

Yoav Peled

# Begin's Palestinian Bantustan

A distinguished Israeli historian and expert on international affairs, Professor Saul Friedlander of Tel Aviv University, took note, in a recent interview (*Ha'aretz*, Nov. 25, 1977), of the similarities between the Sadat/Begin meeting in Jerusalem last month and another meeting, which took place in Moscow some 38 years earlier: the meeting between the Soviet and German foreign ministers of the day—Molotov and Ribentrop. His purpose in drawing the analogy, Friedlander explained, was not to suggest similarities in ideologies or personalities involved, but rather to point out some structural parallels between the situation of Israel and Egypt in 1977 and that of Germany and the USSR in 1939. One of these parallels, which Friedlander did not mention, but should have, is the fact that in both cases the price for the *rapprochement* between the two enemies was to be paid by a smaller and weaker neighbor: Poland in one case, the Palestinians in the other.

It is becoming increasingly clear (and should have been clear all along to anyone familiar with Israel's political history) that the Likud government does not intend to make any meaningful concessions on the crucial issue of the future of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Begin's "peace plan" which calls for "self rule" for the Palestinians living in these two areas, does not include any provision that would substantially alter Israeli occupation.

According to Begin's plan, the proposed autonomous Palestinian council, which would administer the territories, would be given jurisdiction over local education, commerce, tourism, agriculture, health and policing. Defense and public order, however, will remain in Israeli hands, as will, of course, foreign affairs and the all-important issue of economic relations with Israel itself and with the rest of the world. (This, by the way, corresponds to the present "division of labor" between Israelis and Palestinians in the administration of Gaza and the West Bank, although formal authority over all of these matters now rests with the Israeli military government.)

If the distinction between "policing" and the maintenance of "public order" is puzzling, it should not be. "Public Order" obviously refers to the task of defending the Israeli settlements, present and future, from the surrounding Palestinian population, as well as the suppression of what would undoubtedly be defined as "illegal organizations," namely all groups, such as the PLO and the Communist party, who would be challenging the legitimacy of continued Israeli rule. (At present, of course, all Palestinian organizations, political or otherwise, are outlawed on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.)

In an interesting contribution to democratic theory, Begin's plan would allow Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza to choose between Israeli and Jordanian citizenship. It is still unclear whether this would apply to those Palestinians who are *already* citizens of Jordan, namely all of the West Bank's residents, or only those living in Gaza who are now officially stateless persons. (Unlike Jordan, Egypt never annexed the Gaza Strip and did not grant its residents Egyptian citizenship.) Depending on the precise meaning of this proposal, if all eligible Palestinians would opt for Israeli citizenship, Israel's Arab population would increase by either 450,000 or a million, and will constitute either a third or a half of the Jewish population. (There are 700,000 Palestinians in the West Bank, 450,000 in the Gaza Strip, and 600,000 "Israeli Arabs" living in Israel proper. The country's Jewish population is about 3,000,000.) In either case, given a rate of birth among Palestinians twice as high as that of Israeli Jews, within a few decades Arab citizens are bound to outnumber Jewish ones in the Jewish state. Thus, if the Israeli government is sincere in its proposal to offer the Palestinians Israeli citizenship, we must believe that it is willing to hand over to them Israel itself, in order to hold on to the West Bank and Gaza.

Obviously, then, the idea of offering the Palestinians a choice of either Israeli or Jordanian citizenship should not be taken at face value. What is more likely to happen is that the Palestinians living

in the Gaza Strip would become, like those of the West Bank, citizens of Jordan, a country that would have absolutely nothing to do with the governance of the territories in which they live. This arrangement would be equivalent to denying American Jews their U.S. citizenship and allowing them to become citizens of Israel, or to suggesting to the residents of Quebec that they become French citizens while remaining under Canadian rule.

But the greatest farce of all is the seemingly innocent suggestion that Palestinians who opt for Israeli citizenship would be able to buy land and settle in Israel, while Jews would continue to settle in Gaza and the West Bank. On both sides of the equation, this proposal is based on blatant disregard for the realities governing land acquisition in the areas involved. Israeli settlements in the occupied territories are not established on land which had been purchased on the open market, in free and mutually-agreed-to transactions. Their establishment invariably involves forceful expropriation of land (with or without compensations, depending on the legal status of the property, an extremely complicated matter to ascertain) and, in most cases, additional measures such as compulsory "relocation" of the inhabitants, drying up of water resources, defoliation of crops, etc. In some instances, the former owners of the land continue to work on it as laborers employed by the Israeli settlers.

As far as Palestinians settling in Israel, this could only happen, under existing Israeli law, if they would be able to purchase land already owned by non-Jews. Practically all Jewish-owned land in Israel (90 percent of the total land surface within the pre-1967 boundaries) is owned by either the state or the Jewish National Fund. The latter has exclusive authority over development of the land owned by both, and is charged with the determination of leasing policies. (Public land in Israel cannot be sold.) It is a major principle of the Jewish National Fund, openly and explicitly, that land under its jurisdiction, including, of course, state land as well, can only be leased by Jews. Thus, while most Arab towns and villages in Is-

rael suffer from acute land and housing shortages (Israeli Arabs have lost about 70 percent of their land since 1948 to government expropriations), their residents cannot lease land or buy apartments in nearby Jewish communities, even when these properties are vacant and unused. Thus, the offer to allow Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza to "settle" in Israel is empty and meaningless.

What Begin's proposals for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip amount to, then, is simply the creation of a Palestinian Bantustan, and the legitimization of Israeli rule there through an agreement with Egypt (and maybe Jordan) guaranteed by the U.S. The U.S. government has evidently aligned itself completely with this venture, as has the American commercial media. President Sadat is still bravely maintaining his position calling for an independent Palestinian state, but if he really expects anything remotely resembling that to come about through Begin's good will, he cannot be the astute statesman the press has made him out to be. It is more likely, however, that what he is bargaining for are some cosmetic changes in the Begin plan, so that his acquiescence in it would not look like what it really is—complete sellout of the Palestinians.

It is quite clear that an Egyptian/Israeli agreement, based on the current Begin plan and supported by Jordan and the oil-rich Arab states, is not going to bring peace to the Middle East. Moreover, such an agreement would be highly offensive to anyone committed to justice, democracy, or human rights. The greatest service progressive forces in the U.S. could make now to the cause of peace and to the well-being of the Israeli, as well as the Palestinian people, would be to try and prevent their government from supporting any agreement that does not grant Palestinians full and unqualified independence.

*Yoav Peled is a graduate of Hebrew University, Jerusalem, and a doctoral candidate in political science at UCLA.*

## DIALOG

### Socialists and free speech

Those who contend that socialists should defend the rights of Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan to engage in any racist speech that falls short of directly involving illegal acts predicate their arguments on implicit but incorrect assumptions. These include the propositions that (1) laws ostensibly designed to curb right-wingers have been used largely against the left; (2) the failure to defend the racist speech of Nazis and their ilk will result in precedents that will lead to the suppression of those espousing socialism; (3) racist speech must be constitutionally protected because freedom of speech and association has been the best weapon against racism; (4) racist speech must be protected because freedom of speech is essential both to the movement for socialism and the democratic socialist society that we envisage; (5) such defense is necessary because otherwise we would be supporting the (admittedly) dangerous doctrine that

free speech means free speech for the left only; (6) the contention that racist speech should not be constitutionally protected necessarily leads to supporting criminal sanctions against racist speech.

What unstated assumptions and inferences underlies these points used to justify the enshrining in a mantle of constitutional protection such speech as "Hitler's ovens are the only way to deal with Kikes," and "Niggers are monkeys, not human," and to justify socialists' defense of such "constitutional" right of freedom of speech?

The unsupported assumptions include the following: the Constitution requires identical protection for all speech under all circumstances short of the immediate threat of illegal action; in any event the failure to protect racist speech will result in suppression of the left, and the precedents arising out of such failure will constitute the bases and a significant cause of such suppression; to fail to protect racist speech is the equivalent of supporting freedom of speech for the left only; the lessening of racism (to the extent that it has occurred) has been due in substantial measure to freedom of speech, which necessarily includes protection of racist speech; the right of the Klan to engage in racist speech is essential to democracy both in the U.S. today and in a future democratic socialist society; the right to free speech is absolute, no matter how it impinges on other freedoms. No thoughtful and knowledgeable person should accept any of these assumptions.

We live in a world of contradictions and understanding this is essential to

comprehension of socialism and the means of struggling for it. Capitalism represented a higher form of society than the feudal system that preceded it—a form that opened up new possibilities for the advance of human kind. Today capitalism is closing the door to further advances.

Unlimited freedom of a particular kind can lead to a loss of freedom when it comes into conflict with other freedoms. Freedom of movement can be destroyed for all if it is not limited (by traffic laws, for example) in certain respects. This is true of every freedom and free speech (important as it is) is no exception.

Complete unrestricted freedom of speech has never existed and is not foreseeable. In this country there are restrictions on freedom of speech that socialists should support. Some restrictions should be extended rather than eliminated. Thus employers are limited under the National Labor Relations Act as to what they can say to their employees and when and where it may be said. This restriction exists because the freedom of speech of the boss interferes with the freedom of workers to organize. For similar reasons, unions and employers engaging in racist speech have been denied certain rights under the same act. The conflict between producer and consumer rights has resulted in control (not nearly enough) of the producers' freedom of speech in order to protect rights of the consumers. Limitations on free speech of political candidates and their supporters (primarily by limiting expenditure of monies used for the expression of ideas)

have been imposed in order to protect freedom of choice of electors. Numerous other examples could be cited.

Should these limitations be opposed because they might be used against the left? An affirmative answer, among other things, would make an assumption concerning cause and effect that history does not support. The suppression of the left has occurred not because certain laws are on the books but because of the strength of the right and the weakness of the left in periods of real or apparent crisis. In such circumstances, laws and precedents that could justify action against the left have been used for this purpose; where such have been lacking new laws or precedents have been created.

It does not follow that precedents, good or bad, have zero effect; it does mean that politics not precedents are decisive. If this be so, then what political climate is more conducive to suppression of the left—one in which the racist speech of the Klan and the Nazis is safeguarded by the Constitution with the support of the left, or one where the struggle against racist speech is carried on with the recognition that for freedom of speech for the left to be protected it is necessary to carry on the struggle against racism in all its forms, including racist speech?

Free speech is meaningful where ideas are debated. Racist speech of the kind engaged in by the Klan and the Nazis creates an atmosphere in which the ability of the victims of racism to participate in the marketplace of ideas is severely restricted and free speech is

*Continued on page 18.*



# DIALOG

Continued from previous page.

thus endangered for everyone. In a capitalist society unlimited free speech for employers undermines the force of free speech for workers. In a racist society, racist speech by racist organization undermines free speech for racial minorities. In both instances, the protection of such speech endangers the freedom of all progressive forces.

It does not follow that withholding constitutional protection from racist speech requires or indeed is related to rightist restrictions upon all speech. The general principle that the protection of free speech should extend to views of the left and, as well, of the right is not endangered by refusing to extend the First Amendment to racist speech of Nazis and the Klan. There is a crucial difference between the expression of ideas generally (right or left) and such racist speech. The latter is the kind of speech that is more than the expression of an idea. It imposes immediate and serious injury upon those under attack. It is comparable to defamatory speech, which is not safeguarded in the same manner as other speech by the Constitution. There is no constitutional right to untruthfully call a person a murderer; there should be none to call blacks "apes." In both instances denial is not adequate to undo the damage that has been done.

The general characteristics of ideas (which should be entitled to total constitutional protection) is that they conflict with other idea and only the resolution of that conflict by action inflicts injury or confers benefits or often a little of both. It is freedom of expression in this context that is the underpinning of the First Amendment. Words that directly impose injury lie outside of this constitutional purpose.

Democracy is protected by the first kind of speech; it often is undermined by the latter.

It does not follow that socialists should seek criminal laws against racist speech of the type discussed here. We do not seek such laws against every evil outside the protection of the Constitution—nor should we. But it is quite another thing for socialists to defend as constitutionally safeguarded the racist speech of these hate groups. To the contrary, Socialists at every opportunity and by every justifiable means likely to be effective under existing circumstances should support the proposition that democracy and the rights exercised thereunder are irreconcilable with defense of the unspeakable racism broadcast by Nazis or the Klan or their ilk.

A truly democratic socialist society will safeguard the liberties of all its people. Such safeguards should protect them against the kind of racism spewed out by the kind of organizations of which we speak.

All whites should carefully consider whether a contrary position indicates an insensitivity to the damage racist speech does to its victims and whether that insensitivity reflects the racism that our society generates and that everyone must guard against.

—Ben Margolis  
Los Angeles

Solution to last week's puzzle:

J	O	M	O	A	Z	A	N	I	A	S	L	Y
R	A	M	P	T	A	L	O	N	S	H	O	E
S	T	E	P	H	E	N	B	I	K	O	A	P
O	I	S	E	R	E	A	R					
M	A	S	S	E	S	E	D	E	P	T	S	
O	B	O	E	S	H	A	S	G	L	E	S	T
P	E	U	T	I	T	G	R	A	V	E	R	
T	S	A	R	S	K	U	A	S	I			
M	O	H	A	V	E	I	T	S	L	E	I	
C	R	A	N	E	J	A	Y	A	B	L	E	R
D	E	F	T	B	E	N	B	L	U	E	S	T
R	E	A	R	T	E	R	O	S				
A	M	I	J	O	H	N	V	O	R	S	T	E
F	M	C	A	T	R	O	O	T	E	I	R	E
T	I	A	R	H	O	D	E	S	D	E	E	D

## More letters

Continued from page 15.

lisher Bruce Brugmann (the hero of Fager's article).

Brugmann's philosophy is the Big Business and "Big Labor" are the same kettle of fish, and that workers organized under "Big Labor" are at best dupes and at worst agents of destruction for honest business. Throughout the strike he editorialized regularly against his striking staff as "pawns" of the "establishment" unions, namely the ITU and newspaper Guild locals that staffers had chosen to represent them. He depicted his employees as lazy ignoramuses who couldn't cut it in the free-lance jungle, and who wanted to break his financial back by assuring themselves of a job through their union contract(!). What made his position nonsensical was the modesty of the staff's demands: they were asking only for formal notice-giving procedures in the event of firings, and also for grievance machinery. Pretty elementary.

The *Bay Guardian* strike was broken after 18 months. Brugmann had chugged doggedly onward with less substance and more hip entertainment tips, plus a prominent infusion of new advertising by banks and cigarette companies. Thus, the strike was not simply some "unsuccessful" passing phenomenon, as Fager would have the reader believe.

ITT is certainly entitled to print articles like Fager's, giving credit for good journalism. But if you're going to praise the occasionally excellent work of a basically tainted institution (one that falsely wears the mantle of fearless "progressiveness"), then readers deserve some introductory word from you, to put it into perspective.

That aside, *ITT* is mostly golden! You are putting new life into a tired left. Keep giving us encouragement and trouble (like the piece on Carrillo at Yale, which righteously raised more questions than it answered!).

—Anita Frankel  
Berkeley, Calif.  
(Former Public Affairs Director,  
KPFA-FM)

### The J.P. Stevens of "alternative" journalism

Editor:

Would you run an article by a former J.P. Stevens Co. executive praising their dandy sheets? A puff piece about Coors beer by someone who used to work for the company? You've done something roughly similar by printing Chuck Fager's article about the role of the San Francisco *Bay Guardian* in sinking the nomination of Robert Mendelsohn to the Interior Department.

Fager's article mentions an "unsuccessful strike" at the *Bay Guardian*. He fails to mention, however, that he was a strike-breaker there, crossing the picket lines to help autocratic owner Bruce Brugmann defeat workers' efforts to join a union. Many unions, community groups and progressive people here boycotted the paper in the hope of pressuring management into working out a decent contract. But thanks to the efforts of people like Fager, the strike failed.

It's true that the *Bay Guardian* played an important role in stopping Mendelsohn's nomination, but I'm surprised that you would hire a scab to tell us about it.

—Eve Pell  
Mill Valley, Calif.

### Straw man

Editor:

Joshua Dressler's column on free speech (*ITT*, Dec. 21, 1977) sets up a straw man—the notion that those who believe Nazis should be permitted to march in Skokie are advocates of "absolute free speech."

So far as I know, the ACLU, the editors of *ITT*, and others who believe Nazis should be permitted to march also believe, as does Dressler, that the law can reach "the fraudulent corporation, the defamer, and the murder-solicitor." Moreover, contrary to what Dressler

supposes, we all believe that the law can intervene before "the harm that occurred as a result of" speech actually occurs: that is, before the unsafe corporate product is consumed, before the defamation destroys a person's livelihood, before the murder solicited takes place. None of us, to the best of my knowledge, would hesitate to regulate television violence.

The difference between those who would ban Nazis in Skokie and those who would not is: may persons who advocate political opinions generally considered anti-social express their views freely so long as they do not engage in illegal action, or urge others to engage in immediate illegal action?

Those who answer this question Yes

do not believe in "absolute free speech." On the contrary, the instant speech protagonists cease to practice mere advocacy, and begin to urge immediate lawless action, we believe the state should step in.

—Staughton Lynd  
Niles, Ohio

### Correction

The cover photo of the Dec. 14-20 issue, which showed a clerical worker walled in by files, gave an incomplete credit. The photo was by Michael Rosenbaum, came from District Council #37, AFSCME, and was run in *Public Employee Press*. It is part of an exhibit, "Women at Work," which has been on show in New York City.

## Burchett

Continued from page 13.

*A last question on Eurocommunism. Is there anything innate in the European situation that would preclude Eurocommunism from working? It's the question of an alliance with the Socialists; the Socialists will not always, necessarily, betray the Communists. Is it perhaps possible to have that kind of alliance?*

What is going on in France in this respect is very, very interesting and touches on this question. The Communist party certainly learned from its mistakes in 1968, from having been taken completely by surprise. That's one thing. And also taking steps in case the left wing alliance wins and in case the Socialist party betrays the program. I'm sure no Communist leader would express it in this way, but this is my assessment of what's been going on.

The Communist party over the last year or so has been setting up basic organizations in virtually all enterprises in France. I suppose you would call them party cells. Until now they have set them up in some 8,000 enterprises.

These 8,000 are linked with 43 absolutely key industrial or other enterprises—anything big. There will be 10,000 by the end of this year. They are expanding quite rapidly now. Those 43 are sort of a general staff headquarters and they have direct communication with the Central Committee of the party.

Before, all this went up through regional committees, provincial committees and so forth. They've centralized it to allow for greater flexibility and instantaneous

communication.

An obvious result is that they can't be taken by surprise as they were in 1968 when all of a sudden 10 million workers and employees were out on strike, occupying factories. That's one thing.

The other thing is that they have a fantastic machinery. The minute they want to pull a lever they'll have things going on in virtually all the industrial and administrative establishments throughout France. The Socialists are terribly worried about this. They criticize it, although I don't see they have any reason to criticize it—they do have a reason, I guess, but no right to criticize it.

The program calls for nationalization of some key industries. I forget the number, but the present split is because the Communists have demanded the nationalization not only of those mentioned in the original program, but also all the affiliated and branch concerns. The Radicals oppose this completely and want to go back to the original list. The Socialists are also saying that they should stick to the original list.

But supposing there is a compromise and they agree on that as an electoral program and they win. And then they start on this program and the Socialists say "well, it's not the right time and we'd better leave this till we get a more clear mandate from the people."

The Communists are in a very, very strong position to take it by storm and to confront them—"Well, it's done; the workers have occupied; there it is; there are the keys to the managing director's office."

This new organization and the popularity of the party once it's taken a strong position on these things is the reason for the 135,000 new members this year. ■

## Report to Subscribers

This is the first report on our circulation growth and its character in several months, so we are submitting a report of subscriptions and operating income for the last quarter of 1977. The figures show a substantial increase in our rate of growth in the last eight weeks of the year, during which period, for the first time, *IN THESE TIMES*' operating income has just about equalled our operating expenses.

This situation enables us to enter 1978 with the prospect of paying off our most pressing obligations and of being able to use new monies raised to expand circulation and to improve the quality of our coverage.

Our goal is to reach 30,000 subscribers in 1978. For the last eight weeks of 1977 we received subscriptions at an annual rate of over 22,000. With the active help of our readers we are confident that we will reach our 1978 goal.

The following figures are for (1) new subscriptions from all sources other than direct mail solicitation or renewals, (2) direct mail responses and (3) renewals. The money each week is our total operating income. It does not include new investment or contributions of over \$100.

Week (ending)	New Subs	Direct Mail Subs	Renewals	Total Subs	Money/wk
10/7	100	5	58	163	\$2,475.67
10/14	86	3	52	141	1,977.50
10/21	90	5	36	131	2,314.12
10/28	101	1	32	134	2,336.50
11/4	151	14	36	201	3,010.36
11/11	163	230	39	432	5,689.50
11/18	143	282	40	465	5,026.68
11/25	191	181	33	405	5,094.85
12/2	187	161	25	373	4,873.50
12/9	209	79	178	466	7,671.65
12/16	168	56	247	471	6,836.41
12/23	228	48	160	436	5,956.44
12/30	103	28	157	288	4,029.69
Totals:	1920	1093	1093	4,005	\$57,292.87
Weekly Averages:	148	84	84	308	\$4,407.14

Total subscriptions for *IN THESE TIMES* now slightly exceed 10,000. Direct sales each week are about 2,000.



## LIFE IN THE U.S.

## OFF THE RECORD

Neither the best  
nor the worst  
year for the media

Compassionate, thoughtful, incisive  
and intuitive, he is a true pro.

By Sidney Blumenthal  
and Danny Schechter

**I**t was neither the best nor the worst of times. Still, the past year—1977—has been filled with illuminating events. How the public viewed these events was largely determined by the media.

Many stories were overcovered, while others of great significance were barely mentioned at all. Much of the way in which the year is understood has depended upon which stories the media selected to devote space and time to.

**Most Over-Covered Stories of the Year:** The First Family was everywhere. For a fee of \$5000 anyone could purchase an appearance by First Brother Billy Carter, whose feats of beer guzzling landed him a contract with a brewery that named a beer after him.

The press obliged Billy by covering virtually every ridiculous promotional stunt he engaged in, including the crowning of Miss Piggy Pizza. Even Amy's treehouse couldn't compete with this.

Deaths were a big item in 1977 for the press, particularly in the slow summer months. Elvis Presley's death came just after newspaper circulation began to dip in the August aftermath of the capture of Son of Sam.

Elvis merited more ink and posthumous television time than anything occurring in South Africa, or the South Bronx for that matter. His death also overshadowed Groucho Marx's, but Bing Crosby's collapse on a Spanish golf course happened fortuitously since nobody else was

dying at that time.

**Most Under-Covered Stories:** If it wasn't for mid-summer rioting in New York City during a blackout the lems of urban blight wouldn't have received any attention at all.

Jimmy Carter's visit to the South Bronx was covered like a close encounter of the fourth kind. He seemed genuinely amazed that people lived there.

The past year has also seen the revival of what the press termed the New Right. Cover stories in *Newsweek* and *New Times* heralded the renaissance of this new conservatism, while each reached diametrically opposing conclusions.

*Newsweek's* story failed to distinguish between the academic neo-conservatives like James Q. Wilson, Norman "Kultur-Kampf" Podhoretz, and Irving "I didn't know it was CIA money" Kristol, and the far right wing. There are still significant differences between *Commentary* magazine and the Birch Society's *American Opinion*.

*Newsweek* and the other conventional media also neglected to point out the financial sources of money of the far right, the ties of the Birch Society and other extremist groups to the right's surge in the Republican party, and the class origins of the phenomenon.

The press, for the most part, has preferred to state simply that the right is on the move, without examining its roots. The coining of conventional wisdom is, of course, a traditional role for press pundits and newsweekly writers. The ultimate

impact might be that the press is actually reinforcing the trend, however unintentionally.

**The New Yellow Journalism:** The failure in 1977 to analyze closely individual issues reflected an increasing trend in the press to ignore all issues. Many newspapers began supermarketing the news. There was more emphasis on soft features, gossip, low-level consumer supplements, and personalities. The *Miami News* even advertised itself as "the newspaper for people who watch television."

Trying to cash in on the gossip craze, The New York Times Company launched *Us*, a *People* look-alike. *People* itself began to run out of celebrities and had to attempt creating them.

In the vanguard of the new puffery was Rupert Murdoch, press lord of the *New York Post*, *New York* magazine, *Village Voice*, and other publications on various continents.

In American journalism Murdoch has become the Minister of Fear. He had the distinction of promoting the greatest new personality of the year—David "Son of Sam" Berkowitz, a psychopathic killer who was lifted out of the police blotter to worldwide fame.

Murdoch parlayed Berkowitz's crimes into a mechanism for raising circulation. The *New York Post's* screaming headlines helped create an atmosphere of terror in New York City, skillfully used by the new New York mayor Edward Koch in his campaign.

Koch, not so incidentally, was Murdoch's candidate, hyped in the news columns of the *Post* in such an unbalanced way that most of the city staff of the paper signed a petition protesting the unfair coverage. Accusing Murdoch of yellow journalism is like calling David Berkowitz nuts, however.

One reason offered for Murdoch's incessant hype of Koch was that the *New York Times* had already picked Mario Cuomo as their candidate for mayor. Murdoch wanted a man of his own, for whose success he might be credited. And perhaps nothing aided Koch more than the creation of Son of Sam. Murdoch's dialectic of fear triumphed in 1977.

**Stories that didn't appear:** While "60 Minutes" was investigating prostitution in a small Wyoming town, many significant stories were ignored or scantily covered. Among the stories that didn't appear on NBC and CBS news was an examination of the role of the Trilateral Commission, the most influential group with the Carter administration. Why hasn't there been a "Segment 3" or "60 Minutes" investigation of this?

The U.S. Foreign Assistance Program has also been overlooked. Through this program right-wing dictatorships, among others, continue to receive massive amounts of American aid. Yet there has not been any extended investigation of this in the press.

While a national newspaper like the *Washington Post* might occasionally devote a story of two to foreign aid, other papers never print an item about it, and the network news studiously has avoided mention of the issue so far.

Meanwhile, a study by the Center for International Policy has detailed exactly how the Foreign Assistance Program undermines human rights through bolstering dictatorships. The information is readily available, but the press has not used it.

Similarly, the dynamics of American intervention abroad has been overlooked or downplayed. For example, the role the U.S. took in arranging third party intervention in Zaire's Shaba province during the rebellion there this year was never covered. The press looked only for repetition of the Vietnam pattern, a strategy that American policy-makers appear to have abandoned in lieu of newer approaches. Like old generals, journalists are eager to fight the last war.

**Human rights:** Jimmy Carter's development of the human issue prompted the press to devote considerable space to dissidents from Eastern Europe. Most Americans now know who Solzhenitsyn is. But how many have ever read a story about Ben Chavis, one of the Wilmington 10, imprisoned in North Carolina on the testimony of witnesses who have since recanted?

Amnesty International lists Chavis as a political prisoner. Yet the focus on him

in his own country is less than the attention paid to Soviet dissidents.

Also, how familiar was the American public with Steve Biko before his murder? South African liberation leaders, including those in jail, are given perfunctory coverage. How many Americans have ever heard of Nelson Mandela, the leader of the African National Congress, imprisoned in South Africa?

**CIA:** The *New York Times* at year's end followed *Rolling Stone's* lead in publishing stories on the press relationship with the CIA. Congress also heard testimony on the question.

Most of the names of those journalists in bed with the CIA aired this time around were published before or played marginal roles. One exception was C.L. Sulzberger, the *New York Times's* roving columnist. After Sulzberger denied *Rolling Stone's* charges that he had aided the Agency, the *Times's* own reporters repeated the charges, printing them as facts.

Only mentioned in passing is the continued reliance of journalists on government intelligence agencies for information and a frame of reference, especially in coverage of foreign affairs. The *Atlantic Monthly*, for example, makes a practice of regularly sending articles on foreign affairs it is about to print to members of the National Security Council for their perusal and advice.

This interaction is limited compared to the links between *Newsweek* and *Time* reporters in the field and political officers of American embassies, who often provide background material and translations of documents.

To his credit, the *Times's* Terence Smith wrote a brief piece in which he noted that in 1977 the CIA gave hundreds of press briefings. Yet to be examined is the impact this has on shaping the attitude of journalists and the public that receives their reports.

**Fall Guy of the Year:** When Daniel Schorr got too close for comfort to the CIA's secrets he was canned at CBS, in part because of his personal style with his colleagues. But Schorr was also on to the CIA connection with CBS' founding father, William Paley. In his memoirs Schorr, however, has simply reported bits and snatches of Paley's CIA link. The full story has yet to be aired.

**No regrets:** Can anyone think of an idea for which Eric Sevareid will be remembered? How Sevareid gained his reputation as profound is a mystery. He is, however, an expert blatherer, incapable of articulating a clear opinion on anything except communism. He's against it.

Sevareid once wrote a good book, *Not So Wild a Dream*, in which he called himself a socialist. Now he says he's a neo-conservative.

As a close friend of William Paley and frequent defender of the CIA's old boys, like Dickie Helms, Sevareid probably knows a great deal about the CIA's press links. Will he ever talk? If he did, he might actually be credited with reporting a real story.

**Peace Is At Hand Dept.:** Anwar Sadat's landing in Jerusalem was covered like Neil Armstrong's landing on the moon. His every step was reported. Walter Cronkite and Barbara Walters nominally acted as intermediaries for Sadat. The press was so taken with Sadat's finesse in dealing with American journalists that it has neglected to investigate the substantial role played by the American government in orchestrating the whole affair.

The superficial treatment of the Middle East, one of the stories most extensively covered by the media in 1977, reveals the press' limits most starkly. Sadat and Begin are regarded as great personalities. They have achieved success in American terms; they have become celebrities.

**Man of the Year:** Our choice for mensch of the year is a journalist of the finest qualities. He is compassionate and thoughtful, incisive and intuitive, and in a single hour can crack the toughest story. He is a true professional, uncompromising and yet fair-minded.

We're speaking of the former WJM news director in Minneapolis, now city editor at the *Los Angeles Tribune*, Lou Grant. Congratulations, Lou.

*Sidney Blumenthal is now overseeing In These Times's Boston Bureau. Danny Schechter is a Nieman fellow in journalism.*