nicaraguan consulates, corporations doing business in Nicaragua and intensive Congressional lobbying in Washington, D.C. The Conference also resolved to “unmask the Nicaraguan lobby” and to target 78 “pro-Somoza Congressmen” who signed a letter to President Carter in 1978 calling attention to the Communist character of the Sandinista rebels.

Besides the U.S. Peace Council, main sponsors or endorsers of the Conference included other Soviet and Cuba linked front organization, New Left and radical groups, plus a sprinkling of more respectable ultraliberal organizations and individuals like Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Tom Quigley of the U.S. Catholic Conference and Senators Mark Hatfield and Edward Kennedy.

Several Nicaraguans attending the Conference, including one Leon Arguello, identified themselves as members of the Sandinista Liberation Front. Despite the attempt by the Sandinista delegates to include a resolution publicly identifying the Sandinistas with the Conference, that was blocked by Conference leaders. Clearly the intent was to keep the formal resolutions as uncontroversial as possible for fear of provoking unfavorable reactions

among members of Congress and “useful idiots” who had been enlisted as sponsors or endorsers of the event. However, a person who attended the Conference reported that workshops devoted considerable attention to ways of channelling financial and other support to the Sandinistas.

One Conference leader, Robert Cohen, is a prominent member of the National Lawyers Guild which U.S. authorities have characterized as “the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled union.”

Discussing the bias of UPDATE, an organ of the Washington Office on Latin America, the AFL-CIO FREE TRADE UNION NEWS of July, 1978, notes that, “Seldom does this publication address itself to the Cuban question. The January-February issue devoted all its attention to Argentina, Nicaragua, Chile, Guatemala, Paraguay, Uruguay, Panama, El Salvador, Bolivia and the Dominican Republic—but not one word about Cuba! But they are not alone in their myopia. Cuba seems somehow to escape the scrutiny of the most vocal defenders of human rights. Even Yugoslavia, the apologists’ favorite communist state, gets more and louder criticism for repression and human rights violations than does Cuba. And it is safe to say that, on the record, Tito’s Yugoslavia is not known to be as repressive and brutal as Castro.”

The AFL-CIO report declares that, “Even communist Tito and the late Francisco Franco from Spain have ordered amnesties for political prisoners. In 19 years of tyranny, however, Fidel Castro has never granted any amnesty, although he himself benefited from such a pardon by the man he overthrew—dictator Fulgencio Batista.”

The constituent groups of Washington’s pro-Castro lobby—among others The Institute for Policy Studies, The Transnational Institute, The North American Congress on Latin America and the Washington Office on Latin America—are assisted in their work of influencing U.S. foreign policy by a group of sympathizers within both the Congress and the executive branch of government. This, of course, makes their work far easier—and far more effective.

Two Carter Administration office-holders who fall into this category, Brady Tyson and Andrew Young, were mentioned earlier. Young had repeatedly downgraded all efforts to oppose the aggressive role being played by Fidel Castro in Africa. In an important article, “The World According to Andrew Young,” which appeared in the August, 1978 issue of COMMENTARY, Carl Gershman notes that, “. . . in his eagerness to demonstrate his solidarity with the new Marxist-Leninist elite of black Africa, Young finds himself today for the most part on the side not of the oppressed but of the oppressors. In Angola, for example, thousands of young people from rebel villages in the northern and central part of the country are being rounded up and shipped to Cuba’s Oriente Province where they are forced to cut sugar cane and undergo political indoctrination. At the same time, and in a far more comfortable setting, the sons and daughters of Angola’s new ruling class are receiving technical and political training in Cuba’s Isle of Pines at

schools named after President Agostinho Neto. Here, in the division between slaves and slave masters, between the victims of the new order and those who rule over it, we have a true paradigm of revolutionary Africa.”

Mr. Gershman concludes that, “While it is no doubt true that Young has established friendly relations with some leaders who are otherwise hostile to America, he has done so at the expense of a retreat from the principles of liberty and democracy. Worse still, this retreat had involved a solidarity with totalitarian rulers in the Third World whose victims might well pray to be delivered from such ‘sensitivity’ to their yearnings.”

Unfortunately, Mr. Young and Mr. Tyson are typical of the men and women brought by the Carter Administration into key positions in the foreign policy making process.

Professor Seymour Martin Lipset points out that President Carter’s “experts largely come from one ideological camp—New Politics, McGovern liberals and members of past administrations who have publicly recanted their role in the Vietnam War. In the Carter/Transition Task Force they dominated, they recommended each other. As a result, the State Department under Carter and Vance is more openly politicized than in previous administrations The prevalence of New Politics supporters in foreign policy arms-control posts, people who are convinced that a mutually advantageous accommodation with the Soviet Union is possible, increasingly worries America’s allies in Western Europe and Japan, who see Russian armament policies and maneuvers in the Middle East and Africa as evidence that Soviet expansionism continues. . . .”

The fact is that Senator George McGovern (D-S. D.) himself has said that State Department appointments have been “excellent . . . quite close to those I would have made myself.”

Among those in key foreign policy making positions, for example, are Anthony Lake and David Aaron. Lake, a former aide to Henry Kissinger who resigned in protest over U.S. military activities in Cambodia, now heads the State Department’s Policy Planning Staff. David Aaron, a former aide of Vice President Walter Mondale when he served in the U.S. Senate, now serves in the Carter Administration as deputy national security adviser. Aaron, says one familiar with his record, was instrumental in persuading Mondale to oppose “every recent major program needed to upgrade the strategic U.S. Posture.”

Mr. Lake is a board member of a group called “New Directions,” which calls for a new “workable world order,” with the U.S. joining “in a revolution of human decency and global fairness.” The Governing Board of “New Directions,” includes such an old radical face as that of Richard Barnet, co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies.

Writing in *NEW AMERICA*, the journal of the Social Democrats of the United States, an anti-Communist socialist group, Martin Taussig describes the Carter foreign policy advisers in these terms: “Holbrooke, Lake, Moose, Gelb and Spiegel are committed soft-line ideologues . . . They contribute regularly, and sometimes jointly, to *FOREIGN POLICY*, the out-of-office in-

strument of the post-Vietnam Democratic soft-line establishment. In combination they are likely to constitute the most potent force in a department otherwise staffed by bland career diplomats or people without foreign policy experience. Indeed it seems likely that the State Department team was shaped more by them than by anyone else. If Carter has in fact not yet made up his mind about the foreign policy direction he wishes to pursue, he may find that the composition of the new State Department has limited his options. But the appointments themselves seem to be evidence that Carter has made up his mind. He apparently hopes to build a governing coalition by heeding . . . the New Politics movement in foreign policy.”

One of the harshest critics of the “New Politics” approach to the foreign policy of the Carter Administration has been Senator Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N. Y.). Senator Moynihan charges that the policies emanating from men such as Athony Lake and David Aaron have diverted attention from an increasing ideological military threat from the Soviet Union and its allies, such as Cuba. He said that their repeated calls for joint U.S.-Soviet action, “leads where I for one would not wish to follow . . . It is as if with no further consideration, we should divert our attention from the central political struggle of our time—that between liberal democracy and totalitarian communism—and focus instead on something else.”

Among others who fall into the same category as foreign policy advisers Lake and Aaron are Robert Pastor and Mark Schneider.

Mr. Pastor, who worked for the Linowitz Commission and was a long-time advocate of turning the Panama Canal over to the Panamanian government, became the White House National Security Council’s staff specialist for Latin American Policy. Mark Schneider, who served as an aide to Senator Edward Kennedy and assisted him in cutting arms aid to Chile in 1975 as a result of “human rights” violations, became President Carter’s Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Pastor and Schneider have consistently urged a stringent application of “human rights” standards to pro-Western governments in Latin America but have refused to apply such standards to Cuba.

The same Robert Pastor who now serves President Carter was a member of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Latin America of the Transnational Institute. In the acknowledgements accompanying this group’s study, entitled THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A NEW APPROACH TO INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, Mark Schneider is thanked for his assistance. The coordinator of that project was Roberta Salper the long-time radical whose background and other activities have already been discussed.

Its “recommendations” for the Carter Administration stress that, “Apart from dropping paternalistic attitudes and practices, the new thrust of U.S. policy in Latin America should be to support the ideologically diverse and experimental approaches to development that are gaining support around the world. Underlying this recognition and response must be the acceptance of ideological pluralism in both economic and political affairs. As a norm of

international relations, the primary implication of accepting ideological pluralism is clear: the United States must not intervene to shape governments and societies to our views and preferences. Instead, the U.S. must recognize the right of peoples around the world to determine the nature of their political and economic institutions for themselves. Accepting the principle means, for example, that the U.S. will not boycott and isolate (or ultimately invade) any country, however small or near, because of political and economic differences . . . ”

Using such euphemistic terms as “ideological pluralism” and “non-intervention” hardly disguises the real policy being advocated: the full acceptance of Castro’s Cuba, an end to any trade embargo, the establishment of full diplomatic relations. Not mentioned, of course, is the fact that traditional U.S. opposition to Castro has not been based upon any desire for “ideological purity,” or any opposition, for example, to a decision by Cuba to have a “socialist” economy. The U.S., after all, has cordial relations with many socialist states. The objection to Castro was, and is, that he is exporting violent revolution. He is doing so in Ethiopia, in Mozambique, in Angola, in Zaire, in Rhodesia—and in Latin America as well. The demand for “ideological pluralism” is, on its face, a demand for something far different—*carte blanche* for aggression.

In *THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION* there is extensive discussion of “human rights violations.” The authors state that, “The dramatic deterioration of respect for human rights in Latin America during the past decade has been amply documented . . . The case of Chile is a striking example. The Chilean military government, which took power in 1973 with a program of virulent anti-Communism and of national development based on the free play of market forces has proven itself one of the most oppressive in the history of Latin America; and yet it was, until recently, (figured on a per-capita basis) one of the most favored nations in the world in terms of U.S. private and public support. The nexus between official U.S. assistance and repression in recipient countries must be broken.”

Not one word appears in *THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION* in regard to this Hemisphere’s most serious violator of human rights—Castro’s Cuba. Whenever Cuba is mentioned, it is not as a violator of human rights but as an example of the kind of “ideological pluralism” which the U.S. should embrace. While urging the U.S. to isolate Chile and eliminate any aid to it, the authors call for a policy toward Cuba which would “reflect the clear recognition that Cuba has no reason to make amends for its decision to follow a socialist development alternative.” No mention is made of Cuba’s political prisoners—which have been estimated to number up to 80,000. “Ideological pluralism” is not a demand made by the authors of *THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION* upon their Cuban friends.

The recommendations also urge a unilateral decision by the U.S. “to phase out gradually public and private military grant aid for arms purchases and to withdraw U.S. military bases gradually from Latin America.”

Discussing the influence of the Institute for Policy Studies' on White House staff members—such as Brady Tyson, Robert Pastor and Mark Schneider—Lt. General Gordon Sumner, Jr., former Chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board, told a House International Relations subcommittee that, “Under the guise of human rights, a small group of radical policy makers led by Mr. Robert Pastor of the National Security Council, Dr. Brady Tyson of Ambassador Young’s staff, Asst. Sec. of State Pat Derian and Deputy Asst. Sec. Mark Schneider have, in effect, gravely damaged our security in the Western Hemisphere. Championing such causes as absolute worldwide arms sales ceilings, espousing the obviously bankrupt ideology that if there were no weapons, there would be no wars, and contending that U.S. military schooling is responsible for repressive governments, etc. this group, known around Washington as ‘the New Left network,’ has effectively terminated most of the military relationships and seriously affected political relationships in this hemisphere. Working with like-minded staffers in the Congress, they have done a ‘hatchet job’ on the long established security apparatus of the Americas that grew out of World War II and was formalized by the Treaty of Rio in 1948.”

General Sumner declared that, “The message broadcast by the Carter Administration is for the countries of this hemisphere to go left. By embracing the leftist governments and left wing dictators such as Omar Torrijos, while taking punitive action against the right wing and conservative governments, we have departed on a path that the American people know nothing about and would, in my opinion, totally reject. As a matter of interest, state socialism has consistently failed in this hemisphere, and most of these governments, such as Peru, Chile and Jamaica, are desperately attempting to find a way out of the problems brought on by socialism.”

One result of policies supported by the President’s far-left advisers on Latin American has been the dismantlement of the traditional alliance between the U.S. and Brazil. As General Sumner testified, “The 1977 I.P.S. report THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION . . . reads like a blue print for present Administration policies, policies that have been or are being implemented often by individuals like Mr. Pastor and Mr. Schneider who first had a hand in formulating them . . .”

Brazil has not been the only victim of the Carter Administration’s one-sided policy. Argentina has been another. On August 9, 1978 under questioning by the House Inter-American Affairs subcommittee, the Administration’s human rights chief, Assistant Secretary of State Patricia Derian, responded with what columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak described as “language seldom used by one friendly power against another, accusing the Argentine regime of killings, kidnappings and torture. So harsh was her language that the State Department tried to expunge it from the record. But apart from being undiplomatic, there is considerable doubt of its accuracy.”

Describing the impact of the President’s radical-left advisers, Evans and Novak declare that, “The impact could prove tragic for U.S.-Argentine rela-

tions and perhaps for Argentina itself. Moderate and pro-U.S. elements within the Argentina junta have been weakened; deterioration of the U.S. position in the southern corner of South America has been accelerated. This cannot be dismissed as merely unfortunate ardor by an idealist unfamiliar with diplomacy. Deterioration of U.S. relations with Brazil, Chile and now Argentina too closely follows the scenario of Latin American specialists in the Carter Administration who privately predicted the human-rights crusade would foster the left in the Western Hemisphere.”

Miss Derian’s indictment of Argentina was harsh. Columnists Evans and Novak, however, dispute its accuracy. They write that, “Her office insists the Argentine junta has ‘executed 3,000 persons since seizing power in 1976 and at least another 4,000 are missing.’ But those figures come from private sources of dubious reliability. U.S. government bureaus, with vastly more experience than Derian’s, say the figures cannot be verified and seem inflated. Actually, the junta, in confronting bloody far-left revolt in 1976, used an iron fist to prevent a communist takeover . . . objective observers agree that Argentina’s human-rights record has improved markedly in the past year.”

Before President Carter took office, Brady Tyson predicted that human rights would be used to support revolutionary forces in the hemisphere. An identical prediction was made last year by Robert Pastor. As events have unfolded, this has certainly proven to be the case.

Congressional Support

It is not only within the executive branch of government that Washington’s pro-Castro lobby has extensive influence. The same is true in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Of particular significance in this connection are the seminars conducted for “Congressmen and Congressional Assistants” by the I.P.S. These have included programs on “Defense and Disarmament,” “New Trends In Public Policy,” the “Impact Of The Vietnam War On American Society,” “The State And The Corporate Economy,” and “New Era Of American Policy and Statecraft.”

Among members of the Senate and House, past and present, who have been listed in official I.P.S. publications as having participated in the I.P.S. seminars and conferences in recent years are the following: Senator Clifford Case, Rep. F. Bradford Morse, Rep. Alphonso Bell, Rep. Robert Ellsworth, Rep. Joseph McDade, Rep. William Maillard, Rep. Augustus Hawkins, Rep. Robert Kastenmeier, Rep. Henry Gonzalez, Rep. John Conyers, Rep. John Brademas, Rep. Philip Burton, Rep. John Dow, Rep. Don Edwards, Rep. Albert Quie, Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal, Rep. William Fitts Ryan, Rep. Donald Rumsfeld, Rep. Al Ullman, Rep. George Brown, Rep. Thomas L. Ashley, Rep. James A. MacKay and Rep. William Widnall.

Many of these members of Congress are listed as members of the influential Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (MCPL), a group which, among other things, advocates virtual unilateral disarmament.

The connection between the I.P.S. and the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law seems almost beyond question. In a letter dated February 20, 1975, 47 members of Congress—most of them associated with MCPL—commissioned the Institute for Policy Studies to prepare a study entitled THE PROBLEM OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET. It was written by a special I.P.S./Transnational Institute “Study Group On The Federal Budget.” The study advocated a sharp increase in government involvement in all aspects of the economy coupled with a severe reduction in expenditures for national security and national defense.

Among the 47 congressmen who requested the I.P.S. study were Reps. Bella Abzug, Robert Drinan, Walter Fauntroy, Andrew Maguire, Frederick Richmond, Herbert Harris, Robert Krueger, John Conyers, Edward Koch, Michael Harrington, Parren Mitchell, Andrew Young, Abner Mikva, and John Conyers.

Assessing the impact of I.P.S. and the members of congress associated with it, The Heritage Foundation, noted that, “It can be argued . . . that this group is hardly representative of the ideological mainstream of the House of Representatives; but it also must be conceded that many of these men and women have been among the most vocal and visible of the members of the House in recent years. They have formed a left-liberal grouping that has managed to achieve a degree of influence in certain specific areas and which has been especially active in the national defense-national security area. Furthermore, the repeated participation in I.P.S. activities by certain members of Congress indicates that they must be in substantial agreement with at least part of the Institute’s program, aided in large measure over the years by grants from our major tax-exempt foundations despite the available evidence of the obviously radical aims of the Institute’s principal leadership”

Some members of Congress and the far-left have repeatedly worked together to promote a policy which would lead to the recognition of Fidel Castro’s regime in Cuba and eliminate all efforts to thwart Castroite Communist aggressive designs in the world.

An early dramatic example of such coordination took place in April, 1972 when, under the auspices of Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and then Senator Harold Hughs (D-Iowa), a two day conference of far-left activists assembled at the New Senate Office Building to develop a new U.S. policy on Cuba. The organizer of the conference, Professor Larry Birns who, of course, now heads the Council for Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), admitted that he deliberately selected panelists who look favorably on “normalizing” relations with Cuba. The sessions, he said, were not supposed to generate an open debate.

One panelist, John M. Cates, Jr., director of the Center for Inter-American Relations, remarked: “So why are we here? We’re here so Senator Kennedy can have a rationale to get our country to recognize Cuba.”

Brady Tyson, described by HUMAN EVENTS as "the most militant panelist," said that public opinion must be mobilized to persuade the U.S. to ease relations with Castro's regime. He urged the formation of Committees of Cuban-Americans for this purpose.

The meeting was financed by the Fund for the New Priorities in America. Listed as co-sponsors of an ad which virtually the same group, under the name Committee for Peace and New Priorities, placed in THE NEW YORK TIMES, were such pro-Hanoi groups as the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam and Vietnam Veterans Against The War. With the end of the Vietnam War, the group simply shifted its focus from pro-Hanoi to pro-Havana activities.

The pro-Castro lobby has been well-financed. The Institute for Policy Studies, in a publication entitled BEGINNING THE SECOND DECADE, acknowledges the following principal sources of funding:

- * the Bernstein Foundation
- * the Stern Family Fund
- * the Fontaney Corporation
- * the Janss Foundation
- * Irving F. Laucks
- * the Rubin Foundation
- * the San Fransisco Foundation
- * the Sperry family
- * the late James P. Warburg and the Warburg family
- * the Field Foundation

According to I.P.S., it has also received assistance from a number of colleges and universities, among them: the State University of New York at Stony Brook, the University of California at Berkeley, Cornell University, the University of Illinois, Reed College, Antioch College, Tougaloo College, and Virginia Theological Seminary. The I.P.S. has maintained a particularly close relationship with Antioch College, whose president, James Dixon, was among the earliest Institute trustees.

The Heritage Foundation reports that, "Other sources of significant financing for I.P.S. which have been identified include the Ford Foundation, the Institute for International Order, the Society for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues, the National Board of the Presbyterian Church, the Cudahy Fund, Jennifer Cafritz, Watts E. Meyer, Michael Gellert, the Commonwealth Fund, the Jacob Ziskind Trust, the Palisades Foundation, and Community Research and Development, Inc."

THE WASHINGTON POST of January 23, 1977 reports that I.P.S. has gone from a total expense figure of \$177,432.82 for the October 1, 1963 September 30, 1964 year (its first full year of operation for tax purposes) to an operating budget that today approaches \$1,000,000.

In Washington the leftist lobby on Latin America has been aided by members of Congress and others who have recently visited Cuba and returned to

paint a glowing picture of the Castro regime. Upon Senator George McGovern's return—after he made a number of affirmative comments about life under Castro—NEW TIMES MAGAZINE pointed out that the Senator and other recent visitors to Cuba had “put their stamp of tolerance on Fidel Castro's revolution.” The same was true with regard to a group of Minnesota businessmen who visited Cuba.

Commenting upon this phenomenon, Professor Marvin Alisky of Arizona State University, formerly an NBC network correspondent in Cuba, observed that “a strange alliance of liberals and businessmen” are pressuring President Carter to restore full diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba. These groups, he observed, smile benevolently on Latin America's most collectivized economy, “ignoring the price Cubans paid for in loss of all political dissent . . . The same commentators who publicly denounce the lack of civil liberties in Chile somehow are not concerned with the lack of academic freedom at the University of Havana.”

Professor Alisky states that, “The business lobbyists smell sales, perhaps \$500 million. But the catch is that Cuba has no reserve currency. It mortgages its sugar crop to pay for Russian oil and European machinery. The Castro government wants the U.S. to unfreeze bank deposits in the U.S. claimed by Cuba. These were frozen when Castro confiscated \$2 billion worth of U.S. assets in Cuba, calling it ‘expropriation.’ But that term means nationalization with some compensation. Not one cent was ever paid to rightful owners. The Cubans also want U.S. banks to lend the Castro government funds or lines of credit. These credits would pay the businessmen now lobbying for trade relations with Havana. The American taxpayer would pay the tab. Uncle Sam could again be Uncle Sap.”

The man who serves as “consultant” for U.S. businessmen anxious for a piece of the Cuban action is Kirby Jones, former press aide to George McGovern. Calling for an end to the U.S. embargo, Jones states that, “The amount of trade is limited but somebody's going to get their business. If there's a market, Americans want a part of it . . . I don't see how the government can continue to resist the pressure from the business community.”

Columnist Patrick Buchanan asked: “Is there not a conflict of interest, with McGovern pushing legislation which will initiate trade from which McGovern's protege is sure to rip off a fat broker's fee?”

More serious is the question of the gullibility of both American businessmen and others, a gullibility carefully cultivated by those in the U.S. who promote Castro's interests. Reporting about the manner in which American businessmen were captivated by Castro while in Cuba, WALL STREET JOURNAL correspondent Robert Keatley reported: “The Castro charm seemed to work once again with these visiting Americans, as it so often does. The group was respectful, almost reverent at times, which is frequently the case when conservative U.S. executives meet famous Communist officials. They asked no difficult questions.” Another report indicated that the visiting American businessmen gave Castro a standing ovation.

Discussing Senator McGovern's strange performance in Cuba, columnist John Roche expressed this view: "Senator McGovern seems to have gotten along famously with Raul and Fidel, but to what extent was this based on his avoiding certain topics? It's fine to talk about trade. The corridors of Washington are full of hungry capitalists looking for markets—and for the U.S. to extend credit to all sorts of barbarians so they can purchase our goods. Castro would undoubtedly be pleased to accept American credit . . . But did Senator McGovern inquire about political repression in Cuba? Did he, to be specific, raise the case of Hubert Matos, who has spent 17 years in jail literally for doing nothing? Remember when Castro was captured in 1953 after his unsuccessful raid on the Moncada army barracks, Batista sentenced him to 15 years and let him out in 2." Matos was seized and tried—without being charged with any crime. The trial consisted of a seven-hour harange by Castro followed by a 20-year sentence. John Roche wrote, "I hope Senator McGovern raised the Matos case with his charming hosts. Perhaps he will fill us in on this dimension of his 'cordial' discussions."

Professor Irving Louis Horowitz of Rutgers University laments that, "The vanity of congressmen and businessmen is such that it takes little more than a casual wining and dining, and a midnight visitation to turn the heads of the American guests of the Cuban leadership."

Senator George McGovern, described by Horowitz as the "kingpin figure in the Cuba lobby," described Castro as "soft-spoken, wry, sensitive, sometimes witty, sometimes slightly ill at ease . . . I frankly liked him and so did the rest of my party." For McGovern, the parallels between Vietnam and Cuba are frequently mentioned. He notes that, "Castro is something of a Ho Chi Minh of Cuba."

Another of those who is enthusiastic about Castro is Senator Frank Church (D-Idaho). He recently stated that, "Our embargo of Cuba isolates only the U.S. . . . Within Cuba today, one cannot help but see the signs of a spreading prosperity; despite the setback of rock-bottom sugar prices in the current world market. Not only the people in Havana, but people in the once impoverished countryside are surprisingly well dressed and fed, their youngsters a picture of health. Modern schools—all built alike, to save money—are spread across the landscape. Here the children are boarded, each devoting 15 hours a week to work in the fields, with their weekends spent at home."

Of Senator Church's enthusiasm, Professor Horowitz writes: "The metaphysical pathos behind Senator Church's quite typical remarks is clear: the political instinct to get on a bandwagon underwrites much of the effort by the Cuba lobby. The syllogism is: if the current United States position leads to its isolation, and isolationism is evil, then the way to break that isolation is to re-establish relationships with Cuba. But all kinds of questions remain: whether, in fact, such a legitimation of relationships would not indeed isolate the U.S. from other nations of the hemisphere, such as Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela . . . It is true that children work fifteen hours weekly in farm labor. But to celebrate child labor in Cuba hardly represents a

necessary or sufficient grounds for full diplomatic relationships. To be sure, there was once a time when both critics and supporters of bourgeois civilization held child labor to be a vice, not a virtue . . . ”

What the Cuban lobby urges, Dr. Horowitz declares, “is an abandonment of political policy in favor of economic advantage. When one considers the miniscule character of those advantages in exchange for the acceptance of the very real presence of a world-wide military effort on the part of the Soviet Union enlisting the Cubans as their battering rams, the magnitude of the Cuba lobby as a pure political instrument becomes self-evident What we have are congressional demands for diplomatic relations with a country that has dramatically escalated its overseas operations and military adventures. . . . to believe for an instant that such recognition by the U.S. of the Cuban claims will result in an immediate transformation of Cuban foreign policy, would be a profound error.”

The fact is that Senators Church, McGovern and the others, while applying a stringent “human rights” standard to our friends in Latin America, completely ignore the very serious violations of human rights in Cuba. The same is true of the President’s New Left second echelon of advisers, known as “the Network.” The effort to re-establish relations with Cuba is clearly one being carried on by men and women who are not only pro-Castro but who are, in addition, opposed to all efforts to challenge Communism, either in the Western Hemisphere, or elsewhere.

The hypocrisy of the pro-Castro lobby was commented upon by columnist Bernard Levin in THE TIMES of London for March 14, 1978. Mr. Levin, one of England’s most respected political commentators, declared that, “Of all the totalitarian countries of the world, the one which escapes censure most completely and most unjustifiably is Cuba . . . The trouble is that the whitewash was applied to Castro in his early days, more liberally than to any other dictator, possibly not excepting Ho Chi Minh or even Mao himself; how often we were told that Castro was only an agrarian reformer, was concerned only to remove from Cuba the Batista dictatorship, was obliged, much against his will to adopt certain not wholly democratic measures solely because of the wickedness of the Americans . . . ”

The fact is, Mr. Levin states, that while the number of political prisoners in Cuban jails cannot be positively determined, “. . . Castro himself admitted to an American journalist it was some 20,000, and the estimates of the U.S. State Department . . . are the same. That, as a proportion of the population, is almost certainly the highest in the world, certainly much higher than the Soviet Union itself . . . I have said nothing, because I presume it can be taken for granted, about Castro’s fundamental totalitarianism—the censorship, the political courts, the denial of workers’ rights, the Marxifying of education at all levels, the adulation of the Soviet Union . . . In some respects, Castro’s version of communism is actually worse than the Soviet Union’s. Indeed, it is at times hideously reminiscent of Stalin’s tyranny itself”

Cuban Exiles Seek “normalization”

In addition to the traditional pro-Castro groups which have been active in the political arena there are a number of groups which have emerged within the Cuban exile community whose aim is to promote “normalization” of relations with Cuba.

Such groups represent an infinitesimal number of Cuban-Americans, but they have been active and vocal in recent days.

Among these groups are *Areito*, the Antonio Maceo Brigade, and the Committee for Normalization of Relations with Cuba.

AREITO, which is rumored to receive subsidization by the Cuban mission to the United Nations, is led by Professor Lourdes Casal, a Rutgers University sociologist. It supports the lifting of the U.S. embargo against Cuba and through its publication promotes a favorable view of life under the Castro regime. Although it represents an estimated 100 persons or less, it is active in propagandizing in behalf of Cuban Communism.

The ANTONIO MACEO BRIGADE is composed primarily of young Cubans in the U.S. who have belatedly “discovered” the Cuban “revolution.” A number of them have gone to Cuba to visit and have met with Castro. Their activities are frequently reported in the official Cuban Communist Party newspaper, GRANMA. One of the leaders of this group is Rafael Betancourt, who has served as an official with the U.S. Department of Labor.

When the Commission of 75 Cuban-Americans met with Fidel Castro late in 1978, Rafael Betancourt and Lourdes Casal were among those in attendance.

It is obvious that the pro-Castro lobby has adopted a “Cuba right or wrong” policy with regard to events within Cuba as well as to Cuba’s aggressive role in Africa, Central America and elsewhere. The I.P.S., WOLA, NACLA and the other constituent elements of the pro-Castro lobby have never uttered a word of criticism either of the deprivation of freedom within Cuba or concerning Cuba’s role in the world. The same is true of Cuba’s more prominent proponents, such as Senator McGovern and Andrew Young.

In this regard, columnist Anthony Harrigan, Executive Vice President of the U.S. Industrial Council writes: “No matter how many countries are invaded or subverted by Cuban forces, the Cuba lobby in the U.S. is prepared to defend or explain away the communist intervention . . . Senator McGovern, who is the most consistent apologist for the Castro dictatorship, recently refused to accept the Central Intelligence Agency’s evidence of Cuban involvement in the invasion of Zaire. Ambassador Young continues to assert his view that Cuban forces in Africa aren’t a menace . . . It’s time that the press study Senator McGovern’s Havana connection with the same thoroughness it explored the Watergate issue. The Senate should inquire into Sen. McGovern’s sources and contacts. Efforts should be made to learn the extent of the Senator’s associations with the Cubans and whether his ties and communications violate any laws. As for Ambassador Young, it is scandal-

ous that he is allowed to remain in office while serving as an apologist for Castro.”

The effort to alter U.S. policy in Latin America—to normalize relations with Cuba while breaking relations with such traditional friends as Brazil and Argentina—and the push for trade with Cuba while ignoring its aggressive role in Africa and elsewhere, is being promoted, as we have seen, by a sophisticated, well organized and well financed lobbying effort. Elements of this lobbying apparatus may be found in the Congress, in the executive branch of government, and in a host of organizations whose purpose it is to influence government policy and media and public opinion.

If such lobbying efforts are to be effectively countered, it is essential that we understand the nature of that effort and those who are involved in implementing it. Unless it is properly understood we will be ill prepared to respond to it.

The COMMITTEE FOR NORMALIZATION OF RELATIONS WITH CUBA operates out of a post office box in New York City. This group has members of various viewpoints, ranging from those who support Castro unequivocally to those who simply believe that official U.S. relations with Cuba should move forward. This group recently wrote a letter to President Carter requesting the lifting of the embargo against Cuba.

Experts within the U.S.-Cuban community believe that the Castro regime has fundamentally altered its propaganda effort in the U.S. In the early 1960s, Castro appealed primarily to leftists in the U.S., but in the early 1970s, these observers state, Castro decided to deal instead with the U.S. business and academic community. He initiated an approach of selling stability to American businessmen, telling them that Cuba, with no unions, low wages and a guaranteed return on capital, was an ideal place for American investment.

The fact remains that a new and, thus far, effective tactic being employed by the Cuban Government in its efforts to achieve normalization of relations with the U.S. is the use of friendly elements in the Cuban exile community for these purposes. In discussing Fidel Castro's decision to release political prisoners, and his meeting in December, 1978, with the exile group, Karen De Young, writing in THE WASHINGTON POST (December 15, 1978) notes that, “For Castro, aside from the humanitarian aspects of the program, it has turned out to be a political and public relations coup of significant proportions Even if they have not become firm supporters of the Cuban revolution, one of the visiting exiles marveled, ‘Castro made us do something the Revolution considers revolutionary. And he made us feel good about it.’ ”

The friendly Cuban exiles, Miss De Young reports, were treated “to a VIP charter airplane, whose two-hour flight to Havana from Atlanta on December 7 quickly became a floating lounge with free-flowing Havana Club rum and thick smoke of Cuban cigars. Castro publicly massaged their egos. At the Saturday morning news conference, he repeatedly referred to the exiles,

formerly known as ‘worms’ in local Cuban slang, as ‘the true representatives of the Cuban community abroad.’ He praised their ‘courage and valor in defying the threats . . . of terrorist elements in the United States opposed to dialogue.’”

The Washington Lobby on Latin America

Policy in Washington towards Fidel Castro's Cuba, and towards Castroite elements in Latin America and around the world, has become increasingly cordial. This is so despite the fact that within Cuba itself oppression has in no sense diminished. Abroad, particularly in Africa and Central America, the Cuban role has been growing.

Supporters of relaxed relations with Castro and his affiliates throughout Latin America (not to mention Africa) are centralized in several groups. The close connection between these groups and men and women in influential policy-making positions in Washington is the subject of this study.

The constituent groups of Washington's pro-Castro lobby—among others the Institute for Policy Studies, the Transnational Institute, the North American Congress on Latin America and the Washington Office on Latin America—are assisted in their work of influencing U.S. foreign policy by a group of sympathizers within both the Congress and the Executive branch of government. This, of course, makes their work far easier and far more effective.

