

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual
collections.

Collection: Deaver, Michael
Folder Title: News Items/Radio and TV
(1)
Box: 52

To see more digitized collections
visit: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories
visit: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives

Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 11/22/2005

File Folder PRESS - NEWS ITEMS / RADIO AND TV (1)

FOIA

2001-137

Box Number 10869

HAN

1

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
22956	CABLE	010740Z MAR 84	1	3/10/1984	B1
22957	CABLE	010016Z MAR 84	2	3/10/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

→ JAB/~~MKD~~
FYI
for comments

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 14, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM HENKEL

FROM

CHARLES BAKALY *CB*

MD

SUBJECT

SCHEDULING OF PRESIDENTIAL EVENTS FOR NETWORK NEWS COVERAGE

Network decisions as to the content of their broadcast are not definitely made until air time. Ideally, they would prefer to begin editing/feeding at 5:00 p.m. EST, but are fine until 5:30 p.m. Any time later until air time makes it increasingly more difficult to get on the air. So, an event should end by 5:00 to 5:15 p.m.

In the case of the Broome County event, CBS made an editorial decision not to air a CBS White House correspondent produced piece. The time of the event was not a factor at all.

The crucial issue is: "Is the event newsworthy?" With the polls the way they are it is not surprising that the nets are reluctant to air well-produced events with large supportive crowds that end up looking like political commercials and not "news". While these rallies are always good on the local/state/region level, they may not have national news significance to the nets.

It appears that CBS has made an editorial decision regarding the reporting/airing of Presidential events.

The key is to make news. An important issue was raised by Mr. Baker at our recent press meeting concerning the press created impression that the President is detached from people, real people. To counter this we should actively and regularly seek opportunities for the President to make unannounced visits to different groups/businesses/activities to put him in situations where he can interact with people. All of our crowd stories have been that he was with handpicked/magged /politically safe people.

A general theme could be to show the President working to bring all Americans together to share in the new growth/prosperity of the country. An example is the recent meeting with the Baptist leader.

Unannounced, personal events have always yielded good coverage and provide the President with the opportunity to take his message directly to the people and have it reported as such.

My CBS contact states: Time had nothing to do with not getting Enclcott on the air! An editorial decision by New York and Rather. CBS has met and decided it does not want to air "our commercials" i.e., slick rally events without news. The last two nights CBS used Rather voice overs not the pieces sent in by their WH correspondents.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: July 27, 1984
TO: Mike Deaver, Mike MacManus
FROM: Harry Clark/Consulting Producer
RE: Presidential Press Conference Suggestions

At your request, several suggestions to improve future East Room Presidential Press Conferences:

- 1.) While the red carpet in front of the podium is vastly superior to the wood parquet floor (reduced reflection, cleaner looking), the carpet is too hot in wide shots.

I suggest we move the front row of chairs 5-10 feet closer to the podium, thereby covering a third of the exposed carpet. The red won't pop quite as much.

- 2.) While back lighting in hall is okay, I suggest we install brighter bulbs in the chandeliers, thereby giving a classier look as the President arrives at and leaves the podium.
- 3.) While the President's exit into the hallway is far superior to leaving laterally through correspondents, I still think his exit is a bit awkward.

You might want to think of having Larry Speakes step onto the podium at the end of the press conference and escort the President down the hallway from the East Room. I suspect the President might be more comfortable. It looks strange for the President to be disappearing down the hallway by himself. Speakes is the logical escort.

- 4.) After seeing how ABC News sets lights and after talking with Fred Levenson's lighting people, I think the White House should control Press Conference lighting. We can design a lighting plan that satisfactorily meets network needs yet improves lighting of the President.

(Continued)...

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

- 2 -

July 27, 1984

Advantages:

- improved lighting of the President;
- total White House lighting control;
- less network set-up time

Risks:

- network criticism that White House is acting to further stage and control the President.

Let me know if you would like to discuss these suggestions or if you would like me to work with a lighting designer to construct a lighting plan and specifications for contracting.



Harry Clark

HC/djw

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MM

April 2

Dear Mike:

May I come see you for a few minutes
this week when convenient (a) to introduce
my young colleague, John McCoolin and (b)
to talk briefly about Jim Whelan and
an upcoming event of some importance to The
Washington Times?

Donna can find me at 638-6529 in
the press room or 636-4802 downstairs in the
press room. Or late in the day at 636-3169.
Or in the evenings at 836-7063.

Thanks,

Jerry O'Leary

DB

Yes ☒

No ☐

4/10

5:30

Jerry O'Leary
John McCoolin

Neel
Shoemaker

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

2941

Recable.

file

April 12, 1984

file

think
file
do note
to Jerry
O'Leary

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL DEEVER

FROM:

ROBERT M. KIMMITT *Bob*

SUBJECT:

Misleading Washington Times Headline

Today's Washington Times' article by Walter Andrews, headline "Pentagon Opposes Risk Reduction Plan," could also have been headlined "Hill and President in Accord on Peace Plan." Andrews correctly points out that the Defense Department and the Administration had recognized that there are serious problems with jointly manning U.S. and Soviet nuclear risk reduction centers. Indeed, we have proposed that the Soviets man one center in Moscow and we man one in Washington that would be connected by improved communication links. Appropriate military-to-military exchanges are anticipated. In short, we have worked closely with Senators Nunn and Warner in developing the kind of nuclear risk reduction center approach which would be in the best interest of the U.S. Although they have proposed in their resolutions joint manning, partly because this was the concept favored by the late Senator Jackson, they themselves are well aware of the problems and have not insisted on such an approach. They have endorsed our step-by-step approach to negotiations so long as it is understood that our goal is the development of a comprehensive crisis management system. That is our goal and we have said so publicly.

The Pentagon, far from being an obstacle has, in fact, taken the lead within the bureaucracy and has been far more positive and aggressive than, for example, the CIA and the State Department. Walter Andrews' headline has succeeded in taking no new news about good news and turning it into bad news. Both Defense Department and the NSC have been in touch with the offices of Senators Warner and Nunn to make certain they are aware that there has been no change in the Administration position.

4-10-84

Pentagon opposes risk reduction plan

By Walter Andrews
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

The Defense Department yesterday said it remains opposed to the establishment of jointly manned nuclear risk reduction centers as proposed by Congress because of Soviet reluctance to improve existing communications.

The department does not oppose the basic notion of risk reduction centers jointly manned by Soviet and American officials, but it does believe certain steps must be met before the centers are established, said Pentagon officers who requested anonymity.

"We haven't gone through these evolutionary steps yet," one official said.

Sens. Sam Nunn, D-Ga., and John Warner, R-Va., introduced a resolution in January calling on President Reagan to set up centers in Washington and Moscow, which they say would reduce the risk of an isolated incident sparking an all-out nuclear war.

The Pentagon said yesterday such centers are a possibility "in the long term, once the proper foundation... has been established."

The statement said this foundation included the establishment of "technical mechanisms and operational procedures" to improve communication below the heads-of-government level and agreement on situations that would warrant consultations.

Toward this end, the United States has proposed to the Soviets setting up a



Kimberly Slevin/The Washington Times
Sen. Sam Nunn, D-Ga.

Joint Military Communications Link (JMCL) that could be used for such things as urgent consultations on terrorist nuclear activity, emergency requests regarding lost or disabled aircraft or nuclear-powered space vehicles threatening to crash, and advance notice of military exercises.

"The Soviets have, however, been reluctant thus far to pursue this pro-



Walter Oates/The Washington Times
Sen. John Warner, R-Va.

posal," the Defense Department said.

A year ago and again in January, the Pentagon statement noted, the United States proposed three possible communications improvements to the Soviet Union: The JMCL, better diplomatic communications facilities and the addition of a high-speed facsimile capability to the 20-year-old hotline for urgent messages between government leaders.

"In our discussions with the Soviets, we have been able to achieve considerable progress on only the first of these measures, namely, the hotline upgrade. Thus far, the Soviets have been reluctant to pursue the other two," the Defense Department said.

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, Sens. Nunn and Warner warned that time is running out for the two superpowers to work out methods to avoid an accidental nuclear war.

Nuclear weapons technology is proliferating, and terrorism, sometimes state-supported, is spreading and third-world conflicts afford tempting opportunities for exploitation, they said.

"The cumulative impact of these trends is an increasing risk... which could spark a nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States," Sen. Warner said.

Sen. Nunn said, "If you add up the odds over a 20- or 30-year period... and consider intelligence estimates of the number of nuclear nations by 1991, combined with terrorism and fanaticism, the dangers are real. They are present and they are going to grow."

A recent report on the proposed risk reduction centers by the Congressional Research Service also noted that Soviet leader Konstantin U. Chernenko in a March speech appeared "to leave the door open for further discussions on cooperation."

The report noted that "the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to discuss the joint military communications link is a negative indicator."

PRESERVATION COPY

RONALD REAGAN LIBRARY
TRANSFER/PARALLEL FILE SHEET

Please circle "preservation" (put in AV, etc.), "classified" (parallel filed in vault/annex), "collection" (misfile, provenance), "RD/FRD" (parallel file)

PRESERVATION CLASSIFICATION COLLECTION RD/FRD

FROM:

Collection Deaver, Michael K.: Files

Series _____

File Folder Title/Casefile #/NSC # Press – News Items/Radio and TV (1)

Box Number OA 10869

Description of Material:

Note:

George Bush to Mike (w/Post-It Note attached), 4/10/84, 1p

TO:

Collection: Historic Preservation File

Series: _____

File Folder Title/Casefile #/NSC # Press – News Items/Radio and TV (1)

Box Number: _____

Transferred by: Kelly Barton

Date: 11/28/05

NEED ONE COPY IN ORIGINAL LOCATION

SECOND COPY WITH ITEM PARALLEL FILED OR TRANSFERRED

THIRD/FOURTH* COPY FOR COLLECTION FOLDERS - * IF TRANSFERRING TO/FROM TWO COLLECTIONS



4-10-84 2941

Mike —

Too Late?

GB

To Bob Rimmitt
Fr. Bossi/Human

MILD wants
to know NSE
position NOW
please return
AIAA

PRESERVATION COPY

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
March 26, 1984

MEMO FOR MIKE DEAVER
FROM: MIKE McMANUS

I think this is the guy who did an article about the President saying he was not a leader. There are a number of others who have requested interviews whom I think would be better interviews for us. I'll put a list of the other interview requests together with Larry Speakes and make a recommendation for the next wave of interviews.

*Call
George*

Los Angeles Times

WASHINGTON BUREAU

JACK NELSON
BUREAU CHIEF

March 1, 1984

The Honorable
James A. Baker III
The Honorable
Michael K. Deaver
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Jim and Mike:

As you may know, the Times' Washington Bureau has had only one general interview with President Reagan since he took office. Meanwhile, the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and other news organizations have interviewed the President in recent weeks.

George Skelton and I would appreciate your help in arranging for us to interview the President again. A request for the interview was filed some time ago with Larry Speakes by Skelton.

We would hope to interview the President on a broad range of subjects as George, Dick Cooper (our news editor) and I did when the Bureau last interviewed him on January 21, 1982.

Thanks very much for having arranged the earlier interview.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Nelson
Jack Nelson

cc: Larry Speakes

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 29, 1984

*Hold
for Thurs
9:00*

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. MICHAEL DEEVER
FROM MERRIE SPAETH
SUBJECT PHONE CALL FROM LOCAL T.V. ANCHOR

Late last night, Jeff Simmons, the 11:00 anchor of the CBS affiliate in Miami, called to express outrage at a story by Bill Plante on the CBS Evening News.

Simmons noted : "It upsets me. Dan Rather still thinks he's fighting Richard Nixon."

He added : "The story was trash. They took (Lynn Nofsiger's) comments out of context and made him seem that he was commenting on something he wasn't. I as a journalist don't appreciate that. "

Simmons feels that "This behaviour hurts tv news after a while. People aren't that stupid. That report certainly wasn't fair."

He asked if it were possible to let the President know that he thinks "the President has done a tremendous job and doesn't deserve the flak he's getting. Please tell the President to keep up the good work."

I called WIVJ back today to confirm that it was Mr. Simmons who called. It was and he was even more insistent that the CBS story was unfair and disreputable. I explained the demands on the President's time and said I would pass his comments on to you. A transcript of Bill Plante's story is attached.

*4/5
9:00 a.m.
Oval*

File

DEMOCRAT—CBS's Bill Plante: This is political hardball. (Democratic TV
AD commercial: "He said he'd bring a new morality to government. But look at the list of charges: sweetheart loans, hidden financial deals, abuse of privilege —") A new commercial from the Democrats, inspired by Ed Meese's problems, trying to make ethics a campaign issue in 1984 by attacking the Reagan Administration's record of appointments. (Commercial: "This is moral leadership? Vote Democratic.") Gary Hart and Walter Mondale, fighting for the chance to oppose Ronald Reagan have both taken up the issue when they have not been battering each other. (Gary Hart: "Day by day, with every new scandal, the President pursues his policy of making the world safe for hypocrisy." Walter Mondale: "Almost every couple weeks another rotten apple falls out of the tree, and it's just -- it's kind of a -- what I call the sleaze factor that's going on here.") It isn't just Ed Meese. There are more than 40 Reagan Administration appointees whose ethics have been the subject of controversy. Those who have resigned include: Richard Allen, National Security Adviser, who said he forgot to turn in gifts and cash; Ann Burford, Environmental Protection Administrator, who allegedly played industry favorites in toxic waste cleanup; Michael Cardenas, Small Business Administrator, for alleged improper grants -- he was later cleared; J. Lynn Helms, Federal Aviation Administrator, while under investigation for improper business practices before he came to government; Max Hugel, Deputy Director of the CIA, because of stock deals before he took office;

DEMOCRAT—Plante (continued): Rita Lavelle, Assistant Administrator of the EPA, convicted of perjury; Robert P. Nimmo, head of the Veterans
AD Administration, because of government funds used to decorate his
(cont.) office; Thomas Reed, Deputy at the National Security Council, accused of insider stock trading before taking office; Paul Thayer, Deputy Secretary of Defense, who is fighting charges of insider stock trading. Other Reagan appointees have remained in office following allegations of improper conduct. William Casey, CIA Director, traded millions of dollars in stock while in office, now has placed his assets in a blind trust; Charles Wick, U.S. Information Agency head, secretly taped his telephone conversations for a time, at first denied it. He later apologized. And now Ed Meese. Not that this is new. It happened before, in the Truman, Eisenhower and Nixon Administrations. The Carter White House had its share of personnel problems too, but in all those cases there were far fewer people involved. The White House doesn't want to talk about it. Lyn Nofziger isn't so bashful. (Nofziger: "In a way, it's dirty politics. It's -- I don't think -- what it shows to me is they really don't have an issue of any substance.") Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes had a one-word answer to Democrats charges of a moral blind spot. Said Speakes: Hogwash. And what about Ed Meese? Mr. Reagan's advisers think he has at least 60 days before it becomes a real problem for the President. They think he'll be confirmed, but they also predict that if the political damage gets out of hand, he'll be asked to withdraw and will do so.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 15, 1984

MEMORANDUM TO MIKE DEEVER

FROM: PAM BAILEY *PMB*

SUBJECT: CBS 3/16 Interview

Some points you may want to make tomorrow include:

- Our t.v. ads will be a key component of our campaign and will follow our overall campaign strategy.
- We anticipate a positive, upbeat direction to our advertising.
- RR himself -- his strengths and his record -- are our greatest selling points.
- The major advantage we have over the Democrats' candidates is that our "Slate" is filled in and, overwhelmingly, in the minds of the voters, it's positive. Our challenge is communicating RR's record. (We won't have to create a record like certain other candidates would.)
- Definite plus factors going for us include:
 - RR's personality -- his warmth, his self-confidence, courage, his optimism. All qualities Americans positively relate to and recognize in him.
 - RR's record in turning the country around economically and internationally. His slashing of inflation, strengthening of defenses, creation of new jobs and his delivery on his promises have made the future a brighter one for all Americans.
 - RR's vision of the future -- his special ability to recognize and articulate concerns of the average American and, most importantly, his ability to develop and implement solutions.
- This strategy should remain basically the same no matter who the Democrats nominate.
- We're basing our campaign on Ronald Reagan -- the man and the record. We're confident it's a winning combination.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 1, 1984

Mike --

FYI


Larry

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 11/22/2005

File Folder

PRESS - NEWS ITEMS / RADIO AND TV (1)

FOIA

2001-137

HAN

Box Number

10869

1

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
22956	CABLE 010740Z MAR 84	1	3/10/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 11/22/2005

File Folder

PRESS - NEWS ITEMS / RADIO AND TV (1)

FOIA

2001-137

HAN

Box Number

10869

1

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
22957	CABLE 010016Z MAR 84	2	3/10/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 17, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: KARNA SMALL

SUBJECT: Black press

You asked for a summary of events, interviews, etc. we have done for the black press. A list is attached of various briefings either specifically for black press, or briefings where black press has been included.

A list is also attached of the many mailings we have done specifically for black press (usually including specially ordered photographs).

It should be noted that we include many black members of the press in our regular briefing sessions. All requests to attend briefing sessions are granted -- they are included in various events throughout the year.

(Note: There was one small group of black reporters who requested an interview with the President. It was handled as all other interview requests are handled: a letter of response was sent - by Larry - saying that we would be happy to keep their request on file and would see what we could do in future months. The group went to the New York Times and complained that they were not being served. Reporters and journalists all over the country request interviews and do not complain to the New York Times. It should be noted that every one of the reporters who requested that interview had been invited to briefings - with the President - that I arranged. Some had attended, others didn't even bother to RSVP. I bring this up because you might have seen the New York Times publicity which was, of course, unfortunate).

WME/Karna
I showed this to RR - Thank
you But we haven't do
much lately. Maybe we
should be coming up
with a comm plan
for
minor
media
WTD

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 15, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: Larry Speakes

Following are examples of erroneous press reports:

1. Bill Moyers, CBS News Special "People Like Us". This show took vignettes of poverty and health problems in America and reached the conclusion that Administration budget cuts were the cause. Attached is a First Monday summary of that show.
2. CBS Evening News, May 1983, claimed that Administration budget cuts had reduced the number of food stamps available to needy people. Secretary Block presented evidence to the contrary. After an exchange of two letters, CBS finally agreed to a retraction.
3. The Washington Post. Lou Cannon predicted Manuel Lujan was the successor to Jim Watt in spite of official denials from the Press Secretary.
4. The \$120 million libel suit against CBS by General William Westmoreland (attached is an "Accuracy in Media" report on the Westmoreland suit). NOTE: because this suit is still under litigation, you should be careful not to comment in any way that would prejudice the case.
5. Stories in The New York Times, The Washington Post and The Los Angeles Times concerning Soviet accusations that the U.S. was guilty of violating arms limitation agreements. Attached is an "Accuracy in Media" summary of those stories.
6. An example of how a positive story for the President was misrepresented through a headline is contained in the attached clipping from the San Antonio Express News. The story refers to the President's intention to donate his Social Security checks to the Fund to Retire the Government Debt. In fact, the story says: "White House aides with the vacationing President in Palm Springs initially said Friday that Reagan did not intend to accept any money from Social Security."

They later said Reagan is interested in donating his checks to help the Government retire its trillion dollar debt." In spite of these specific comments, the headline strongly implies that while the President is making \$200,000 a year, he will also be collecting Social Security. This, of course, is not the case but such a headline, obviously, left a false impression.

NOTE:

Caution should probably be exercised in citing these or any specific examples of press miscues. Thousands of words are filed out of here every day with few, if any, factual errors. The matter of interpretation is an imprecise area and, thus, the theme often utilized by press office spokesmen is a more general one: "On the whole, the President has had good relations with the press. There are, of course, occasions where we feel it necessary to correct distortions, incorrect interpretations, etc."

Westmoreland Suit Picks Up Steam

Reed Irvine

A question that I am frequently asked these days is how General Westmoreland's \$120 million libel suit against CBS is progressing. The answer is that it is moving along slowly, as both sides proceed with the discovery process. It is now said that it may go to trial in the fall.



Gen. Westmoreland recently held a press conference at which he released a thick stack of documents buttressing his contention that CBS had knowingly slandered him in the documentary that they aired in 1982, charging that he conspired to falsify intelligence data when he commanded our forces in Vietnam. He released affidavits from such dignitaries as former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, two former CIA directors, Richard Helms and William Colby, and former Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

They were all impressive in their support of Westmoreland, but one of the most damning affidavits came from Cmdr. James Meacham, USN (Ret.), who had been used in the CBS documentary as one

of the "witnesses" against Westmoreland. In his affidavit Meacham said, "The broadcast did not accurately present those events of which I have knowledge. I know of no conspiracy to alter and suppress intelligence, and do not believe that a con-

spiracy to alter and suppress intelligence occurred. It is my opinion and belief that Gen. William Westmoreland was not involved in a conspiracy to alter and suppress intelligence. I told Sam Adams (a consultant to CBS) and George Crile (the producer of the documentary) before the CBS broadcast that there was no conspiracy to alter and suppress intelligence and that no one I was associated with falsified any intelligence." Meacham proceeds to repudiate the implications of statements that he had been shown making on the CBS program, remarks that had, of course, been edited by CBS. One thing CBS had not included was Meacham's categorical denial of the CBS charges.

The reason why CBS didn't use state-

Accuracy In Media

ments that contradicted the point they wanted to make about the big conspiracy came out in two memos from the producer of the program, George Crile, that Westmoreland released to the press. The first memo was from Crile to Mike Wallace, who was the correspondent doing the documentary. Crile had persuaded Gen. Westmoreland to submit to an interview by Mike Wallace. He had told Westmoreland that Wallace wanted to interview him about the role of intelligence in wartime, and he gave him a list of general topics that Wallace supposedly wanted to discuss. Only one of the topics on that list related to the only question CBS wanted to discuss with Westmoreland—a 1967 dispute between Westmoreland's headquarters in Vietnam and the CIA about how many Vietcong there were out there.

Crile's memo to Wallace makes it clear that the sole purpose of the interview was not to get the general's views on that controversy, but to try to get him to admit that he was guilty of understating the enemy strength for political reasons. Crile's memo says: "Now all you have to do is break General Westmoreland and we have the whole thing a-ced." Later he says, "Here are the areas where Westy seems to be guilty as hell and where you should direct your energies."

Wallace did as he was told. Not having been advised that he was to be grilled about this old controversy as if he were a defendant in the dock, Westmoreland didn't come prepared with all the numbers. At one point in the interview, he gave an incorrect figure for the rate of infiltration of the enemy troops from the North in the fall of 1967. Wallace pounced on this and used the error in the broadcast to support his charge that Westmoreland had misstated the true figure in his public statements in 1967. He and Crile simply ignored a letter Westmoreland had sent them after the interview correcting the wrong figure he had used.

Crile didn't think that fairness was called for. A later memo to Wallace expressed dismay at the way an internal investigation of the documentary was being conducted by CBS News Vice President "Bud" Benjamin. He said, "Bud is acting as if the fairness doctrine were the standard that should be applied to consider the broadcast. I think he is off base."

Tests Enrage NEA

Paluh de Tolodano

LOOKING FOR THE PROBLEM WITH THE PURSUE SCHOOLS?

using its treasury, made up of union dues, to attempt to dictate to the Democratic

Soviet False Charges Get Big Play

Reed Irvine

On January 30, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* and *The Los Angeles Times* all carried prominent stories on their front pages about Soviet accusations that the United States was guilty of a wide



range of violations of arms limitation agreements. *The Washington Post* headline at the top of the first column on page one read: "Soviets Say U.S. Cheats on Treaties; Detailed Charges Already Delivered to Dept. of State." *The New York Times* put the story at the top of the third column on page one. Its headlines read: "Moscow Accuses U.S. of Violating Arms Agreements; Diplomatic Note to the State Dept. Charges Wide Range of American Offenses."

In these two stories, which ran 900 and 1100 words respectively, there was not one word giving any official or unofficial reaction from the United States. The *New York Times* did say that a State Department spokesman said the Administration had no immediate comment on the Soviet charges. The story broke on a Sunday,

when very few State Department personnel are on duty. It is quite possible that the clever propagandists in the Kremlin took that into account in timing their release, hoping that they would be able to get it into our media unchallenged.

pointing out that the agreement covered only missiles with a range of more than 3,400 miles. He denied that there had been any underground missile tests exceeding 150 kilotons. He noted that environmental shelters that had been used to cover con-

control agreements." Half of the story was devoted to chief arms negotiator Edward Rowny's views on the future of arms limitation talks, but the last five paragraphs did describe the specific rebuttals of the Soviet charges.

Accuracy In Media

If that was their strategy, it succeeded remarkably. The stories in the three large circulation, influential papers cited above gave the Kremlin just the publicity it was hoping for. The stories were given very prominent play, they went into great detail, and nothing was said to suggest that the charges might be false. It was a great propaganda success.

As soon as the story appeared in the morning papers, the State Department did react with a categorical denial of the Soviet charges. The spokesman denounced them as "spurious and baseless." He provided a point-by-point refutation. He denied the charge that the stationing of Pershing II missiles in Europe violated SALT II,

struction at Minuteman missile sites in the 1970s had been discontinued in response to Soviet concerns. He said that the radar systems that the Soviets charged were violations of the anti-ballistic missile treaty were for the perfectly legitimate purpose of verifying Soviet missile tests and to provide early warning of any missile attack.

The *Washington Post* reported all this on January 31, but the denial was not on page one, where the Soviet charges had been so prominently displayed on the previous day. It was found on page A8, in a story that said: "The Reagan administration yesterday brushed aside as 'baseless' Soviet charges of U.S. violations of arms

The New York Times and *The Los Angeles Times* buried the State Department denial in stories about Gen. Rowny's views on the arms talks. In *The New York Times*, the headline read: "Arms Negotiator Says More Talks Could Bring Pact." Nothing in the headline would have led the reader to suspect that in the fifth paragraph of the story there would be a report that the State Department had denounced the Soviet charges of treaty violations as "spurious and baseless." If the reader took the trouble to follow the continuation of this story over to page 6, he would have learned that the U.S. had rebutted each of the Soviet charges, but he would only have learned of one of those rebuttals—the denial that we had tested weapons yielding over 150 kilotons. The *L.A. Times* treatment of the U.S. rejoinder was similar.

This is strange, but even stranger is the fact that these flimsy Soviet charges were given more prominence in our leading papers than were the very serious and substantial charges of Soviet treaty violations made by our government a week earlier.

The Soviet "Arms Control" Strategy

Friday weather
city cloudy, cold.
24-48. Tonight's low 31.
Details on Page 7B.

THE SATURDAY EXPRESSES-NEWS

116th year No. 29 68 pages San Antonio, Texas

January 1,

1983: \$200,000-a-year Reagan could collect Social

WASHINGTON (AP) — The new law will entitle President Reagan and 200,000 other people between the ages of 70 and 72 to a major break from Social Security — they'll be able to draw full benefit checks even though they're still working.

White House aides with the vacationing president in Palm Springs, Calif., initially said Friday that Reagan did not intend to accept any money from Social Security. But

later they said Reagan is interested in donating his checks to help the government retire its trillion-dollar debt.

Due to a change that Congress ordered in 1977, the age at which Social Security allows people to get their full benefits regardless of earnings is dropping from 72 to 70. It was supposed to have dropped to 70 last Jan. 1, but Congress postponed the move to ease the pressure

on Social Security's dwindling old age trust fund.

Jim Brown, a spokesman for the Social Security Administration, said this liberalization of the so-called earnings test will cost the trust fund \$600 million in 1983 and a total of \$5.4 billion over the rest of the 1980s.

The old age fund has had to borrow \$17.5 billion over the past two months to cover its checks, and the National Commission on Social Se-

curity Reform estimates the system may be short \$150 billion to \$200 billion over the next seven years.

Until now, Reagan's \$200,000 salary would have precluded him from drawing a monthly check from Social Security.

The old age fund now pays out billions of dollars more each year than it takes in, and its deficit mounts by \$17,000 each minute. Thus Reagan, if he decides to take his check

would be adding to one federal debt despite easing another. Social Security's current financial problems are not reflected in the national debt.

The White House spokesmen said they did not know how much Reagan was entitled to.

But considering his lucrative earnings as an actor, governor of California, columnist and lecturer before he entered the White House, he is surely eligible for more than

THE SATURDAY EXPRESS-NEWS

Edition

25¢

116th year No. 29 68 pages San Antonio, Texas

00-a-year Reagan could collect Social Security

Reagan is interested in checks to help the retire its trillion-dollar

change that Congress or-
the age at which So-
allows people to get
benefits regardless of
opping from 72 to 70.
posed to have dropped
1, but Congress post-
ve to ease the pressure

on Social Security's dwindling old
age trust fund.

Jim Brown, a spokesman for the
Social Security Administration, said
this liberalization of the so-called
earnings test will cost the trust fund
\$600 million in 1983 and a total of \$5.4
billion over the rest of the 1980s.

The old age fund has had to bor-
row \$17.5 billion over the past two
months to cover its checks, and the
National Commission on Social Se-

would be adding to one federal debt
despite easing another. Social Secu-
rity's current financial problems are
not reflected in the national debt.

The White House spokesmen said
they did not know how much Rea-
gan was entitled to.

But considering his lucrative
earnings as an actor, governor of
California, columnist and lecturer
before he entered the White House,
he is surely eligible for more than

\$700 a month. Reagan, the oldest
president in America's history, will
turn 72 on Feb. 6.

Brown said the president would
have to file for the benefits.

Nancy Reagan would not be eligi-
ble for any benefits on her own or
her husband's Social Security record
until she turns 62. She claims to be
59, although other sources put her
age at 61.



The Media

"PEOPLE LIKE US"

Moyers, CBS Suffer Credibility Crash

Life could hardly be tougher than it is these days for some elements of the national media and CBS news recent production of "People Like Us" is sure to make things worse, a whole lot worse.

First, as reported in *First Monday*, a respected Washington think tank surveyed the top 270 media figures and concluded, based on the answers they received, that the national media is a well-paid, powerful and liberal elite. The American Enterprise Institute published the surveys results. Then along comes another think tank with persuasive evidence demonstrating abysmally poor coverage by the national media of the energy crisis. *The Washington Journalism Review's* recent article citing repeated examples of distorted and ill-informed reporting from El Salvador did not help matters much either.

"People Like Us" just may be the final straw in a growing credibility crisis for the major media voices in Washington, D.C., and New York City. By even some of the media's own accounts of the show after its airing, Bill Moyers, his writers and researchers and the CBS news executives responsible for the show blew it. Blew it big.

LBJ Protege Stumbles

The show purported, in Moyers' introduction, to illustrate "people who have slipped through the safety net and are falling away. In the great outcry about spending, some helpless people are getting hurt. No one knows exactly how many. This broadcast concerns only a few. Except for matters of chance, they are people like us." Thus, the show's condescending title and the beginning of a disaster for CBS and Bill Moyers.

Moyers, Lyndon Johnson's press secretary, a fact which was never mentioned, selected, with the aid of his CBS researchers, four cases said to be typical of those supposedly being lost as a result of President Reagan's cuts in federal spending. Unfortunately, analysis possible only after the show had been aired revealed that three of the four examples clearly were not attributable to the President.

In the first case, a cerebral palsy victim denied benefits by the Social Security Administration was found to have been taken off benefit rolls by an administrative procedure mandated by the Carter administration. Whether or not the decision to remove the man was right or wrong, it simply had nothing to do with President Reagan's cuts in Washington's bloated spending. If anything, fault lay with career bureaucrats following policies initiated by Jimmy Carter.

The second case was presented by Moyers in so blatant a fashion as to leave even *The Washington Post* agape. This case presented a mother with an ill child who removed her sibling from the home to a nursing institution. In the program, the woman said she would love to bring her child back home, if only the government would continue to pay for a nurse. Nothing was said by Moyers to indicate that President Reagan has not only not changed the visiting nurse program but that it is precisely the administration's policy to encourage such parents to keep their ill children at home.

If anything, Moyers' second case proved just how tragic can be the results of misinformation and distortion by a media upon which millions of Americans depend for most, if not all, of their understanding of what is being done by their government.



The third case involved a woman whose child needed an expensive operation. The woman could not earn enough money on her job to pay for the operation, so she made the logical choice of going on welfare and letting the government pay for the operation. The woman then returned to work. Somehow Bill Moyers concluded that that proved Ronald Reagan's sin, rather than the more obvious conclusion that the case demonstrated in fine point exactly the manner in which the President's safety net is intended to work.

The fourth case, concerning a church sponsored meals program for the acutely impoverished was too broad in scope to dispute particulars. Regardless of the facts in the last case, CBS and Moyers, a man who first came into national prominence while working for the architect of the Great Society, went three-for-four and still struck out.

"People Like Us" just may be the final straw in a growing credibility crisis for the major media voices in Washington, D.C., and New York City.

Moyers' creative errors were at least matched by those of CBS news executives who stitched together a pattern of hypocrisy not often seen in dealings between the White House and a major national television network. First, the execs refused to allow a member of the Reagan administration to be included in the actual program. Then, they refused to have a Reaganite appear after the program's airing. When the White House asked for a pre-airing copy of the program transcript in order to prepare for the expected barrage of hostile media questions, CBS refused.

Believe it or not, things got worse for CBS. When the White House requested a pre-showing of the program similar to that granted to other media figures, CBS refused. After investigation of the program by the White House based on advance media reports about the show's contents indicated that CBS was off-base, the same answer came back. When Democrats whooped with delight and vowed to use the show in the coming campaign, CBS still refused to give the White House equal time.

To paraphrase Hamlet, "credibility, thy name is fleeting," at least in the oaken paneled offices of CBS news.