(Uruguay Mitrione) MITRIONE, DAN Soc 4.01.4 State of Seige URUGUAY

Approved For Release 2005/01/13 : CIA-RDP88-01365R000300210067-1

dation. It is the Government's hope that the good offices of the Commissioner will continue to be used as required to facilitate settlements of all kinds.

The Government views this claims policy in the context of other policies intended and designed to remove the sense of grievance and injustice which impedes the relationships of the Indian and Inuit peoples with the governments concerned and with their fellow Canadians.

THE TRUTH ABOUT DAN MITRIONE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the September 9, 1973 issue of the Indianapolis Star carried a tremendously important article by Dr. Ernest W. Lefever concerning the vicious distortions and outright lies in a currently popular film purporting to depict the events surrounding the assassination of a great American, the late Dan Mitrione.

Dr. Lefever, a distinguished scholar on the staff of one of our most prestigious research institutions, the Brookings Institution, demonstrates with precise detail that the film, "State of Siege," far from being a factual account of the struggle of heroic Latin American revolutionaries against U.S. imperialism, is a shameless and coldblooded piece of far-left propaganda. In this connection, Mr. President, it is worth noting that the "heroes" of the film, the Uruguayan revolutionaries called Tupamaros, have been denounced by the Uruguayan Communist Party as "insane fanatics" and by Moscow's leaders as "loudmouthed thugs" using "gangster tactics." So we are not dealing here with traditional Communist propaganda but with that species of leftist fanaticism represented by the murderous "Black September" movement as well as by the Tupamaros.

The most savage of the distortions in "State of Siege" is the portrayal of Dan Mitrione as, in Dr. Lefever's words:

> A ruthless, calculating, deceitful man . . . a CIA superagent willingly serving U.S. political and financial interests by installing reactionary, repressive, semi-fascist regimes in Latin America.

In fact, however, Dan Mitrione was a deeply respected, much loved resident of Richmond, Ind., who joined the Agency for International Development after a distinguished career as a police officer, rising from patrolman to chief in just 11 years. The father of nine children, a devoted family man and church member, he was active in a wide variety of Richmond charitable and social service activities. A colleague of his during his AID service has described him as "unusually compassionate. He was considerate. Brutality was foreign to his nature. The Uruguayans who got to know him held him in affection and respect."

And yet this film, which explicitly claims to be factual, shows the character based on Dan Mitrione as an instructor and advocate of torture, a conscienceless agent of Fascist-style repression, the instigator of rightwing acts of terror against people struggling to be free.

The real Dan Mitrione was not only wholly different as a human being, his job in Uruguay was the perfectly legitimate one of helping to train local police officials in advanced techniques of administration and crime detection. And it is worth reminding ourselves, Mr. President, that the Uruguay in which he served was the model democracy of Latin America, a free and open society characterized by genuinely democratic political institutions and extensive social welfare programs. In addition, Uruguay was a staunch supporter in the United Nations and the Organization of American States of U.S. policies, and therefore no American policymaker in his right mind would have thought it desirable, much less have attempted, to replace the existing government with a Fascist-type dictatorship—this being one of the principal reasons, according to the film, for Mitrione's presence in Uruguay.

The fully documented article by Dr. Lefever details a great number of other distortions and lies in this self-proclaimed factual film. He concludes that:

> "State of Siege" is in fact a cynical propaganda tract masquerading as a documentary.

That is, perhaps, the kindest way to put it. It is an unspeakable slur on the memory of a good and decent man, and it is from beginning to end a vile calumny on the policies and purposes of the United States. One does not have to be an unquestioning supporter of every one of this Nation's foreign policies to label as a vicious lie the claim that we are sending Americans around the world to teach torture and bring down democratically elected governments.

I do not want to be understood, Mr. President, as denying any filmmaker the right to make and exhibit any political propaganda he wishes. If someone wants to put together a movie purporting to show that Adolf Hitler was a true and beautiful humanitarian and that nazism was dedicated to the highest ideals of Western civilization, we should not deny him a license. But those who view this film ought not to suppose that what they are seeing is a scrupulously accurate documentary, a genuine contribution to history.

That, unfortunately, is the widely disseminated notion about "State of Siege." Its director, Mr. Costas-Gavras, knows exactly what he is doing; too many of those who reviewed the film and recommended it to the American public do not.

So to the extent that Dr. Lefever's article can serve as a vitally needed corrective to the brutal dishonesty of "State of Siege," it deserves the widest possible currency. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT DAN MITRIONE

(By Ernest W. Lefever)

Washington.—At 4:15 a.m., Monday, Aug. 10, 1970, the body of a stocky, unshaven 50-year-old man was found in the back seat of a stolen Buick convertible parked on Calle Lucas Moreno at Montevideo, Uruguay.

Blood was dripping through the floorboards and running toward the curb. He had been shot twice in the head and twice in the body. His eyes were bandaged. His left armpit bore deep bruises close to a half-healed gunshot wound. His inner arms were pitted by 16 needle-punctures.

This 12th murder—and fifth kidnap—victim of the Tupamaro terrorists was Dan A. Mitrione, former police chief of Richmond, Ind., devoted Catholic father of nine who was a U.S. public safety adviser in Uruguay.

Kidnaped 11 days earlier, Mitrione had been "tried" by a Tupamaro "peoples court" and accused of being a CIA or FBI agent, of teaching Uruguayan police advanced torture techniques and of organizing a campaign of repression against "revolutionary" leaders. For these "crimes" he had been condemned to death.

Three years later, Mitrione's good name has been besmirched and his family anguished by a viciously anti-American film designed to malign him and what he stood for, and "prove" that the Tupamaros who killed him were justified.

"State of Siege" was authorized by two apostles of Europe's intellectual left—Constantin Gavras (who now calls himself "Costa-Gavras"), a craggy-faced film director of Russian-Greek parentage, and Franco Solinas, gifted Italian Communist scriptwriter.

It reportedly was bankrolled by Donald S. Rugoff, Madison Avenue film distributor, who has a taste for radical themes and whose wife plays a role in "State of Siege."

Costa-Gavras, the "Hitchcock of the left," has spared little effort in his attempt to convince American critics and the world that his film is a factually exact account of the life, kidnaping and death of Mitrione.

"The events in this film actually took place in a South American country," says the opening line, followed by a close-up of a light green Cadillac with a Montevideo license plate.

"State of Siege," like Costa-Gavras's previous box-office hit, "Z" (which Rugoff also reportedly underwrote to the tune of $600,000), makes use of a documentary format. Costa-Gavras and Solinas (who wrote "Battle of Algiers") intended it to be dramatic journalism, accepted as fact, not fiction.

This claim that "State of Siege" is factual, at least in essentials, has been accepted at or near face value by many American reviewers. A few took the opposite view but most critics never faced the issue directly.

This mixed reception raises two questions:

Is "State of Ciege" an honest documentary, a fictional thriller, an anti-U.S. propaganda tract, or a combination?

Will it exert, as critics who praised it have suggested, a constructive impact on Washington's policy toward Latin America by shocking U.S. citizens into awareness of "torture and repression" that the Agency for International Development (AID) allegedly carries out their name?

These questions can be answered only by comparing the film with the facts—the flashing, disjointed, confusing images of "State of Siege" with a straightforward march of events that led to the murder of Mitrione.

Uruguay in 1970 was, to begin with, anything but the reactionary police state pictured by Costa-Gavras and Solinas. On the contrary, it was one of the most democratic and open societies in the world. Its president and parliament were popularly elected.

The most notorious group was the Tupamaro Liberation Front, a small paramilitary terrorist organization dating from 1962, similar to the Weathermen in America and the Black September killers in the Midwest. In 1970, there were fewer than a thousand Tupamaros, with about 150 in prison or awaiting trial. Their social goals were not clear, but they seemed to seek a revolutionary order a la Castro or Mao.

The day after Mitrione's murder, a Uruguayan Communist leader denounced the Tupamaros as "insane fanatics." In 1971, Moscow called them "pseudo revolutionaries" and "loud-mouthed thugs" using "gangster tactics."

Through interrogation, flashback, inference and published "documents," Costa-Gavras

Approved For Release 2005/01/13 : CIA-RDP88-01365R000300210067-1