

THE PRESS

How The Left Turned Me Right

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution in the Streets—a highly praised and definitive new volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes and is President of the Foundation for Economic and Social Progress. A film writer and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN* OPINION. Gary Allen lectures widely.

■ THERE ARE FEW more dreadful confessions which can be made by a regular contributor to these pages than that once he too was a "Liberal." You'll never, for example, hear of Taylor Caldwell making such an admission — that dear lady having been a Rightwing Extremist since at least the age of two. But not me, alas. Of course, I have never tried to hide my guilty past — though I do look on it somewhat as an unsightly wart, and rarely discuss it in the presence of females or small children. Occasionally, however, some fellow Conservative will ask how my great conversion took place. Wholly in earnest, I reply that I became a Rightwing Extremist at the Los Angeles Public Library — a phenomenon which if it became contagious might lead the city fathers to padlock the door.

I remember that in 1961 I accepted some five pounds of books from a Conservative friend with the purpose in mind of showing him how little Conservatives really knew. After all, I had

majorled in history at a university that considers itself "The Harvard of the West," and had myself taught American history. Surely I was qualified to cure my friend's temporary madness.

Reading those books naturally produced a peculiar state of shock. It was like being a member of the Spanish Court in the late Fifteenth Century and hearing that the world was round. Preposterous! But then, I wasn't quite sure. Unnerved, yet far from capitulation, I made my way to the Los Angeles Public Library planning to salve my concern by seeing what the professional reviewers had written of my friend's extremist tomes. Surely the reviewers of *Nation*, *New Republic*, and *Saturday Review* would not let me down.

I began to pour through *Book Review Digest*, the standard reference work devoting itself to reporting synopses of reviews from the major book publications. First on my list was Cleon Skousen's *The Naked Communist*. There were no reviews. None at all. Not a word concerning a four-hundred page volume on Communism written by this most scholarly man who had been a top assistant to J. Edgar Hoover, a professor at Brigham Young University, and field director of the American Security Council. That seemed odd. The book was not produced by a major publisher, but I knew that it had enjoyed an enormous sale.

Frustrated, but passing on, I began looking for reviews of another of the volumes my friend had given me. This time it was *From Major Jordan's Diaries*, memoirs from the records of the

expediter in charge of Lend-Lease aircraft flown to Russia during World War II. Nobody could ignore the dynamite contained in the case made by the Major — including proof supported by Senate investigation that materials for constructing atomic weapons were smuggled out of the United States by agents of the Soviet Union . . . with the personal clearance of Presidential Assistant Harry Hopkins. Again, not a word from the reviewers, though this time the original publisher was the nationally respected firm of Harcourt, Brace.

Now I *was* puzzled. Where was my side? Why wasn't the "Liberal" Press disproving or at least attacking these books? It didn't make sense. Soon I began searching for critiques of the late Senator McCarthy's *Retreat From Victory*, a story of George C. Marshall, Chiang Kai-shek, and the fall of China. Skousen and Major Jordan were not national celebrities, but at the time this book was written few men in the nation were more widely known, more despised and more loved, than were Senator Joseph McCarthy and his target, General Marshall. Surely no literary journal could ignore such a book. Yet, incredibly, *all* of the major reviewers managed to ignore it. Something was rotten and it wasn't in Denmark.

Finally I discovered a Conservative book which had actually been reviewed. Eureka! It was like discovering a bald-headed Kennedy. The manuscript was John T. Flynn's *The Roosevelt Myth*, a 450-page volume which I had read with considerable misgivings since my professors had been unanimous in leading me to worship at the shrine of St. Franklin. I had even assured my own classes that "F.D.R. gave the country an alternative to Communism through the New Deal" (a verbatim quote, alas, from my own lecture notes to my classes in modern American history). Until I read Flynn's book I was ready to nom-

inate F.D.R. for the first vacancy among the avatars of Vishnu. But, while it was obvious that Flynn had no love for Roosevelt, the proofs he presented seemed sound from the point of view of every test that I could give them. What did the reviews say? The first one was mild. It began: "If you want to learn anything about Franklin D. Roosevelt, don't read this book." The rest were more extreme but in the same vein. Through all of the mumbo-jumbo and circumlocution, it was obvious that the reviewers were not discussing the book but attacking Mr. Flynn, a highly respected author of eleven volumes of history and hundreds of articles in the leading American magazines and newspapers. Digging further into reviews of Flynn's works of the Twenties and Thirties I discovered that he was once the darling of the Left, even a regular columnist for *New Republic*. No wonder the "Liberals" were so angry.

A second Flynn book, *While You Slept*, did more to make a Rightwing Extremist of me than any other single volume. Beginning it late one evening, I had been unable to put it down till dawn. Flynn exposed not only the Korean fiasco but documented American treason which had led to the enormous expansion of the Soviet Union and the sellout of China to the Communists. He demonstrated that the rising tide of Soviet imperialism had been consistently supported by the American Left and noted that while World War II had dethroned one set of criminal murderers it had enthroned an even more diabolical group. I am embarrassed to say that it had never before occurred to me that millions of American soldiers gave years of their lives — and hundreds of thousands were maimed or killed — with the primary geopolitical result that the Soviet Union was enabled to capture most of Central Europe and part of Asia, and that the Chinese Communists were set up to

seize power in the world's most populous nation. Much of *While You Slept* was devoted to the work of the Communists within an organization known as the Institute for Pacific Relations (I.P.R.), which had worked vigorously and successfully at engineering the consent of the American people for pulling the plug on Nationalist China. If all of this were true, I thought, why had it never been mentioned in my history texts and classes in college or graduate school? Certainly these events had altered the course of history. Yet, for example, I had never heard of the I.P.R. You can well imagine that I was more than a little shocked to learn that every large metropolitan library in the country contains the Hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee confirming Flynn's case.

But the reviewers nonetheless conducted a smearathon on *While You Slept*. The *New York Herald Tribune*, whose consistent editorial promotion of books praising the Chinese Communists had been a matter of concern to John Flynn, commented:

The evidence is not really all in. Statements and documents are being quoted inexcusably out of context. We are reading political polemics not careful historical analysis. We cannot possibly get an accurate view by reading either side alone.

I didn't miss the fact that the reviewer was careful not to be specific about what the author had quoted "inexcusably" out of context. After gaining experience at interpreting "Liberal" reviews I learned that this is a convenient device to give the impression of scholarly research without actually conducting any. And impressions are important! We wouldn't want anybody to get curious and actually read such a Conservative book. He might check the documentation for himself.

The *New York Times* also took great pains to avoid inspiring any potential reader to purchase a copy of *While You Slept*, saying:

John J. Flynn has shed much heat but little light on one of the great issues of our time. . . . With the wisdom of what has been called 20-20 hindsight he interprets wartime and postwar relations among the United States, Russia and China in terms of subsequent and not then current events. These may be satisfactory procedures for the polemicist, but not for the historian.

I noticed that according to the *Tribune* we must disregard Flynn's well documented book because the evidence is *not* in, and according to the *Times* we must disregard it because the evidence *is* in. I was amused to see the mighty *Times*, the supposed *sine qua non* of literary sophistication, stooping to such clichés of the propagandist as *heat and light* and *20-20 hindsight*. And having read the book for myself, I realized how totally the *Times* had missed the point: Flynn's whole thesis was that the ideological persuasion of those involved in our wartime and postwar relationships with the Soviet Union made the subsequent expansion of Communism inevitable. I was a "Liberal," but dishonesty was dishonesty.

Another book which had shaken my "Liberal" underpinnings was Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane's eyewitness account, *I Saw Poland Betrayed*. Ambassador Lane was a professional diplomat who forfeited his career in order to write this book. His account of American treason in the Communist conquest of Poland came as a severe jolt. After all, hadn't World War II begun over the territorial integrity of Poland? It made little sense to precipitate a world war to save Poland from the Nazis only to meekly and hypocritically relinquish

it to the Communists. Yet, in reviewing the Ambassador's book, the *New York Herald Tribune* declared:

It is [hard] to go along with him on his chastisement of Roosevelt and Churchill for their wartime Polish policy, since for geographical reasons it was always doubtful whether they could have brought about any different result.

In other words, it was inevitable that Poland would live under the dictatorship of a powerful neighbor. If that is so, I thought, why did we fight the war? Why was principle so important to my "Liberal" friends when the Nazis were involved and expediency and "practicality" the order of the day when dealing with Communists? Such a question is not easily washed away by even an ocean of rationalizations and platitudes.

There were other books, too. Professor James Burnham's *Web of Subversion*, Ralph de Toledano's *Seeds of Treason*, and several more. But the experience with each was much as with the others. I remember sitting there in that library turning from reference source to reference source, checking and rechecking, almost as if in pain. It was as if I had been a part of circulating a vast lie. I felt unclean. Dishonest. I didn't like it a damn bit.

As you may well imagine, it was a long drive home from the library. This was far more important than an argument between friends. This was a matter of integrity. Somehow propagandists had seized control of the whole apparatus of information. And they had been so effective in their job that I had been able to coast through college and a graduate degree without so much as suspecting it. I was either a prize chump or there was one godawful conspiracy afoot. I remember feeling sick. After a rough night, I phoned my friend and

scheduled a luncheon date. The day's fare was crow.

The situation was not new by any means. In *The Red Decade*, as far back as 1941, *Reader's Digest* editor Eugene Lyons explained that: "From experience [writers] knew that anti-Communist books started off with a heavy handicap not only in liberal and quasi-liberal publications, but in the hands of many reviewers for major newspapers and magazines. . . . Books slanted to conform to the party line, by the same token, started with a critical advantage." That is why we are building what Tom Anderson calls the "Constitutional Underground"; that is why there is an AMERICAN OPINION; and, that is why we must grow, using the principles of judo to expose and defeat the stronger opponent. For my own part, that is why I ceased to be a "Liberal."

I

HAVING DEVOTED some time to examining the publishing establishment's fixation against exposure of the Left, I soon became curious as to just how long the "Liberals" of the Press have been misjudging the Communists. How far back did it go? Fortunately the Memory Hole about which George Orwell wrote, where yesterday's history is simply incinerated when it is no longer useful to Big Brother, has not yet become a formal national institution. When our "Liberals" write history books they do sweep their past errors under the rug, but it is still possible to review back copies of periodicals at the public library. And there is no better way of examining the "Liberal" record. It is a fascinating game and easy to play. If you want to find out what *Hogwash Weekly* was saying about your favorite Communist dictator when he was being promoted as a "fierce nationalist and agrarian reformer," it is not at all difficult to check *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*, note the

pertinent pages and dates, and order out the damning evidence.

Delving back into hordes of dusty old magazines one quickly discovers that "Liberal" intellectuals and opinion makers of the Twenties and Thirties looked upon the Communist Revolution in Russia with a great deal of sympathy, consistently referring to it as "the great experiment." In *The Red Decade*, Eugene Lyons explains:

In the early years of the Russian experiment, American eulogists . . . showed a romantic almost lyrical acceptance of the revolution. The facts, no matter how harsh, were usually admitted and assimilated as parts of the agony of birth. . . . Theirs is for the most part a literature of apologetics, ranging from panicky rationalization and self-deception to deliberate concealment. The early-day literary eulogists wrote as inspired prophets of an embattled revolution. . . .

The Red Decade contains a wealth of information concerning the Communists' seduction (if it was rape it was statutory) of American intellectuals. In his chapter entitled "The Liberals Invent a Utopia," Lyons says:

The American liberal aberration has its house organ, "The New Republic," which led all the rest in avid and indiscriminating acceptance of the myth of Stalin's Utopia. "The Nation" contended for the honors but never could master quite so much brilliant misinformation on the subject.

While millions of Russians were being herded like animals into cattle cars to be shipped to slave labor camps in Siberia, the *New Republic* and the *Nation* were ballyhooing the Soviet Union as the world's foremost protector and de-

fender of civil liberties. As 5 million human beings were deliberately starved to death in the Ukraine under the direction of a Commissar named Nikita Khrushchev, such "Liberal" periodicals regularly hailed the "success of collective farming" and denounced as reactionaries those who told the truth about life in Russia. Of course, thirty years later these same magazines were rhapsodizing that Khrushchev was a sincere man leading Russia as "a liberal in the Western tradition." *New Republic* and *Nation* are still first in war, first in peace, and last in historical accuracy.

It was not only in their academic publications that Communism was being glorified as the benevolent "wave of the future." While a few segments of the Press were presenting the grisly truth about the Red tyranny, many others parroted the Communist Line — the Line that the Communists don't mean what they say about wanting to conquer the world, because they are really humanitarians interested only in democracy and ending poverty.

For most of the Thirties the tone of much of the public opinion in America concerning the Soviet Union was fabricated by the *New York Times* and its Moscow correspondent, Walter Duranty. A trip to the library to research Duranty's reports will convince any skeptic that the Timesman was either a Communist or the most colossal fool ever to be permitted to carry an instrument as pointed as a pencil. Writing about the Stalin Constitution in the *New York Times* of July 19, 1936, Duranty informed his readers:

It is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual change in the Russian leaders. Under the new Constitution the Russian people emerge from their tutelage and are called upon to receive their rights and undertake their duties as a free and democratic people.

That last line would have gone over big in the Siberian salt mines. Like a host of his successors, Duranty was predicting the mellowing of the Russian dictatorship over thirty years ago. Ah, if he and his fellows had only held their breath.

While the political commissars were deliberately starving to death 3 million *kulaks*, small farmers who resisted confiscation of their land by the Soviet State, Duranty was telling his American readers: "Any report of famine in Russia today is an exaggeration of malignant propaganda. . . . There is no actual starvation or deaths from starvation." Later, in his autobiography, Duranty bragged: "I tried to make myself think like a true blue Stalinist. . . ." He succeeded so well that in 1932 he won a Pulitzer Prize for his reports from the Soviet Union. Yes, Duranty knew what he was doing, all right.

The *Times* gave Duranty's Communist propaganda a resonance and authority which it would have lacked in the *Daily Worker*. Of course, Walter Duranty was not unique in using the non-Communist Press to present Communist propaganda. Eugene Lyons has explained:

The capitalist press gave the neo-proletarians the widest leeway in using their new "class weapon" to attack their employer's system. . . . The simple fact is that for many years the New York Times, Herald Tribune, Current History, the New Yorker and many other so-called class magazines used largely "proletarian" standards in measuring literature. Even eye witness accounts exposing the great famine, the deliberate slaying of peasants, and the persecution of scholars, artists and intellectuals by the Soviet secret police, were denounced by liberal scholars, artists and intellectuals in America as "yellow journalism."

In August of 1939 a group of four hundred prominent "Liberals," composed primarily of educators and journalists, published an Open Letter branding as "fascists" and "reactionaries" all who dared suggest "the fantastic falsehood that the USSR and the totalitarian states are basically alike." Nine days later the Nazi-Soviet pact was announced and Hitler and Stalin were partners. The Open Letter became known as "The Letter of the 400 Fools." For over a year, while Hitler and Stalin carved up Europe — with the Communists getting Eastern Poland, part of Finland, and all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania — "Liberals" remained unusually silent.

It is said, of course, that true love will find a way. Certainly the "Liberal" love affair with the Communists blossomed anew when in June of 1941 Stalin and his cohorts were attacked by Germany. Since it was Hitler who attacked Russia, and not vice versa, it was difficult for some Americans to understand why the invasion suddenly turned Stalin's sins into virtues; but overnight Russia was once again being celebrated by our "Liberal" Press as the champion of freedom and democracy.

It is nearly impossible to understand how even our "Liberals" ever bought the idea that Stalin was "our noble ally." Churchill made it plain that he would deal with Satan if necessary to save England from Hitler; but a review of American periodicals of the day portrays *our* alliance with Stalin not as a shotgun marriage but one of enduring romance. Despite the fact that even in their American publications the Communists had since 1919 been openly calling for the overthrow of the United States by force and violence, it was considered bad taste by the "Liberal" opinion makers of the period to point out that our "noble Russian ally" was a ruthless dictatorship built upon the dead bodies of millions of human beings.

During World War II the Communist propaganda which dominated the intellectual journals of the Twenties and Thirties graduated into mass circulation magazines like *Life*, *Time*, *Colliers*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*. This blatant attempt to merchandise the Communists to the American people is painfully obvious even from scanning the titles of magazine articles of the period listed in *Readers' Guide*. Here are a few random samples from literally hundreds:

How Red is Russia? Greater Reward for Greater Effort is the rule nowadays in what is really a Capitalist State set in a Socialist framework, *Colliers*, Feb. 28, 1942; *Government by Horse Sense — Selling the People On Russia*, *Fortune*, June 1943; *USSR — Work and Manners of the Soviet People*, *Life*, March 29, 1943; *We Must Work with Russia*, *New York Times Magazine*, Jan. 17, 1943; *No More Commissars*, *Time*, Oct. 19, 1942; *Moscow Now — Cordiality Highlights Reds' New Era of Good Feeling*, *Newsweek*, June 7, 1943; *Russia: Partner in War and Peace*, *Newsweek*, June 8, 1943; *It Takes the Sun 11 Hours to Cross Heroic Russia*, *Life*, Dec. 14, 1942; *These Are the People of Russia*, *Saturday Evening Post*, Dec. 12, 1942; *Americans and Russians Are So Alike*, *American Magazine*, Dec. 1944; *Our Russian Ally*, *Colliers*, Dec. 18, 1943; *Russian Slogan: Work, Study & Learn*, *Reader's Digest*, Feb. 1944; *Russia's Efforts to Streamline Karl Marx*, *Newsweek*, April 19, 1944; *Russia Lets Down Old Barriers*, *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 19, 1943; *Why Should Stalin Produce All the Bright Ideas?* (Editorial) *Saturday Evening Post*, April 8, 1944; *American Turn Out to Honor USSR*, *Life*, Nov. 22, 1943; *Russia Beckons Big Business*, *Colliers*,

Sept. 2, 1944; *Those Russians — New Era of Good Feeling*, *Life*, July 17, 1944; *Lights On Again in Russia*, *Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 16, 1944; *Smart Boys Those Cossacks*, *Saturday Evening Post*, June 26, 1943; etc., etc., ad infinitum, ad nauseum.

During World War II a number of simultaneous Communist propaganda campaigns were conducted in this country using the non-Communist Press. One of the most significant of these was the massive effort to undermine the reputation of Chiang Kai-shek and Nationalist China in order to condition the American people for the takeover of China which the Communists had planned for after the war.

The Red China campaign was kicked off with the publication of a number of highly touted and well reviewed books about China, among them Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China*,* Owen Lattimore's *Making Modern China*, and Anna Louise Strong's *Chinese Conquer China* — all written by secret Communists or longtime Communist sympathizers. In *While You Slept* John T. Flynn examined the twenty-nine books concerning China published in the United States during the crucial period between 1943 and 1949. Of these volumes, twenty-two of the twenty-nine were obviously written to promote the cause of Mao Tse-tung. Flynn's study revealed that "Every one of the 22 pro-Communist books were reviewed, [and] received glowing approval . . . in the *New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, and the *Saturday Review of Literature*. And every one of the anti-Communist books was either roundly condemned or ignored in these same reviews." A cross

* Later, the *Saturday Evening Post* of April 9, 1949 called Snow's *Red Star Over China* the most authoritative book ever written about Chinese Communists.

check of the book journals at your local library will disclose that Communist and pro-Maoist authors were reviewing each other's volumes, forming a kind of mutual admiration society — mutual admiration of the Communist butcher Mao Tse-tung.

The mass magazines were also packed with articles favorable to Mao. Such propaganda appearing in an openly Communist publication would have had little influence on public opinion. The comparatively few non-Communists who read it would have dismissed it for what it was — Communist propaganda. But the Communists knew that their articles in non-Communist publications like the *Saturday Evening Post* could do more damage than the combined verbal tonnage of ten years of the *Daily Worker*. Between 1943 and 1947, the *Post* published forty-five articles by Edgar Snow, the notorious Stalinist press agent. Snow, who was also married to a Communist, consistently presented the Stalinist line on China, Russia, India, Yugoslavia, and facets of American foreign policy. He glamorized the Chinese Communists as being independent of the Soviet Union and described them regularly as humanitarian, democratic, agrarian reformers who deserved American support.

As World War II climaxed, the same "Liberal" pundits, social savants, and editorialists, who had so constantly and so shamelessly displayed their Russophilia throughout the war, issued voluminous hoopla over the Yalta agreement which turned most of Central Europe over to the Communists. Their prose was so impassioned that it would have embarrassed the authors of Mother's Day cards. And the rapture grew. Herbert L. Matthews even wrote in a 1945 issue of *Colliers* that "All [the Russians] want is security. By refusing to share the secret of the atomic bomb, we are fostering Russian suspicion. . . ." Matthews was but one of many gurus of

the gazettes who wanted us to give the atom bomb to the Soviets to prove our "sincerity."

When, in the hangover of the early Fifties, it was no longer possible to pawn Stalin off as a sincere and democratic humanitarian, American "Liberals" switched to the myth that while the Russians were "bad" Communists, the Chinese and kindly Mao Tse-tung were "good" Communists. (Gentle Mao had just butchered 50 million of his own people to solidify his regime.) Today's events have reversed the process and the same opinion makers now tell us that it is the Chinese who are the "bad" Communists and that we must immediately "build bridges of understanding" to the "mellowing" Russians who are supplying the equipment with which American boys are being killed in Vietnam.

The years since the war have brought the "Liberals'" unholy crusade against colonialism in which the United States has insisted that Europeans be ejected from the "emerging nations" and that their place be taken by kindly Nationalists who have regularly turned out to be Communist agents—men like Sukarno, Mau Mau leader Jomo Kenyatta, Souvanna Vong, Kwame Nkrumah, Sekou Toure, and a long list of others. In every case the Communist dictator received a buildup in the American Press as a "democrat" and "agrarian reformer." In the late Forties in French Indo-China, for example, the United States offered diplomatic recognition, armed, and financed to the tune of \$6 million, a Communist regime headed by Ho chi Minh — who in 1931 had been expelled by the British from Hong Kong for his revolutionary work as Director of the Southeast Asia Bureau of the Third Internationale. Ho's chief press agent in America was one Harold R. Isaacs, a *Newsweek* correspondent in Asia whose articles of that period glorified Ho chi Minh as a native George

Washington. Isaacs was serving as a journalist in Hong Kong when Ho was expelled for his Communist activities, and he could have had no doubt that the Vietnamese leader was a Communist. Yet, during 1946, Harold Isaacs produced a series of articles on Ho for *Harper's* magazine which spanned four months and displayed the bottomless depths of his idolatry of the Red dictator. The noble Ho, said Isaac's, "kept life in his body by his purity of aim and singleness of purpose."

In his authoritative book *Background to Betrayal*, which was ignored by the major reviews, correspondent Hilaire du Berrier reports that American General Philip E. Gallagher even got a job for one of Ho's Communist agents as a reporter for Associated Press, and that countless American journalists flew in and out of Hanoi carrying in their pockets rich gifts from Communist Ho Chi Minh as they filed regular stories on his gentle and democratic ways.

The story of Fidel Castro, the bearded bandit of the Sierra Maestra, is recent enough that most Conservatives remember how our professional "Liberals" promoted him to power. But, the general public has forgotten, or was never aware, of how inexcusable it was to have ever regarded Castro as anything but a Communist. It is, in fact, difficult to top the case of Fidel Castro as an example of how the "Liberal" Press has merchandised the Communists.

The acknowledged leader in the hoopla for the hairy wonder was Herbert L. Matthews of the *New York Times*. In fact, the wry comment that Castro "got his job through the *New York Times*" has become a Conservative cliché.

The *New York Times* for February 24, 25, 26, 1957 — beginning on the twenty-fourth with a front-page autographed photo of "student leader Fidel Castro" — presented a series of articles by Herbert L. Matthews on the Cuban

Revolution. Mr. Matthews praised Castro without qualification. Of Communist revolution in Cuba, he said: ". . . it amounts to a 'New Deal' for Cuba, radical, democratic and, therefore, anti-Communist. There is no Communism to speak of in Fidel Castro's 26th of July Movement." As late as July 16, 1959, after Castro had been in power for six months and had been denounced as a Communist in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by his own Air Force Chief, Major Pedro Diaz Lanz, Matthews reported in the *Times* that "This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control. . . ."

Undaunted by the mass executions and the open Communists who surrounded his friend Fidel, Matthews wrote in the *Hispanic American* of August 29, 1960: "Paradoxical though it may seem, Americans should be praying that nothing happens to Fidel Castro. Any hope of changing the situation for the better lies with him." Four days after Castro announced to the world that he was a Communist and had been one since his student days, Herbert Matthews told an audience at the Overseas Press Club that he *didn't believe him*. As the *New York Herald Tribune* of December 7, 1961 reported, Matthews said: "I don't believe anything he says. . . . Today Castro may believe he is a Communist, but tomorrow he may believe something else." Few Americans stopped to wonder why it was that, while Matthews did not now believe anything Castro said, when preparing his dispatches from Cuba he apparently believed every word that dripped from the beard of the great Fidel. Few even noticed when, following the Castro fiasco, Herbert L. Matthews was promoted to be Assistant Editor of the *Times* and a member of its editorial board.

It is little wonder that Robert C. Hill, our Ambassador to Mexico during Castro's rise to power, who had in vain tried to warn Washington that Castro was a Communist, testified before a Senate Committee that: "Individuals in the State Department and in the *New York Times* put Castro in power." Of course, Herbert L. Matthews couldn't have sold Castro to the American public all by himself. He had to have plenty of help — and he got it. Support of Castro among "Liberal" newspaper columnists was nearly unanimous. Typical of their sentiments is this statement from Ralph McGill's nationally syndicated column of January 8, 1959:

Fidel Castro and the young people of Cuba have won a revolution. They have not consolidated it. This may be difficult for them to do. Powerful interests will oppose them. But it should be obvious that Fidel has no intention of going Communist. He is a product of Western civilization. Nor do the intellectuals and the people about him consider orienting themselves toward Moscow.

Look magazine tops the slick world of mass publishing in circulation. (*Look* is pinker than *Life*, as they say.) Tom Anderson has written that he wouldn't even believe the page numbers in *Look* unless he counted them himself — and with good reason. Sandwiched in with *Look's* weekly pieces on wicked Rightists and flag-waving Superpatriots there is inevitably an article on the lovable Lefty of the week. Castro has won the "lovable Lefty of the week" award on several occasions. *Look* for February 4, 1958, for example, described "Dr. Castro" as a "towering 31 year old lawyer and intellectual," and offered this *repartee*:

Look: Charges have been made that your movement is Communist in-

spired. What can you say about this?

Castro: This is absolutely false. Every American newsman who has come here at great personal risk — Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, two C.B.S. reporters and yourself — has said this is false. . . . Actually the Cuban Communists, as your journalist once reported, have never opposed Batista. . . .

It is curious that Castro cited *Look's* reporter as a debunker of the consistent report that he was a Communist before the *Look* story was written, and that even Castro quoted American news media in general as proof that his revolution was not Communist. Oh, the editors of *Look* were convinced all right. William Attwood, the magazine's Foreign Editor, declared in *Look* for March 3, 1959: "We can thank our lucky stars that Castro was not a Communist." As with Herbert Matthews, William Attwood has since been promoted—to Editor-in-Chief of *Look*.

The support of Fidel Castro by the "Liberal" Press was so flagrant and so contrary to the known facts that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee found it necessary to investigate the subject. The Committee established that Castro had been a notorious Communist since his student days and had helped lead a Communist revolt in Bogota, Colombia, in 1948. They also established that, just as AMERICAN OPINION and other Conservative journals reported at the time, Castro was trained by the Communists as was his brother Raul. Three Ambassadors, a former Undersecretary of State for Latin America, and official intelligence sources were all trying to get the Press to warn America that Fidel and his lieutenants were known and even notorious Communists; but the "Liberal" opinion makers were too busy denying his Communist background, and attacking Conservatives who offered proof that he was

a Soviet agent,* to listen. Such a situation is an all too regular event.

II

PROPAGANDIZING for the Communists by the "Liberal" Press has not ceased, our "Liberals" having refused to learn from their mistakes. A recent example of the recurring theme is the Vietcong propaganda campaign carried on by *New York Times* editor Harrison Salisbury, a Pulitzer Prize-winner who served as the *Times* Moscow correspondent from 1949 to 1954. It was *Time* magazine which said of Salisbury: "His reports often read more like Red propaganda than accounts of what is really going on in Russia." *Reader's Digest* editor Eugene Lyons commented that: "He was widely regarded as a fellow traveler. . . . At regular intervals, for example, he assured *Times'* customers that the entire [Soviet] population was one hundred percent behind Stalin's domestic and foreign policies." It is not surprising then that Salisbury won a Pulitzer Prize the very year after he returned from Moscow. After all, following a shorter trip there in 1944 he had been named Foreign News Editor of the *New York Times*.

It is also not surprising that Salisbury was the first American journalist admitted to Communist Hanoi. For two days in December 1966 Americans were bombarded with dispatches from Hanoi carrying the by-line of Harrison Salis-

bury and proclaiming that Americans were responsible for bombing atrocities in North Vietnam. It was not reported until later that Salisbury's traveling companion was Australian Communist Wilfred Burchett, whose latest book was offered as a premium for subscribing to the official Communist newspaper, *The Worker*. And it was not reported until later that the facts and figures quoted by Salisbury were taken from a twelve-page Communist propaganda release entitled *Report on U.S. War Crimes in Nam Dinh City*. Such propaganda coming directly from the Communists would have been dismissed; but most Americans believed they had no reason to assume they were getting anything but honest reporting from Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times*. Actually, the same press release used by the *Times'* editor had been handed out to Western reporters in Moscow in early November but had not found its way to print because it was so obviously mere propaganda.

Nonetheless, the Pulitzer Prize committee attempted to award Salisbury the 1967 Pulitzer Prize for international reporting on the basis of his story taken directly from Communist press releases. The Pulitzer advisory board, however, vetoed the award because Salisbury's reports had not cited the Communists as the source for his articles on North Vietnamese civilian casualties. Salisbury was enraged. After all, hadn't he spelled all the words right? As he said: ". . . I put the opinion of the editors of the *Times* above any jurors. If the *Times* thinks my [*sic*] stuff is good, I put that above the Pulitzers or anything else. You can interpret that any way you like." I interpret that to mean that if Herbert L. Matthews likes it, to hell with everything else.

III

AMERICANS are raised from childhood to have confidence and pride in our

* Nathaniel Weyl's authoritative *Red Star Over Cuba*, which positively established that the Cuban revolution was a Communist operation from start to finish, was unanimously panned by the critics. Samples: "an assault on scholarship" — *Literary Journal*; "Weyl's expose is written second hand which hardly inspires confidence" — *Atlantic Monthly*; "he cannot see an inch beyond the conspiratorial view of history" — *New York Herald Tribune*; Weyl casts "vulgar" aspersions based on "insufficient" evidence against "foreign service officers of the United States who have taken solemn oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution of our country" — *Catholic World*; and "the book is based largely on testimony of two disgruntled ambassadors" — *New York Times*.

Press. We tend to assume that our traditional sources of information give us a full and undistorted view of world events. Anyone marching against the tide of majority opinion appears to be headed for deep water. The individual or group challenging mass public opinion seems to most of us to have odd or extreme notions. Yet a simple trip to nearly any library will illustrate just how far the *majority* has been misled.

The danger is enormous.

Are the Pied Pipers of our journalistic debacle Communists? A number of them undoubtedly are. Effective Communist infiltration of our national Press dates well back into the Thirties when a powerful newspapermen's union, the American Newspaper Guild, was headed by Heywood Broun, described by Eugene Lyons as a "literary trigger man" for the Communists. Broun, according to the sworn testimony of Benjamin Gitlow, a founder of the Communist Party in America and its former General Secretary, was understood by the domestic Communists to be carrying out Kremlin policies in the newspaper unions. Eugene Lyons says in *The Red Decade* that "Preponderant Stalinist influence in the American Newspaper Guild extended the terror to a portion of the press. Secretly edited Communist 'shop papers' in the *New York Times* and on *Time* magazine made life miserable [for non-Communists]."

In 1956, an investigation by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee into subversive infiltration of the national Press revealed that a frightening number of important journalists were Communists or powerfully under the influence of Communists. As the Subcommittee's annual Report made clear:

The Subcommittee encountered considerable evidence of Communist activities in the press, radio and television. . . . The Communists in the

United States have their own . . . newspaper . . . and control various weekly and monthly periodicals. . . . But these publications are so brazenly slanted that their propaganda value . . . is sharply limited. In order to overcome this disadvantage . . . Communists have made vigorous and successful efforts to infiltrate the American press and radio and to entrench their members in all other forms of mass communications, where, by emphasis or omission of the written or spoken word, it may be turned to the advantage of [the Communist] conspiracy.

The naive will assume that following the Subcommittee's Report there must have been an editorial housecleaning. No such housecleaning has taken place, though from time to time journalists are promoted. For example, two former employees of the *New York Times*, John T. McManus and James Aronson — apparently believing that they were leaving the *Times* in good hands with men like Matthews and Salisbury — did move up to become General Manager and Editor respectively of the *National Guardian*, a weekly newspaper cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a "virtual propaganda arm of Soviet Russia."

It is now altogether too obvious that only when the citizens of this nation begin to question the sources of their misinformation can America reverse the plan for the enslavement of our country which is even now being implemented. This month, the Communists are celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. At the same time, America's "Liberal" Press will be celebrating fifty years of being totally wrong about the Communists. If we give them half a chance they will see that a free America does not survive another such anniversary. ■ ■