

202-783-4407

*with Confidence*

**ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC.**  
America's Media Watchdog

Executive Registry

75-12161

*Rec'd*

3 NOV 1975

Reed J. Irvine, Chairman  
J. R. Van Evera, Executive Secretary  
Bernard Yoh, Consultant  
Charles A. Sutton, Consultant

777 14th St., N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005

# AIM

# REPORT



Published by **ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC.**  
 777 14th Street, N.W., Suite 427  
 Washington, D.C. 20005 • Telephone: 202-783-4407

Vol. IV

October 1975

No. 10

## MAJOR MEDIA IGNORE SENATE SPY CHARGE

In June 1972, the discovery of a political espionage operation in the Watergate set off an investigation that ultimately forced the resignation of the President of the United States. We still don't know what those spies were after, but it is safe to say that they could not have found anything in the offices of the Democratic National Committee that would have endangered the security of the country.

What brought the President down was not the spying itself, but his complicity in the effort to cover up the crime. The press, notably *The Washington Post*, takes great pride in the investigative reporting that helped blow Watergate sky high.

But now another charge of espionage in Washington has surfaced. It involves not political fun and games, but deadly serious business. The charge is that there is evidence that Soviet intelligence has infiltrated seven to nine offices of United States Senators. That allegation was made by Senator Goldwater as he was interviewed by columnist John Lofton during a TV program in Washington on September 30.

Senator Goldwater said he got his information from none other than Vice President Nelson Rockefeller. The Vice President reportedly discovered this when he was in charge of an investigation of the CIA. Senator Goldwater asked him if this information would be included in his report, and Mr. Rockefeller assured him that it would be.

But strange to say, when the report was published, the information about Soviet espionage in the Senatorial offices was not included. Senator Goldwater said he asked Mr. Rockefeller about this, and he was told that it had been omitted at the request of some unnamed official.

### A Sensational Story

This is obviously a sensational story. It might well put Watergate in the shade. We have the same ingredients of

(Continued on page 2)

3  
Nov

## SON OF A GUN

Knowing that hunters and their organizations were very upset by their program on hunting, "The Guns of Autumn," CBS decided to broadcast a sequel. They called it "Echoes of the Guns of Autumn," but it was irreverently nicknamed "Son of a Gun."

Since the first program was so heavily loaded against hunting that it offended millions, scared away advertisers and exposed CBS to a possible fairness doctrine complaint, this was a wise move. This is not the first unfair and one-sided program that CBS has aired, but the hunters succeeded where many others have failed. When CBS upset the Secretary of Agriculture and influential members of Congress with a documentary called "Hunger in America" they blithely rejected Secretary Orville Freeman's demand for equal time to answer what he considered false charges. Nor did the Defense Department get time on CBS to answer

"The Selling of the Pentagon," a badly slanted documentary that put down the military.

When Accuracy in Media won an unprecedented ruling from the Federal Communications Commission that NBC had presented an unfair picture of private pension plans in its documentary, "Pensions: The Broken Promise," NBC did not agree to show the other side. They fought the FCC to a standstill in the courts, and the Commission weakly abandoned the fight.

The hunters succeeded because they are numerous and are willing to speak up forcefully. CBS found that it had a tiger by the tail, and they suppressed their usual stereotyped dismissal of charges of unfairness. They gave the other side a hearing.

(Continued on page 3)

## Major Media Ignore Senate Spy Charge

*(Continued from page 1)*

espionage and coverup, but the basic crime and the danger posed to our country are obviously much more serious.

**You would think that the investigative newshounds would be all over the Vice President, seeking answers to the obvious questions. What senatorial offices were allegedly involved? What is the source of the information? When did the infiltration take place, and is it continuing? Was the purpose to get secrets or to influence senatorial actions, or both? Who ordered the suppression of the information? Why? Have any protective measures been taken to guard against this? Have there been any indictable offenses?**

For some strange, unfathomable reason the major media have not asked those questions. They have not even reported the story. They knew about it. The story was carried on the UPI wire the day after Goldwater broke it. The UPI story began as follows:

Senator Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., says the Soviet Union has the United States "absolutely infiltrated" — every major industry, every major business, and the committees of Congress.

Goldwater said he will ask Senate intelligence investigators to look into charges the Soviets have infiltrated "seven or nine" Senate offices. He said information to that effect was deleted from the Rockefeller Commission's report on the CIA.

The Washington weekly, *Human Events*, carried the story in its October 11 edition, adding the information that when columnist John Lofton asked Goldwater if the Soviet agents were actually working in Senate offices, Goldwater said: "Well, working in offices, reporting, helping in the drafting of legislation, the writing of reports, and so forth and so on. But I have no idea what offices they might be. But I would put myself in the position of the KGB, and I think one of the first things I would try to do would be to place as many people in clerical positions on the Hill as I could place."

## Lax Security on Capitol Hill

*The National Enquirer*, a mass circulation gossipy weekly that frequently scoops the major daily newspapers on interesting stories, reported in its October 14 issue that Congressman Steve Symms of Idaho had demanded a full-scale investigation of Soviet spying on Capitol Hill. Symms charged that the Soviet operatives had become so brazen that they did not even try to cover up their activities.

*The Enquirer* said that its own check revealed that "Russians roam Capitol halls virtually immune from FBI surveillance." A source was reported as saying that pressure from congressmen to keep FBI off Capitol Hill had turned

the area into a massive "safe house" for foreign agents, meaning a place where foreign spies can safely rendezvous. *The Enquirer* said the FBI had admitted that the Capitol is off limits to FBI agents without special authority.

*The Enquirer* recently exposed the carelessness of Secret Service agents guarding Secretary of State Kissinger and Dr. Kissinger's own carelessness in reading top secret documents in public in a way that enabled photographers with telephoto lenses to photograph them. It now charges that the guarding of classified documents on Capitol Hill is dangerously lax. It charges that "top secret" clearances have been granted in less than two weeks after application even though it takes a month or more to complete a full field investigation of an employee.

## The "Ho-Hum" Reaction

Accuracy in Media has asked the publishers of both *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* what they have done about the Goldwater charges. As we go to press, they have not responded. It would appear that these great papers that have done so much to push the investigations that have virtually paralyzed the U.S. intelligence agencies are not interested in informing the public about Soviet espionage on Capitol Hill. Nicholas Horrocks, *The Times* reporter who has been covering the CIA investigations, told AIM that he could not say why *The Times* had not published Goldwater's charges. He agreed that the story was newsworthy. But the TV networks, the newsweeklies and the wire services have either ignored the story or let it drop after a single mention.

## Grassroots Goadings

The New York-Washington media axis does not represent the press of the entire country. *The Omaha World-Herald*, for example, has shown that there are editors who don't think that we ought to focus exclusively on the sins of the CIA and ignore Soviet espionage. On October 3, it published an editorial about the Goldwater charges, which said: "The great danger is that in focusing so much on the excesses and the shortcomings of the CIA, Americans will stop thinking about the Russian espionage which our own intelligence agencies should be policing. If only part of what Barry Goldwater said is true, he has disclosed a frightening problem."

Reed Irvine devoted his October 12 Accuracy in Media column to this story, and it has undoubtedly appeared in many, if not most, of the more than 70 daily papers that now get the AIM column.

Wilson C. Lucom, Chairman of Concerned Voters, sent a 1500-word press release on this story to every daily paper in the country. Some of them published it in full. Mr. Lucom called for the release of the information about the "seven or nine" senatorial offices that had been infiltrated

according to Goldwater. He said this was essential to safeguard our national security. Mr. Lucom also asked for an investigation of the suppression of this information by the Rockefeller Commission. He noted that *Newsweek* had recently reported that Secretary Kissinger had "excised and cut out a great deal of material about Soviet spying on the United States out of the CIA Report." Mr. Lucom labeled this a continuation of the Watergate coverup mentality and said it had to be stopped.

Mr. Lucom also pointed out that Senator Frank Church of Idaho, who heads the Senate Committee investigating the intelligence agencies, promised on June 18 to investigate Soviet intelligence activity in the United States. He charged that Senator Church has yet to hold a single hearing on this question. He said that this showed the need to revive the House Internal Security Committee and to re-invigorate the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Lucom asked the following top media officials to assign investigative reporters to look into the Goldwater charges of KGB infiltration on Capitol Hill and the coverup by the Rockefeller Commission:

Mrs. Katharine Graham, Chairman, *The Washington Post*, 1150 15th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005  
Joe L. Allbritton, Publisher, *The Washington Star*, 225 Virginia Ave., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003  
William S. Paley, Chairman, CBS, 51 West 52nd St., NYC 10019

Herbert Schlosser, President, NBC, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, NYC 10020  
Leonard Goldenson, Chairman, ABC, 1330 Avenue of the Americas, NYC 10019  
Arthur Sulzberger, Chairman, *The New York Times*, 229 W. 43rd St., NYC 10036  
Wes Gallagher, President Associated Press, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, NYC 10020  
Roderick W. Beaton, President, UPI, 220 E. 42nd St., NYC 10017

## What You Can Do

1. Ask your local editor to apply grass roots pressure and demand that the AP and UPI investigate the charges and keep their clients informed.
2. Write to the media leaders listed above and ask them why they are ignoring this important story.
3. Write your Congressmen and Senators to remind them that the agenda for discussion should not be determined exclusively by the New York-Washington media axis. If your local paper has shown the type of concern exhibited by the *Omaha World-Herald*, point this out to your elected representatives.

---

## SON OF A GUN

(Continued from page 1)

### How Did the Hunters Fare ?

How fair was "Son of a Gun?" Some hunters were far from satisfied. They argued that CBS had put on a ninety-minute anti-hunting documentary and that they should have given something like equal time to the rebuttal. The second program was only an hour in length, and some felt that too much of it was devoted to a defense of the first program. This impression may have been created by such tricks as reading two letters critical of the first program and two letters defending it even though CBS admitted that the mail was running against the program by a ratio of more than two-and-a-half to one. Telephone calls were even more overwhelmingly critical. Eighty-five percent of the telephone calls in New York City criticized the program. But fewer than two-thirds of the calls used on "Echoes" were critical.

Aside from the letters and calls, CBS did give the pro-hunting side considerably more time in the second program. Accuracy in Media found that just half of the time was devoted to either criticism of the first program or

to pro-hunting material. About one-fourth of the time was devoted to defense of the original program, and the rest was neutral.

This was enough to assure CBS that it would not have to face an FCC ruling that its programming on hunting was unfair to hunters. The fairness doctrine does not require that *equal* time be given to all sides, only that they all get heard.

### No Excuse For Unfairness

"Echoes" made it perfectly clear that there was no valid excuse for the unfairness of "The Guns of Autumn." It showed that excellent material was available to CBS showing the attractive side of hunting, the role it plays in game management, and steps that are being taken to train young people to hunt properly. If CBS had made just a modest effort to include some of this material in the first program the hunters would have been less outraged and CBS would have been spared much embarrassment and expense.

It is difficult to understand the mentality of those in the networks who so deliberately ignore both the moral and legal obligation to give a fair presentation to both sides of controversial issues. Are they really interested in enlightening the public? Or are they merely interested in propagandizing for particular points of view and special causes? The evidence points to the latter.

To make matters worse, they are not above using deception and trickery to secure the cooperation of those they intend to attack viciously. Louis Ruggirello, owner of Louie's Game Preserve near Dexter, Michigan, charges that CBS secured his cooperation by telling him they wanted to do a Bicentennial program for the hunter. He said they told him they were going to do a pro-hunting film. He cooperated, even to the extent of treating the entire CBS crew to a wild game dinner, but his cooperation cost him dearly. Even though the CBS crew complimented his place, his preserve came out looking bad, and his business has suffered. CBS denies that it told Ruggirello that it was doing a Bicentennial type program, but AIM has found that other hunters in Michigan also claim to have been tricked by this CBS claim.

We have been told that the hunters who treed a bear while communicating with two-way radios were told that CBS wanted to contrast old forms of hunting with hunting using modern technology. They too are outraged by what they consider deception by CBS.

## Lessons For All

It is to be hoped that CBS has learned something from this experience, since their venture into anti-hunting polemics cost them a lot of money and a lot of good will. Perhaps they will value fairness more highly in the future.

The public can also learn from the experience. The hunters showed that it pays to let the networks know when you are outraged. If more victims of unfair programming would speak out forcefully and with all the strength they can muster, the networks would soon learn that unfairness does not pay. This is especially true if the aggrieved parties can convey their unhappiness to the sponsors whose advertising dollars make the network programs possible.

---

## PLAIN AS A PIKESTAFF, BUT NOT TO PIKE'S STAFF

In September, a former CIA analyst named Sam Adams made some serious charges before Congressman Otis Pike's House Committee on Intelligence. He said that he had discovered prior to the Tet offensive in February 1968 that the strength of the Vietcong was much greater than had been estimated previously. He charged that this information was withheld from the American people because the American authorities in Vietnam wanted to give the public the impression that Vietcong strength was being rapidly reduced. According to the report of this testimony in *The New York Times* of September 19, 1975, Mr. Adams "told the committee that the surprise of the Vietcong's 1968 Tet offensive had resulted largely from underrating the Communists' strength by as much as one-half."

This made a big stir in the press, even though Adams was simply repeating charges that he made when he testified for the defense at the trial of Daniel Ellsberg in March 1973. *The New York Times* devoted an entire column to his testimony. *The Washington Star* made it the subject of its lead editorial on September 27, under the heading, "Ritualization of the Lie." While asserting that there was no way to judge the validity of the testimony, *The Star's* editorialist did not shrink from judging harshly the high officials whose veracity Adams attacked.

## The Other Side

Immediately after Adams made his charges, two members of the Pike Committee, Rep. David Treen of Louisiana and Rep. Dale Milford of Texas sent a letter to Rep. Pike asking that the officials whose integrity had been attacked by Adams be called to testify and tell their side of the story.

So far that has not been done. But it turned out that Rep. Pike's staff was already in touch with a witness who was willing and able to rebut Mr. Adams. He was James V. Ogle, also a former CIA analyst who had been working on Vietcong intentions and capabilities in Saigon prior to the Tet offensive. Pike's staff had invited Mr. Ogle to talk to them, apparently under the impression that he was hostile toward the CIA. A committee investigator told him he had heard that Ogle was one of "the good guys." His name had been given to them by Mr. Adams.

It turned out that Mr. Ogle had quite a different story to tell. Ten days before Adams testified, Mr. Ogle met with the staff and gave them good reasons why they should be wary of Adams' estimates of Vietcong strength. What is more, he told them that, contrary to what Adams was saying, the Tet offensive had been predicted, since he had personally been in part responsible for the prediction. Acting on this intelligence, President Johnson, General Wheeler, General Westmoreland and Ambassador Bunker all began warning against the forthcoming Vietcong offensive. President Johnson described them as VC "kamikaze" attacks.

Much to Mr. Ogle's surprise, none of the information he had supplied the committee was reflected in their questioning of Mr. Adams ten days later, and the staff showed zero interest in having Mr. Ogle testify. They told him that the written statement he had given them would be included in the printed record. That would be published after a delay of months and would get little, if any, attention.

Ogle was disillusioned about the Pike Committee. "I thought they were trying to get at the truth," he said. "I am now sure they were trying to make political hay. They are guilty of the same thing Adams accused the CIA of, ignoring some of the facts for political purposes."

## The Star Outshines The Post

Ogle thought this might make a pretty good story for the press. He first contacted George Lardner, who was covering the intelligence hearings for *The Washington Post*. Mr. Lardner let his own biases show, saying that he could not believe that there had actually been a prediction of the Tet offensive. He nevertheless asked Mr. Ogle to give him a copy of his written testimony, which he did. He never heard from Mr. Lardner again.

Two days later, Mr. Ogle called Norman Kempster of *The Washington Star*, who showed a lively interest in the story. Kempster did a good story, which appeared on the front page of *The Star* on September 22, occupying 34 column inches. *The New York Times* picked up the story from *The Star*, but gave it only 7 inches on the inside pages. *The Post* continued to ignore it.

The only interest shown by TV came from CBS, they invited Mr. Ogle to their Washington studios for an interview. His account of the interview is interesting. Here is how it went.

**CBS: Why do you think the people looked on Tet as such a defeat for the Americans?**

**Ogle:** I think it was the television coverage. Night after night, they saw Saigon in flames. I was walking back and forth to work—8 blocks. I didn't see Saigon in flames. Maybe there was some building in Cholon (the Chinese quarter) in flames; that's where the cameras were trained.

**CBS: Why do you suppose the House Committee called Adams instead of you?**

**Ogle:** He is good theater. All I could do is say, "This is how I remember it"—things like that. He could go on for hours quoting from classified reports. And I think this point is worth noting. Mr. Adams did what he did for patriotic reasons. But the Church Committee is recommending punishment for people who break the law for patriotic reasons. So I think it is strange that the House Committee relied so on Adams, when it had in its files information contradicting him."

Mr. Ogle, in a written memo to AIM, says: "I got the distinct impression that his (the interviewer's) manner, always cool, turned rather hostile at this point. Ogle thinks the interview was never aired.

## AIM Luncheon For Ogle

We invited James Ogle to address an AIM luncheon in Washington on October 6. The luncheon was attended by 70 people, including several representatives of the press. Mr. Ogle gave a brilliant talk, explaining clearly how the Tet offensive was predicted and what was wrong with Adams' charges. He discussed the problem media misrepresentation that confronted our officials in Saigon, giving an illustration from his own experience.

He told of receiving a reprimand from Washington over a memo he had written in which he said that a new front group in Saigon had a program identical to the communist National Liberation Front. *The New York Times*, apparently eager to present the new group as an alternative to the communists rather than as the transparent fiction it really was, carried a story about this memo which was headlined: "Saigon Analyst Sees Significant Difference Between Front and Alliance Programs." That was false, and the reprimand was withdrawn when Washington saw what Ogle had written was just the opposite of what *The New York Times* said he had written.

Ogle drew this conclusion: "My own experience convinces me that the cables cited by Mr. Adams (about Vietcong strength estimates) were written with just these problems in mind. They were written not to fool the people but to keep a media misrepresentation of the order of battle (troop strength) debate from fooling the people. It had really come to that."

## Who Lies?

Ogle said this about lying: "In 16 years as an insider in the CIA I have never known any high Administration official to lie to the American people about anything about which I had privileged information, unless it was to protect an on-going covert operation . . .

"Time and time again, however, I have heard from the media stories presented as fact which I knew to be 180 degrees out of phase with the truth. There is a sense in which one could say that almost all the leading columnists and commentators in the country today made their reputations 'screwing up the news' on Vietnam."

Denying that he was subscribing to conspiracy theories or attributing bad motives to anyone, Ogle said: "News has always been about the man biting the dog, not the dog biting the man. But 100 years ago people spent a very small fraction of their time reading about men who bit dogs; they spent most of their time in the real world where dogs bit men. Today, however, we live in a media-saturated world which has largely replaced the real world for millions of people; and in all modes of the media—entertainment, news, discussion—there is a tendency still to show the man biting the dog. The rare exception is given the greatest prominence. What is almost always true is never spoken of.

"At the moment, intelligence in general and the CIA in particular are suffering terribly from this perverse phenomenon. And yet, in a very true sense, it is the media, and not the intelligence organizations of this country which threaten the foundations of the Republic. Not because the media are the 'bad guys,' but that's the state of the art.

"The people of Vietnam, perhaps, were victims of a cultural lag which they could not overcome in time. But they were seduced and abandoned by us, indeed, crucially betrayed by us, because we were victims of a cultural lag which we have not yet overcome. The American people saw the war upside down, and they saw it every day, in living color. And a man can only stand so much."

In explaining our defeat, Ogle said: "We reckoned without the effect of the media on the people. We hadn't been

asked to study our own media and people. We only studied the enemy, and our allies. We should have been studying ourselves."

## Post Won't Explain

*The Washington Post*, that tiger of investigative journalism and self-proclaimed scourge of official hypocrisy, has accorded James Ogle "non-person" status. We wrote to Katharine Graham, Chairman of *The Post*, on September 24, asking if there was any valid reason for the suppression of this story. Mrs. Graham has not responded. However, *The Post* did print a letter from a former top CIA official replying to Sam Adams' charge that the order of battle figures had been understated.

---

## THE TIMES COVERS FOR CASTRO

From September 5 to 7, Fidel Castro staged a large international conference in Havana to show Communist solidarity with the tiny number of Puerto Ricans who would like to end that island's highly profitable ties with the United States. The communists have been pressing for Puerto Rican independence, and they have had a little help from terrorists and our own Public Broadcasting Service, which obligingly airs their propaganda at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Their big conference in Havana got very little attention in the U.S. Some think that Castro did not want publicity here. He reportedly rejected a request from one television network that wanted to cover the proceedings. The reason for this is probably related to the efforts to picture Castro as moderate and benign in American eyes. This helps the campaign to normalize American-Cuban relations.

Nevertheless, at Secretary Kissinger's press conference on September 10, a reporter asked about the prospects for normalization of relations with Cuba, "especially in view of the recent forum being held in Havana for the so-called independence of Puerto Rico."

Secretary Kissinger said: "We have pursued a policy with respect to Cuba of moving by reciprocal steps towards an improvement of relations. This policy has shown some progress and we are prepared to continue this policy.

"At the same time, the meeting in Havana can only be considered by us as an unfriendly act, and as a severe setback to this process, and as a totally unwarranted interference in our domestic affairs."

The following day, *The New York Times* reported the above response as follows: "On another foreign policy

issue, Mr. Kissinger remarked that the Administration's policy of 'reciprocal steps' toward an 'improvement of relations with Cuba' had shown some progress in recent months." That was all!

AIM has tried without success to get some explanation of why *The Times* did not tell its readers that Kissinger had denounced the Havana meeting as an unfriendly act and totally unwarranted interference by Cuba in our internal affairs that had set back the process of improving relations.

Mr. Sulzberger of *The Times* waxed indignant at our suggestion that the curious editing of Mr. Kissinger's reply raised a question of whether or not *The Times* "was toying with the news." Mr. Sulzberger said: "This newspaper has been in business for 125 years by reporting the facts as accurately as they possibly can. Other periodicals that have drifted from this pattern have long since been relegated to the newspaper graveyard. It would seem to me that Accuracy in Media is far more interested in scoring political points than in a meaningful discussion of some of the difficult problems of covering the news. If that is, indeed, your purpose, it might be worthwhile for you to reserve a plot in the graveyard."

## Thinking the Unthinkable

Mr. Sulzberger would have us believe that it is unthinkable that *The New York Times* would have on its staff any practitioners of the art of advocacy journalism.

But if advocacy journalism is what propels papers to the graveyard, Mr. Sulzberger should be grateful to AIM for

ARE WE DOING WHAT YOU WANT US TO DO?

If so, won't you help us keep on doing it? Your support is essential! If you have not made your tax-deductible contribution this year, do it now.

To AIM  
777 14th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

To help you keep up the good work, here is my contribution of \$100\_\_\_\_\_ \$75 \_\_\_\_\_  
\$50\_\_\_\_\_ \$25\_\_\_\_\_ \$15\_\_\_\_\_ \$10\_\_\_\_\_ Other\_\_\_\_\_ .

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

calling such things as the distorted Kissinger quote to his attention.

To give him a little additional food for thought, we pointed out that David Binder, the perpetrator of this journalistic horror, once sent a letter to AIM's chairman, Reed Irvine, calling him a "fascist beast," a favorite epithet of the extreme left. More recently, Mr. Binder verbally assaulted Senator James Buckley of New York at a press conference the Senator was holding.

We were informed by a member of Mr. Buckley's staff that Mr. Binder was emotionally upset because the Senator had the audacity to suggest that Portugal was in danger of going down the tube. The Senator's office protested the conduct of this journalist to his head office, and he subsequently

called to make an apology of sorts. There is some reason to think that Mr. Binder is interested in making "political points," and that may explain his editing of Kissinger.

We have also called to Mr. Sulzberger's attention a syndicated column by Jeffrey Hart about an article in the July 31 *Rolling Stone* which Hart describes as "a long paean" to the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. We are printing Mr. Hart's column below. He notes that the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was a creation of the Communist Party, by the admission of the *Daily World*, that party's official organ. The author of the laudatory article in *Rolling Stone* was Gloria Emerson of *The New York Times*, who just happened to have written some highly emotional articles condemning our side in the Vietnam War.

It is enough to tempt one to think the unthinkable.

## WHERE THINGS STAND

1. On October 13, AIM filed a fairness doctrine complaint against WNET/13, charging the station with one-sided programming on the issue of Puerto Rican independence.

2. The District Court of Appeals on October 16 rejected AIM's claim that the FCC should enforce Section 396(g)(1)(A) of the Communications Act, requiring that programs funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be produced with strict adherence to objectivity and balance. We will probably seek Supreme Court review. There is now no enforcement of this important provision of law.

3. On September 5, the FCC rejected AIM's complaint against WNET/13 of New York City, in which we charged the station with violating the fairness doctrine in their programming on Chile. Chairman Wiley and Commissioner Hooks dissented from the ruling.

*ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC. is a non-profit, educational organization. Gifts and contributions are tax deductible. Francis G. Wilson, President, John R. Van Evera, Executive Secretary.*



AIM REPORT

10/75

Nonprofit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Wash., D.C.  
Permit No. 44478

D4-5

Accuracy in Media, Inc.  
777 14th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.  
20005  
(Address Correction Requested)  
(P.S. Form 3579)

# Celebrating the Abraham Lincoln Brigade

By JEFFREY HART

In its July 31 issue, the quasi-underground paper *Rolling Stone* ran a long and celebratory article on the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. These were American volunteers, largely Communist and serving under Communist auspices, who fought on the Republican side in the Spanish Civil War. There is nothing remarkable about the appearance of the article in *Rolling Stone* the politics of that paper is standard New Left except that the author of the article was Gloria Emerson of the *New York Times*, not long ago a principal *Times* correspondent on the scene in Vietnam.

Let us for a moment go back three or four years, to the time when the Vietnam War was a burning and divisive issue in American politics. Gloria Emerson's regular dispatches from the scene were not "news." They were mood pieces, designed to capture the essence of things in some small incident. Week after week they appeared, sometimes on the front page, and their quality was inimitable. The closest thing in my experience to the Emerson mood was the soap-box radio serial, Stella Dallas. Emerson wrote tear jerkers.

At one point in 1972, the Saigon government was trying to resettle in the South some farmers from exposed Quantri Province in the North. Here is the special Emerson music:

**"The refugees, many of them bare-foot, stood on the shiny airstrip early yesterday morning holding clumsy bundles and shivering babies and looking fearful of the big American warplanes and the long voyage ahead . . . . The United States mission in Vietnam has been severely criticized for its relocation programs, which were often considered of little or no benefit to the Vietnamese who were forced to move . . . ."**

Just by way of contrast, here is how

another *Times* reporter wrote up the same relocation program four days later: "After the heartache and uncertainty of leaving home, and a short-lived epidemic of airsickness, the 1,500 pioneers of South Vietnam's most ambitious refugee resettlement project are taking over their new village and say they are eager to start a new life. For the swarming families who arrived here last Thursday, Friday and Saturday, the move looks like a good deal. 'This is good land, much better than I had up there,' said Le Tiet, a 50-year old farmer."

From the thousands upon thousands of words filed from Vietnam by Emerson, let us select one other choice item, from 1971. This time she rated five columns on the front page of the Sunday edition. Ostensibly, the story concerns some minor skirmishing around the obscure village of Bachuc. Four South Vietnamese had been killed, and some villagers injured, by Vietcong mines in the neighborhood.

The moral of this strange item is presented by Nguyen Van Sam, a Bachuc "religious leader," who says, according to Gloria Emerson: "Between death and injury, death is perhaps easier for us. We are very poor. If a villager loses an arm or a leg his family will suffer, for he can no longer work." Accompanying all this is a large front-page photo of Tran This Nam, a "mother of eight," who lost an arm and a leg in a Vietcong mine blast.

All of this, of course, issued in an implicit but very loud message. If you supported Vietnamization and continued resistance to a Communist takeover, you wanted to blow the limbs off the "mother of eight" and by inference wanted the "eight" to starve.

Miss Emerson concluded these heart-rending proceedings, and by this time the reader was about ready to turn himself

in as a war criminal, with another quotation from the ever obliging Nguyen Van Sam: "God cannot hear what we are trying to say. We are choked by the hands of the government, so we cannot shout out."

God might not have been able to hear, but the reader certainly did. It was not enough that the U.S. withdraw its troops. The war itself had to stop, and whatever the consequences.

Now let us return to the present, things having been tidied up in Vietnam. Miss Emerson not only wrote the long paean to the Lincoln Brigade for *Rolling Stone*, but along with 1,300 other enthusiasts attended the 38th anniversary celebration in New York's Statler-Hilton Hotel. Steve Nelson and other Brigade veterans made speeches. Nelson is national commander of the veterans of the Brigade. He has also been identified by Louis Budenz as a Soviet espionage agent.

**The official Communist organ *Daily World* welcomed the anniversary, and was not shy about identifying the genesis of the Brigade. "The Lincoln Brigade was not a spontaneous immaculate conception . . . . It had its origin, inspiration, and organizing genius somewhere. That was the Communist Party of the United States."**

This kind of thing is usually discreetly overlooked, but it is common knowledge. The Lincoln Brigade was the American unit. Josip Broz, later Tito, a Communist functionary, ran the overall transport operation in Paris. The German contingent was named after Ernst Thaelman, a German Communist, etc.

As the editors of *Rolling Stone* reminded the youthful audience for Gloria Emerson's article, the Lincoln Brigade is a "stirring reminder that Americans did once fight on the side of democracy."