rchestrated Outrage About Cuba 2 Inderneath the inaccurate state Castro seized power, and despite a office of New Jersey Sen. Robert near-constant drive by the United Torricelli went so far as to brand us

Underneath the inaccurate statements and ad hominem attacks by Roger E. Hernandez ["The Cuban Influence," op-ed, Feb. 3] against the Center for Public Integrity for its recent investigative report, "Squeeze Play: The United States, Cuba, and the Helms-Burton Act," our facts, figures and overall findings remain unchallenged.

Since 1979, we found, individuals and organizations with a direct, identifiable interest or stake in the future of Cuba have poured more than \$4.4 million into the U.S. political system. Of that amount, approximately \$3.2 million, or 73 percent, has come from trustees and directors of the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF).

of imposing U.S. law on the subsidwhich took the unprecedented step the passage of the Helms-Burton act the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act, which eliminated U.S. subsidiary ation of Radio Marti and TV Marti, gotten-three things. First, the cre-Cuba PAC, have pushed for-and ably the most effective in Washingforce that is, dollar for dollar, arguiaries of foreign companies. trade with Cuba. And third, in 1996 have cost U.S. taxpayers more than \$280 million. Second, the passage of the broadcasting operations that American Foundation and the Free ton. CANF and its allies, the Cuban Canosa, have created a lobbying CANF and its chairman, Jorge Mas

Nearly four decades after Fidel

castro seized power, and despite a near-constant drive by the United States to get rid of him, he is still "racis ruling Cuba and—more than ever— we are straining our alliances to free the hemisphere from its last dictatorship. How did this happen? Why has group

the United
States taken
such a hard
line against
Cuba in com-

parison with other countries, such as China, that also have dictatorial regimes and equally egregious human rights records? Why has so little meaningful debate been heard on Capitol Hill over U.S. policy toward Cuba?

Much of our work at the Center for Public Integrity—we've issued 27 investigative reports in six years—has focused on the political process and how it sometimes can become distorted. And so it seemed like a perfectly reasonable undertaking to examine U.S. policy toward Cuba and the forces behind it.

The orchestrated reaction and public campaign against our study are actually a metaphor for the influence—and tactics—of the Cuban American National Foundation and its supporters. The day before our study was released at a Washington news conference, CANF was already circulating attack information about the center to journalists and others. CANF's supporters in Congress took to the radio airwaves in Miami. The

Torricelli went so far as to brand us "racist." In his similarly intemperate comments, columnist Hernandez blasted the center for "using racial stereotypes to attack an ethnic group." The demonization of the messenger

Taking Exception was completed by repeated references to the Arca Foun-

made a grant of \$25,000 to the political parties. Nine other foundagroups contributes to politicians and weren't hammered. None of these nies and other groups interested in Cuba. Two other foundations helped the Arca Foundation has funded ormally declined to support this yeartions, conservative and liberal, forto underwrite our research, but they "The Cuba Hustlers" about compamote a dialogue with Cuba, which we ganizations and conferences to prothe cost of the study. Over the years, center, accounting for less than half long project. detailed in a separate chapter titled dation, which

Unlike many not-for-profit organizations, the Center for Public Integrity has always identified up-front—as we did in our news conference and on page two of our Cuba study—our specific sources of support. Arca and the other 20 foundations that contributed to us in 1996 knew at the outset that they could have absolutely no role in our investigations. In-

deed, we have lost many donors over the years that became unhappy with our findings.

as Aryan Nation. "Squeeze Play" is about the evolution of U.S. policy Center for Public Integrity's board ers, including the distinguished Cuethnic group-period. Such distincaffect public policy. It is not about an organization's successful efforts to toward Cuba, and about a political op militia capabilities and worked year ago that a co-chairman of Pat and advisory board. Buchanan's presidential campaign for Public Integrity that pointed out a being called a racist—that's a first oan American journalists on the tions are understood by most readwith such white supremacist groups had taught hate groups how to develconsidering that it was the Center Imagine my chagrin, however, at

It seems to me that Hernandez and the Cuban American National Foundation want to have it both ways. The conservative faction of the Cuban American exile community discovered in the early 1980s how to wield political power and influence in Washington as effectively as any organization. But anyone who has the temerity to note its inordinate potency as a political force is viciously slammed and smeared with the ignominious epithet of "racist."

The writer is the founder and executive director of the Center for Public Integrity.