

Soviet Active Measures and the Western Media

22nd May 1984

FREEDOM OF THE press is fundamental to the protection of the citizen against the power of the State. It is a prerequisite to liberty. Unconditionally we must fight for it.

But how should we react when allies of a totalitarian system try to use the freedom of our press as a protective screen behind which they can conspire to destroy freedom itself? Is the remedy to inhibit freedom of expression? No. The contrary is the case. The remedy is more investigation, more information and more publication of the truth. And for each of us in our own way to draw attention to the facts. That is my purpose today.

There are lessons to be learned from the conflict between Carthage and Rome. The Carthaginians were a great semitic people. When they needed to, they knew how to fight. Their greatest general, Hannibal, led his troops to victory in battles against Rome. But the Carthaginians were a mercantile civilisation. They were traders and merchants and they interpreted the motives of the Romans, according to mercantile logic. Rome was different. Rome's purpose was military conquest and imperial expansion. This, the Carthaginians were never able to understand, and so ultimately Carthage was destroyed.

Today in the West we are like Carthage and Moscow like Rome. We seem incapable of understanding Moscow's way of thinking. We are mercantile and want to conduct our affairs in peace. We try to set our policies on the premise that the Soviets want to do the same. Every time the Soviets embark on a new 'peace' offensive, too many of us are pitifully eager to forget that this is no more than a modulation of Soviet tactics, not a change in their fundamental strategy.

Yet this should not be difficult for us to perceive. The 1977 Brezhnev constitution states quite officially that it is Soviet Russia's aim, indeed duty, to spread the communist system to all countries of the world without exception. The Brezhnev Doctrine holds that once communism is established in a country, it becomes irreversible. The USSR would use military means to intervene in any country where communist rule is threatened. On the other hand, communist rule must be established in non-communist countries. To achieve this, the Soviet Union would support 'wars of national liberation' by harnessing genuine local revolutionary forces and guiding them to Marxist/Leninism. The Brezhnev Doctrine means that the movement can only go one way.

Nonetheless, many of us still want to believe that the problems that separate us are problems that can be resolved by negotiation and mutual goodwill. But unfortunately we must realise that we cannot find lasting peace through negotiation, because what the Soviets really want we cannot negotiate. We cannot cede to them the right to progressive imperial conquest. We cannot negotiate away our freedom. We must face the fact that the antagonism between our two civilisations is not superficial, but fundamental, and that we are condemned to this state of affairs for the long term. There is no easy solution, no quick fix. The only way to peace is by doing whatever is necessary for both sides to realise that war cannot be won.

As a result of the West's defensive power, the Soviets recognise that their most effective current strategy is not armed conflict but instead to weaken us from within.

If they can make us lose our confidence, confuse our sense of purpose, weaken our resolve to defend ourselves, then they can win without armed conflict.

That has been their strategy in Europe. Their plan is clear:

- obtain overwhelming military, including nuclear, superiority so as to be able to exercise political blackmail.

- attempt to separate the USA and Europe and thereby encourage the withdrawal of US troops from Europe. This would eliminate automatic US involvement in a European war and isolate Europe.
- achieve substantial political power in each European country either through local communist parties, or by infiltrating local socialist parties.
- penetrate and if possible dominate the key centres of power and more particularly the Trade Unions, the media, the Civil Service, etc.

If this can be accomplished. Europe will fall like a rotten fruit.

Their methods have been equally clear. Politically they have established communist parties in each country. In Italy, France, Greece and Portugal, for example, these have grown to a substantial size, gaining between 12% and 30% of the vote. But whenever candidates, standing under the Communist Party label, are unable to succeed at the ballot box, they switch labels and adopt the camouflage of socialism. They penetrate local socialist parties. Recently in Great Britain, the Cabinet papers for Clement Attlee's period in office as Prime-Minister were declassified. They show that Attlee, a moderate socialist leader, understood and stated clearly, as early as 1950, that as a result of the lack of electoral support, the Communist Party of the UK had changed its strategy from trying to obtain parliamentary representation to infiltrating the Socialist Party and other centres of power.

At the same time the Soviets, through skillful and coordinated use of their political allies and agents of influence, have worked to mould public opinion. Their major propaganda thrusts have been to encourage:

- unilateral disarmament
- neutralism
- increased trade with the Soviet bloc
- anti-Americanism

Anti-Americanism has a double benefit for the Soviets. Its impact in Europe is obvious. But also it encourages isolationism in America. If anti-American demonstrations are orchestrated every time a high profile American official visits Europe, and if the US media give suitable prominence to the demonstrations, then resentment and isolationism are encouraged among Americans. Of course there will always be some anti-Americanism and some xenophobia just as there is always some temptation to seek peace by unilateral disarmament. The object of Soviet measures is to use these naturally occurring sentiments and to distort them, exaggerate them and manipulate them so as to serve Soviet purposes. One of their principal tools is propaganda. So they need the media.

Andrei Sakharov, the Nobel Prize winner, smuggled out of Russia what he called his testament to the West. In it he described agents of influence working in the West for Soviet agencies. He wrote 'these include some political figures, businessmen and a great many writers and journalists, Government advisers and heads of press and TV.'

Also we have the testimony of a number of defectors who have held key positions in Soviet bloc intelligence. Men like Ladislav Bittman who was Deputy Chief of the Disinformation Department (Department Eight) of the Czech Intelligence Service. He spent eight years abroad directing and recruiting spies under the control of the KG B. And Stanislav Levchenko who worked as a journalist on the New Times but, in fact, was an important member of the KG B assigned to Tokyo with responsibilities for penetrating the Japanese media. There are many others.

Each one of these men has testified to the importance of recruiting journalists as their agents. Let me quote some extracts from Bittman's testimony. Bittman stated that he 'focused on political figures and journalists'. 'The primary responsibility of these journalists was to publish articles and stories, but their pieces did not emphasize support for Soviet policy. Rather, the major focus concentrated on undermining the United States and NATO,

and on creating rifts between West Germany and France or between the United States and, its allies.'

'I provided guidelines for the agents to follow. These consisted of a two or three page outline of objectives and themes to be covered ...'

'A relatively high percentage of secret agents are journalists. A journalist operating in Great Britain, West Germany or the United States is a great asset to Communist Intelligence. He can be investigative, professionally curious, it is his job to get important and even highly sensitive information.'

'There are many journalists who are agents. There are important newspapers around the world penetrated by Communist Intelligence Services. There are one or two journalists working for a particular paper and who are agents and who receive from time to time instructions to publish this story or that story ...'

Levchenko has stated:

'In my own case, the most important influence agents I directed were journalists.'

'A KGB officer generally focuses on recruiting two kinds of journalists. One type is the specialist in a particular subject area who possesses both sensitive information and connections with key individuals The second type of desired journalist is the individual with a wide following, or one associated with a newspaper with a wide distribution.'

'In general you provide guidelines, themes and objectives. You make suggestions and discuss how the agent might implement and accomplish the objective.'

These intelligence officials backed up their statements by supplying the names of those whom they had employed as agents of influence. Recently, there have been further defectors from Soviet Intelligence who were closely connected with the Soviet propaganda apparatus. They have confirmed the testimony of Bittman and Levchenko and have provided substantial further information.

Sometimes an apparently independent newspaper publishes with regularity articles which must cast doubt on the publication's claimed independence. Such a newspaper is Ethnos, Greece's largest daily tabloid.

Here are some examples of its reportings:

- On Poland: Solidarity is a union working for the CIA and the Vatican which receives funds from the Mafia. The Pope's historical visit to Poland from 16th June to 23rd June 1983 was not reported.
- Afghanistan: Afghanistan's resistants are described as a group of bandits whose crimes are similar to those of the Nazis. According to Ethnos there is no Afghan problem. It was artificially created to serve US strategy.
- The Berlin Wall: Ethnos describes this as the wall of peace which was built to prevent a planned Western attack against East Germany.
- Soviet Russia: is described as the world's leading peace loving country.
- The United States: according to Ethnos, Reagan, with the FBI, have muzzled the American people; political liberty in the United States has never been under greater threat; the country is plunging into totalitarianism.
- The Korean Airlines Jumbo Jet: according to Ethnos the incident was a deliberate provocation by the CIA to spy on Soviet Russia.

- Grenada: Ethnos announced that 2,000 people were killed during the first day of the invasion.

A young Greek journalist, Paul Anastasi, carried out an investigation into Ethnos. He published a book in which he alleged that he had uncovered links between the publishers of Ethnos and two important Soviet agents, Boris Pankin, a senior KGB officer, and Vassili Sitnikov, a leading Soviet agent of disinformation operating in Europe. The publishers of Ethnos have sued Paul Anastasi for criminal libel. He has been convicted to a prison sentence which is subject to appeal before the Greek courts. Mr Anastasi has counter-sued Ethnos. Let us hope that the Western press will watch these cases with interest and concern.

I realize that for a number of people in the audience, the facts that I am describing are commonplace. Their academic, government or journalistic work, has made them familiar with these problems. Nonetheless, I hope that they will bear with me while I cover the generalities before reaching a conclusion.

The apparatus in Moscow which is responsible for propaganda is extensive. The leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) regards propaganda as an indispensable adjunct to Soviet foreign policy and military strategy. Evidence is available which indicates that the investment by the Soviets in propaganda is between \$3 and \$4 billion per annum. In addition to this there are the investments made by those countries which the Soviets use as a secondary instrument in their propaganda effort and more particularly the European satellite countries and Libya and Cuba. There are three major organisations under the Politburo that direct the propaganda apparatus. First, is the International Department of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) headed by Boris Ponomarev, an alternative member of the Politburo.

Second, is the CPSU's International Information Department (IID) headed by Leonid Zamyatin, the former director of the Soviet news agency, Tass. Working alongside the IID is the KGB controlled covert propaganda organisation called Service A which is part of the KGB's First Chief Directorate. Service A plans, coordinates and supports secret operations which are designed to back-up overt Soviet propaganda. Service A supports KGB residencies in every Western Capital in planting rumours, forgeries, agents of influence in the media and government. It is estimated that as many as 15,000 Soviet officials are working in these organisations. In addition, Moscow coordinates similar organisations run by its Eastern European, Cuban and Vietnamese allies. The campaign orchestrated by this apparatus are known by the Soviets as 'Active Measures.'

An analysis of the principal Soviet front organisations illustrates the breadth of the active measures effort. One of the major organisations is the 'World Peace Council' (WPC). It originated in 1949 from the 'World Congress of Intellectuals for Peace.' The WPC owns a number of publications which are published in English, French, Spanish and German. Its principal propaganda objective is to encourage the West to disarm. The WPC conducts its operations on a worldwide basis and it has spawned regional and national peace committees.

The 'World Federation of Trade Unions' (WFTU) established in 1945 is another Communist front. Its objective is described as the comprehensive support and defence of the world socialist system and it orchestrates campaigns against multi-national companies and in favour of union power. It has been granted Category A status by the United Nations along with UNESCO and the Food and Agricultural Organisation.

The 'World Federation of Democratic Youth' (WFDY) and the 'International Union of Students' has the task of influencing youth.

The 'International Organisation of Journalists' (IOJ) has as an avowed aim the defence 'of freedom of the press and journalists'. A major activity of the IOJ is the training of journalists in the IOJ's main schools which are located in Budapest, East Berlin, Prague and Sofia and further schools are planned in Havana and Algiers.

The 'Christian Peace Conference' (CPC) claims to be a 'forum at which Christians from all over the world will meet together and search for God's will concerning current political, social and economic problems.'

The 'Women's International Democratic Federation' (WID F) has as avowed goals 'to unite women regardless of race, nationality, religion or political opinions so that they may win and defend their rights as citizens, mothers and workers ...'

You will notice that each of these organisations plays on genuine matters of concern in our society: peace; trade unions; education of the young; freedom of the press; freedom of worship; women's rights. I mentioned earlier that in the Third World, the Soviets harness genuine revolutionary sentiments so as to guide 'wars of national liberation' to Marxist/Leninism. So in the West, they try to harness genuine issues to use them to promote the interests of Marxist/Leninism.

There are a multitude of other major communist front organisations, such as the 'International Association of Democratic Lawyers' (IADL), the 'International Radio and Television Organisation' (ORIT), the 'World Federation of Scientific Workers' (WFSW) and the 'International Federation of Resistance Fighters' (IFRF), etc., etc.

Each of these organisations has sponsored suborganisations at international, national and local level and publishes magazines, bulletins, etc. Each of these organisations can be shown to be a communist front with links to Moscow.

As is normal with the Soviet structure, these organisations are supplemented by another layer of front organisations, which pose as independent western charities and institutes. An example of a Soviet propaganda campaign was the campaign against the neutron warhead. It was part of the Soviet general campaign aimed at preventing NATO from modernising its Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF).

The campaign was led by the World Peace Council who declared the 6th to 13th August, 1977, as an international 'week of action'. It then became a coordinated effort of the whole propaganda apparatus including the use of agitprop. The sequence of events was:-

- Peace councils in various East European States held protest meetings.
- In Istanbul, a peace committee demonstrated in front of the US Consulate General.
- In Accra, a group delivered a protest letter to the US Embassy.
- In Stuttgart, Frankfurt and Dusseldorf, front groups organised demonstrations in front of the US Consulate General.
- Similar agitation was carried out by front groups in Lima and Tanzania, as well as a Peruvian protest to the United Nations.
- Other major international fronts such as the 'World Federation of Trade Unions' participated in the international week of action.

Also there were the series of communist-planned conferences in Europe. The target of this effort was the United Nations 'Special Session on Disarmament' (SSOD) to be held in New York from 23rd May to 28th June. Three conferences were organised to provide psychological momentum to the SSOD. The World Peace Council, through one of its sub-fronts, the 'International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces', organised a symposium from the 6th to 8th February in Vienna on 'Nuclear Energy and the Arms Race' in collaboration with the International Atomic Energy Agency, a United Nations body. A larger meeting was staged in Geneva from 22nd February to 2nd March under the group calling itself the 'Special Non-Government Organisations Committee for Disarmament.' In fact the real organiser was the World Peace Council aided by the Swiss peace movement. Then there

was the 'International Forum on the Neutron Bomb' held from the 18th to 20th March in Amsterdam. Sympathisers from all over Europe were brought in for the meeting which culminated on 19th March in a demonstration by some 40,000 people. There were many other meetings used for the same purpose and organised by the World Peace Council, including one in Mexico City from the 1st to 4th February and another from the 9th to 12th February in Athens.

All this activity was picked up in the Western media. NATO Secretary-General Luns described this Press comment as all consisting of 'half truths, untruths and ignorance.'

On 8th April 1978 it was announced that President Carter had decided to delay the production and deployment of the neutron warhead.

The chief of the International Department of the Hungarian Communist Party, Janos Bercz, wrote that the 'political campaign against the neutron bomb was one of the most significant and successful since World War II.'

Another type of propaganda campaign is the type which attempts to discredit an individual.

A good example was the campaign to discredit Franz Josef Strauss. Strauss was a young up and coming Minister in Adenauer's Government. In 1956, aged 41, he was promoted to Minister of Defence. As such he made a major speech in the Bundestag calling for the deployment on German soil of US controlled nuclear weapons so as to counter-balance the growing Soviet threat. The disarming and neutering of Europe had already become a primary Soviet strategy. So Strauss became a prime target.

The campaign, which was intensive and long lasting, followed traditional lines:

- photos, subsequently proven to be fabrications, depicting Strauss in sexually compromising situations, were published in the East European Communist press and distributed to West Germany.

- efforts were made to smear Strauss by linking him to a murder trial, the Praun affair. Praun was a dentist charged with a double murder. A journalist ran a story associating Strauss with the case. Strauss took legal action and won the case.

- efforts were made to impugn Strauss's honesty. In 1962 he was accused by a leftist publication of recommending to the US, for a major development project on US bases in Germany, an apartment designer Lothar Schoss who was connected to the company Finanzbau AG (Fibag). It was suggested that Strauss was to share in the Fibag profits. Judicial and Parliamentary investigations followed and both cleared Strauss of misusing influence. Strauss also won a libel action before the Nuremberg courts.

- It was also suggested that Strauss secretly negotiated to buy for \$375,000 cash the Casa Roccavispa villa in Switzerland. The real estate agent testified in court that he had been surprised to read the entirely false story but he welcomed the publicity.

- efforts were made to link Strauss with the Lockheed scandal. Compromising documents were circulated and these were subsequently shown to be forgeries.

Strauss was forced to sue for libel on many occasions and won case after case. And there was the Fallex affair. This was Germany's equivalent of the Pentagon Papers. Top secret military information was passed to a major German weekly by a Defence Ministry employee, Colonel Martin. This included details of the NATO evaluation of the military exercise known as Fallex-62. The article which followed was specific and published such information as: Hamburg would not be defended; the timetable for plans to move NATO aircraft to bases that were not normally used; troop transport timetables; plans for mining Bavarian forests to free US troops there for combat, etc.

Adenauer, in Parliament, called the publication of the article an 'abyss of treason'. Following a formal complaint of treason, the police raided the offices of the publication at 10 p.m. October 26th 1962 on orders of the Federal Prosecutor. The editor was arrested. But it was Strauss who was punished. He was accused of over-reacting against the press. He resigned from the Adenauer Government on November 30th. It was subsequently written that 'almost everyone concedes that one of the most brilliant post war political careers in West Germany is in ruins' and that some particularly hostile journalists had 'expended time, effort, and money, risking jail and credibility with unsubstantiated charges to prevent Strauss from becoming Chancellor and had won'.

General Sejna, the high ranking Czech intelligence defector, testified that the campaign to discredit Franz Josef Strauss was orchestrated by the KGB. This does not mean that the publications or journalists involved knowingly participated or realised that their views were being manipulated and used by the Soviets for their purposes.

It is important to understand how such campaigns gather momentum. The overwhelming majority of the journalists who get caught up in such a campaign do not understand the origins or purpose of the campaign. Those responsible for the publications that are used as platforms usually do not realise that they are being used.

The campaigns often begin as a result of a clear policy decision taken by the Soviet propaganda apparatus. The apparatus brings into play all its assets, both overt and covert. You will find that most of the major themes are developed in a coordinated way in that part of the media which is directly controlled by Communist organisations throughout the world, as well as by the Front organisations and the covert network.

As explained by the defectors such as Levchenko, Bittman and others, the covert activities are initiated by general instructions being given to KGB agents of influence. They start by publishing articles reflecting these instructions. The work of the inner core of agents and front organisations then influences a far larger group of sympathetic left leaning journalists. Those are the people described by Lenin as 'useful idiots'. They do not realise that they are an extension to the Soviet propaganda apparatus and would indignantly and sincerely reject any such suggestion.

Then comes the outer layer consisting of those who follow fashion and seek easy praise.

Responsible journalists can also be disinformed by these campaigns. When a journalist works on an article he refers to the press cuttings file which covers the subject about which he is writing. Information included in these files, particularly when it originates from responsible publications and has not been corrected, will be used over and over again. So, once the press cuttings files have been polluted by propaganda, the false information will be repeated quite innocently and as it is repeated will gather further credibility and momentum. Responsible journalists go to great lengths to check a statement in cuttings, but inevitably even they can become victims of disinformation.

So, the media faces a major challenge. How can it defend itself from these campaigns without restricting freedom of expression. Here are some thoughts. We need more information, more disclosure, wider publication of the facts. In other words more and better journalism. The better informed the public, the better equipped it is to be able to distinguish between news and active measures that distort the news. Therefore the media is central to the solution.

I do not have a list of measures which would solve all our problems. Rather I will propose general ideas that need discussion and which concern all propaganda whatever its origins. The implementation of such ideas has both advantages and disadvantages and these need to be assessed. But they all have a common objective - to increase the flow of information so as to enable the media to better inform the public.

1. The Role of the Executive branch of Government

The last thing that we want is any form of Government control, direct or indirect, of the media. That way lies disaster. The Government can have a useful role as a provider of information. In the last years of the Carter Administration, the US government decided to make available details of major Soviet active measures including forgeries, disinformation, etc. The media could then analyse this information and draw its own conclusions. The Reagan administration has continued the practice.

European Governments should do likewise. So far they have failed to find the courage.

Furthermore Governments should set up a system for objective worldwide monitoring of communist controlled media to identify major propaganda themes and possible agents of influence. The results, without editorial comment, should be made available to the media. Major Soviet active measures and themes can be identified in several ways. One is to study the statements of the leading Soviet bloc propagandists. The interviews and public writings of Ponomarev, Zamyatin, and their deputies such as Fallin, Zagladin, Bovin, etc. tell us a great deal. When senior propagandists make coordinated statements, it almost always reflects Politburo policy.

A second technique that can be used to identify themes objectively is by making a computer analysis of the content of overtly controlled communist media. Techniques have been developed to examine, systematically, the substance of mass communications. This involves analysing the content of data over a specified period of time by classification and statistical tabulation. To complement this, quantitative content analysis should also be combined with descriptive textual analysis. This allows objective identification of major thematic trends and the focus of Soviet foreign propaganda.

Having identified the Soviet themes, it is possible to compare them with the editorial record of newspapers, TV programs, journals, newsletters, or that of particular journalists. If there is consistent harmony over a period of time, this should be cause for concern. Of course, it is not, ipso facto, proof of conscious collaboration. But it does deserve analysis. These measures are part of the flow of information which a free country should consider normal.

2. The Role of Legislation

European Parliaments should enact legislation similar to your Foreign Agents Registration Act, perhaps eliminating certain of its exemptions. The purpose is to ensure that nationals employed as agents by foreign countries would need to disclose the identity of their employers and their terms of employment. But this is not sufficient. Today there are too many front organisations which are apparently local and independent. So a more global system is necessary. What we need is a system that supplies the media with as much information as possible so as to help it defend itself against covert influence and which does so without either restricting freedom of expression or unduly invading privacy. The principal of disclosure of interests is now generally accepted with regard to public servants. In business, this is also true. It does not yet apply to the media. But the media faces problems which call for some form of disclosure. For example, in Britain there is a hard left newspaper called Militant. It has achieved substantial influence and is the organ of a powerful group of hard left politicians. Its sources of finance have often been questioned but few answers have been supplied. Is this right? Obviously in a free society journals of all political persuasions, even the most obnoxious, must be as free as any other publication. But should they be able to promote their ideas without the public knowing whom they represent and who are their paymasters? My own view is that those sections of the media that are part of the political process should publish detailed statements of their sources of funding.

Institutes, councils and so forth, many of which present themselves as charities or institutes of learning, can also pose a problem. Some of them are propaganda organisations which have the clear vocation of influencing the political process.

Should we have the right to know from whom they raise money and to whom they disburse it? Again I believe that we should.

Then there are those who work in the media and who daily affect the political life of their communities. Should they be asked to disclose their interests? Obviously the idea of invasion of privacy is odious to us all. But are journalists less influential than public servants or businessmen? I think not. Here is a recent example which gives rise to differences of opinion among reasonable men. Alexander Coburn is a political journalist who writes, inter alia, for The Village Voice and for The Wall Street Journal. He often comments on world affairs. Some months ago it was discovered that he had received a grant from the Institute for Palestine Studies. I have no knowledge of this Institute nor of Mr Coburn's relationship with it. So I can pass no judgement. But obviously there must be room for different opinions as to whether or not this payment was professionally appropriate. That is proven by the fact that the editors of The Village Voice and of The Wall Street Journal, both of whom were taken by surprise, reacted differently. The Village Voice severed its relationship with Mr Coburn whereas The Wall Street Journal maintained it. That is a genuine difference in the assessment of the facts. But how do editors make these judgements if they do not have the facts to assess?

3. The Role of Owner/Publishers and Editors

Tocqueville in his book 'The Origins of the French Revolution' analysed the question as to why the French Revolution should have taken place in France rather than elsewhere in Europe. He pointed out that, at the time, French peasants had a better standard of living than in neighbouring countries. His conclusion was that the French aristocracy failed because they wanted privilege without responsibility.

Today in Europe, owner/publishers enjoy the glamour and influence of press ownership but when it comes to hard decisions they often like to hide behind their editors. In other words they want the privileges without the responsibilities. Such men and women forfeit the moral right to own.

Owner/publishers and editors must work as a true partnership. Neither has a monopoly of virtue. Both have a responsibility for whatsoever is published in their journal. It is their responsibility to set the standards. Among those standards, they need to consider a requirement to disclose, when desirable, the sources and bias of the material that is published. This concerns both op-ed pages and news pages.

The op-ed pages publish opinions. The question is how much information do readers need about the person who is expressing the opinions. In commercial matters this is simple. If a newspaper publishes an opinion on the quality of airlines, the editor would consider it appropriate to disclose to his readers the fact that the author is the Chairman of Pan Am. But what about politics and philosophy? Regularly I see pieces published on the op-ed pages of journals of reference written by authors who are sponsored, for example, by the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington. Sometimes that connection remains undisclosed. Sometimes the name of the Institute is published but without explanation. The name of the Institute on its own means little to the average reader. Yet all of us who study these matters know that the Institute for Policy Studies is a powerful leftist propaganda organisation in contact with the Communist bloc. We in Europe know it through its European associate, the Transnational Institute. Of course there can be no objection to the publication of articles sponsored by them. But how far should the editor go to inform his readers as to the sources and bias of the opinions he is publishing? That is a question that needs debate.

Editors can have similar problems on their news pages. In London the other day, I read a copy of The Sunday Times which published on its front page an article by Mr Martin Kettle analysing the current coal miners strike. This strike is a direct political challenge to the Government. The leader of the National Union of Mine Workers is Mr Arthur Scargill who is a Marxist. His Vice-President is Mr Mick McGahey who is a leading member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB). Mr Kettle is a

regular contributor to the publication, Marxism Today. This is published by the Communist Party of Great Britain and describes itself as the 'theoretical and discussion journal of the Communist Party'. Further on in the same issue of The Sunday Times, there was a long article on America and Nicaragua. It was co-authored by Mr Mark Hosenball. Mr Hosenball has been closely connected for many years with Mr Philip Agee, the CIA defector who cooperated with the Communist bloc. The British Government, under Prime Minister James Callaghan, took steps to expel from Britain both Mr Agee and Mr Hosenball on grounds of national security.

None of this would matter if the articles had been published in a journal well known for publishing the work of far left authors. But The Sunday Times is a great national institution. Most of its readers would expect the articles they read in The Sunday Times to be objective journalism written by objective journalists. Unfortunately over the past decade, The Sunday Times recruited a number of people from a different culture to that of the paper's heritage. Lord Thomson, who owned the paper at the time, recognised this but felt too old to do anything about it. In any case he was more interested in commerce than in issues. The result can best be illustrated by quoting from a book called Journey into Journalism written by the well known playwright, Arnold Wesker. This is a book about Mr Wesker's experience in The Sunday Times when he was gathering background material for his play The Journalists. The Sunday Times attempted to stop its publication. In it Mr Wesker describes his visit to the Business Section of The Sunday Times and his talks with some of their financial journalists. This is what he says and how he quotes them: - 'Far from being pillars of capitalist society they seem to me an army of very bright urban saboteurs.' 'You see' Mr Wesker quotes them as saying 'it is a question of the credibility of The Sunday Times, which, as an old conservative family newspaper, commands more respect than, say The Observer, which is known for its liberal policies, and therefore we are a better journal through which to infiltrate radical views - more people will believe us.'

How do you handle this problem? What disclosures are necessary? The trouble with today's intellectual environment is that few dare discuss the problem. It attracts accusations of McCarthyism. It is taboo. That must be wrong. It is a genuine problem which needs free and open discussion.

4. The Role of Schools of Journalism

Part of the curriculum for training journalists should be a course on propaganda and Active Measures. It should teach how to identify them and how to defend against them. Of course, this should not be restricted to Soviet or far left propaganda. It should cover the whole spectrum. The enactment of your Foreign Agents Registration Act was a reaction against pre-war Nazi propaganda.

5. The Role of Journalists

My whole thesis is that in a free country the best remedy is wide publication of the true facts. According to the best traditions of the free press, journalists should investigate and publish. But they face a problem. There is a tradition of forbidden areas. Dog must not eat dog. Not only is it unpopular to expose a colleague or a journal but it is also difficult to find papers who would publish your material. Investigation should not be concentrated on the unpopular. It takes no courage to be fashionable, to express conventional wisdom and comfortably to join the pack in attacking the same wounded stag. Courage resides in saying the truth that does not please and which can make you a pariah in the eyes of your peers. That precisely is the duty of the press and one of the great justifications for the freedom of the press.