

ULU RECORD UNIT

THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

Rep. Skelton

Legislative Counsel

OLC 80-2158/A

27 OCT 1980

Honorable Ike Skelton
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Skelton:

This is in response to your note of 14 October 1980 concerning the inquiry from one of your constituents, [redacted]. Though it is beyond our purview to comment on the accuracy of the referenced articles, we do appreciate your constituent's concern.

STAT

The Central Intelligence Agency does make available to foreign governments unclassified Agency publications in accordance with an international exchange program authorized in Title 44 of the U.S.C., sections 1718-1719. Please assure [redacted] that any CIA publication earmarked for the exchange program is done in total conformance with the law and sound security practices. In fact, prior to any Agency publication being made available for exchange, it is reviewed by the Deputy Director of the National Foreign Assessment Center, coordinated with the Department of State and National Security Council to the extent that policy matters are involved, and finally, reviewed personally by the Director of Central Intelligence. Moreover, the exchange program does contribute significantly to the information available to our government's policymakers on a day-to-day basis.

STAT

[redacted] second concern was in regard to the airing on PBS of the film, "On Company Business," and the use of public funds to support PBS. It would be most inappropriate for this Agency to comment on the appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of Congressman Lawrence P. McDonald's remarks in the May 29, 1980 Congressional Record and some reviews, both pro and con, of this particular program.

STAT

STAT

We hope that this response will aid in alleviating [redacted] concern in regard to this Agency's participation in the international exchange program. We trust that you will likewise find the enclosed information useful in your own deliberations.


We appreciate your interest and that of your constituent, [redacted]

STAT

Sincerely,

[redacted]

STAT

 Frederick P. Hitz

Enclosure

Distribution:

- Original - Addressee w/encl.
- 1 - OLC Subject w/encl.
- 1 - OLC Chrono w/o encl.

OLC [redacted] (22 October 1980)

STAT

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SYSTEM
AIRS ANTI-CIA PROPAGANDA:
PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

• Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in the battle over the proposed intelligence charter for the Central Intelligence Agency, the lobby of CIA antagonists has concentrated their efforts on a significant issue, that is whether the CIA shall be permitted to engage in covert actions against subversion, terrorism, and other destabilization operations instigated by the Communist totalitarian regimes headed by the Soviet Union and often carried out through their empire of surrogate and satellite regimes, parties, and fronts. All are willing to permit the CIA to have as many surveillance satellites as possible, to look at photographs, to read Pravda, to monitor radio broadcasts, and so forth.

But the CIA's antagonists do not want the United States of America and its principal foreign intelligence agency to have a capacity for covert actions against Soviet-backed destabilization and aggression in the Third World which is, of course, the principal arena of conflict now between the Communists and the free world.

During this month, the Public Broadcasting System aired in successive weeks a three-part anti-CIA film entitled "On Company Business." The film's coproducer and director has boasted that he made it "as a political weapon" which is scarcely surprising since it featured a number of anti-CIA defectors who had participated in the Cuban Government's 1978 people's tribunal held in conjunction with the 11th World Youth Festival which excoriated the U.S. intelligence agencies for opposing Soviet-backed Marxist-Leninist insurgencies. These defectors included John Stockwell, responsible for "blowing" the covert actions against the MPLA in Angola; Jesse Leaf; and Jim and Elsie Wilcott. Also featured was Victor Marchetti, a former CIA official like Stockwell associated with the institute for Policy Studies, a Marxist think tank with ties to Soviet and Cuban intelligence. Although Marchetti has also obtained some small notoriety for his 1978 effort to influence the Norwegian elections by naming names, the film's principal adviser, and indeed apparently originally a 20 percent partner in this film, "On Company Business," Philip Agee provided a constant com-

mentary to amplify charges made by other ex-CIA agents.

Although it is obvious and a part of the public record that a substantial number of the CIA defectors used in the film have links with Cuba or other hostile Communist intelligence services, Agee is outstanding in this regard. Agee openly thanked agencies of the Cuban Government and representatives of the Communist Party of Cuba for providing him with information for his first CIA exposé book, "Inside the Company," and according to CIA officials Agee made at least five clandestine trips to Havana during the process of writing that book. Just prior to his efforts in 1977 in Jamaica, Agee was sighted in Moscow, a curious place to do research on alleged CIA operations in the Caribbean. And according to columnist Robert Moss, writing in the London Daily Telegraph, Agee met with the Cuban DGI station chief in London on at least 30 occasions before being expelled from that country. Agee is currently living in Hamburg, West Germany, after being expelled from four European countries on account of his continuing intimate relationship with Cuban intelligence personnel.

It should be noted that a number of veteran CIA officials appear briefly in the film shown over the Public Broadcasting System. In most instances, these individuals were filmed during or immediately after various public speaking appearances and were not aware of the Marxist-left backgrounds of the producers of this film.

I would also point out that since the publication this month of a roman a clef entitled "The Spike," coauthored by Arnaud deBorchorgrave and Robert Moss, there has been a growing awareness of Soviet disinformation operations to plant stories in the Western media from which they can be picked up and requoted to legitimize Communist propaganda themes. One of the more well known disinformation stories that appears in "On Company Business" is the article by Seymour Hersh published by the New York Times that incorrectly alleged the CIA supported a truckers strike in Chile during Allende's regime. As the Church committee reports eventually showed, this was not true; however, the filmmakers use that Times story and then follow it with an identical allegation by Agee to reinforce in the viewers mind this false charge.

I do not use this example to single out Mr. Hersh for criticism. Anyone familiar with the profession of journalism is aware of the dependence of investigative journalists on their sources. The Soviet strategists are also

aware of that fact and there is a considerable body of evidence, much of it provided by defectors from the KGB and other Communist secret services, indicating that the KGB's disinformation department is directing more than 1,000 disinformation operations each year in the free world press and that they are utilizing people under their control or influence in government, academia, and the media to leak disinformation stories to reporters. The technique is simple: They feed a reporter several true scoops before giving him the phony one.

An excellent background report on the film, its producers, and its origins with the U.S. Castroite left has been published in the Information Digest, the authoritative newsletter on U.S. political and social movements, subversion, and terrorism which is published by John Rees. The article follows:

ON COMPANY BUSINESS

The taxpayer-funded Public Broadcasting System (PBS) on May 9 and 16, 1980, aired the first two hour-long segments of an anti-CIA documentary, On Company Business, with part three to be broadcast on May 23. On Company Business has been described by PBS as "perhaps the most important film we've ever shown"; while its director and co-producer, Allan Francovich, was quoted in an editorial page article in the Oakland Tribune (4/25/80) by former Ramparts magazine staffer Marina Hirsch as saying, "I made this film as both a political weapon and an educational tool. Everything the CIA does is secret for a very specific reason. If the American people knew what was really going on, they wouldn't stand for it."

In a PBS interview, Howard Dratch, coproducer and production manager of the film, emphasized that "Part of what we were trying to show in the film is that covert action has been continuing; there's been no change from the time of the Church Committee; that these covert actions continue and they continue to be very dangerous . . ." Francovich has emphasized, "You have to realize that . . . the CIA is not the problem. The problem is the foreign policy of this country." And the problem, specifically, as indicated by the film and by writings and statements of its producers, is U.S. intervention against Soviet-sponsored aggression.

Although the documentary was rushed through to completion last year thanks to a \$60,000 grant via the TV Laboratory at WNET-TV in New York from the Film Fund, a grant from the Independent Documentary Fund supported by the Unitarian Northshore Veatch Project which also has heavily financed the Center for National Security Studies (CNSS); the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; FDM Production, Inc., a non-profit, tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organization; and the Ford Foundation; its producers are reticent about its initial financing.

This is of particular interest because media sources have reported that in 1976, a proposal to complete "On Company Business" subheaded "A Feature-Length Docu-

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

mentary Film on the Central Intelligence Agency With Philip Agee," was circulated in 1976 with the PBS market as its intended outlet.

The film credits for part one which dealt extensively with CIA intervention in Latin America and the Bay of Pigs invasion as well as assassination plots against Castro list "Additional Crew in Cuba." This may provide some collateral for the story from media sources that they understood the producers were planning to approach the Cuban government in 1976 with the proposal for assistance in completing their anti-CIA documentary.

It is noted that according to that proposal, On Company Business was produced through a limited partnership set up by the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) law firm of James Larson, Doron Weinberg and Donald J. Stanz. Larson and Weinberg are both recent past presidents of the NLG and veterans of visits to Havana, with Larson having been a participant in the October 1977 conference of the American Association of Jurists (AAJ), a regional affiliate of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), in Havana. The lawyers' retainer was a 5 percent interest in the production.

The partnership, originally called Isla-Blanca Films, was located at 2104 Acton Street, Berkeley, CA 94702. Now, as Isla Negra-Blanca Films, its letterhead address is 5915 Hollis Street, Emeryville, CA 94608, an address also used by the Institute for the Study of Latin American Affairs (ISLA), the clipping service of the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA)'s West Coast office. It will be recalled that NACLA, the "intelligence-gathering arm" of the New Left, was given credit by Philip Agee along with agencies of the Cuban government and Cuban Communist Party Central Committee members, for having aided him in producing his first anti-CIA book, *Inside the Company*.

Thus it is no surprise that while the General Partner of Isla-Blanca Films, Allan Francovich, was stated in 1976 to own 30 percent of the film, Philip Agee was listed as owning 20 percent and other Limited Partners 45 percent.

The 1976 proposal listed an estimated two-year income from a one-hour documentary as \$386,000. The U.S. Department of Justice has already intervened in a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit brought by Agee in order to claim profits on his books produced in violation of his contract with the CIA.

The Allan Francovich-Howard Dratch proposal makes clear the intent of the film and reveals the "moderate" cloak of concern for democracy they attempted to express in their PBS interviews. Dratch, for example, reiterated that what was specifically being attacked was covert action, the capacity to actively intervene using a great variety of tactics against Soviet and Soviet-surrogate expansion and aggression.

Said Dratch: "When you get in the business of covertly intervening overseas to overthrow elected officials, to bribe politicians, to infiltrate labor unions, to do all these covert action tasks without telling the American people—and people overseas know about it, but the American people, as one person says in the film, are being kept in the dark—there, I think, you are endangering the very democracy in this country which the CIA is supposed to be protecting."

Among the obvious omissions are mentions that the Soviet and other Marxist-Leninist parties are industriously subverting unions, blackmailing and bribing officials

and engaging in terrorism in order to set up a totalitarian system.

The 1976 project proposal was more direct:

"We are in the process of making a feature-length color documentary on the CIA with Philip Agee, former CIA officer and author of the best-selling book . . . The film will be the story of thirty years of CIA subversion, murder, bribery, and torture as told by an insider and documented with newsreel film of actual events. . . . We have already filmed 12 hours of materials in Canada, England and Portugal. . . .

"The core of the film will be a series of intense and emotionally powerful interviews with Agee, already filmed in Vancouver and London. Agee is uniquely able to explain how the CIA works. He details his training and indoctrination, outlines CIA operations in the crucial early years of the Cold War in Europe, reveals CIA front organizations and agents, and recounts dramatic events in his years working for the CIA in Latin America . . . Based on his past knowledge of CIA practice and personnel, Agee pinpoints countries in which the CIA is presently engaged in its usual activities, unhampered by Congressional scrutiny.

" . . . Behind events, which to the ordinary viewer seem as incomprehensible as acts of God (sic), we will show the CIA in action. Out of this documentary material a consistent pattern of CIA activity will emerge. A powerful cinematic blend of filmed on-the-spot investigations, newsfilm, supplementary interviews and a dramatic sound track will make it clear that the CIA's policies have resulted in the subversion and overthrow of legally constituted governments and in the slander, arrest, torture and murder of hundreds of thousands of people who have dared to struggle for a better life. . . .

"The film will be analytic, but it will not sermonize or allege. It will be go beyond the abstractions of national security, geopolitics, and balance of power to show the broken lives, hatred, cruelty, cynicism and despair which result from U.S.-CIA policy. . . . Our film will show how the CIA works and how its activities fit into a calculated policy determined at the highest levels of the U.S. government. The CIA is not, as Senator Church contends, a 'rogue elephant.'"

The two producers went on to catalogue the footage they had already taken during 1975.

"In England we filmed a Member of Parliament revealing that a CIA-funded organization is training Britain's own internal security forces and wondering whether England could go the way of Chile. Agency officials were running the normal range of student, labor, and media operations out of the U.S. Embassy in London. . . . As Washington debated over policy, the people of London could stand outside the homes of CIA personnel and watch them come and go. We filmed an enterprising street theatre group conducting a tour of the elegant homes of members of the London station.

"In November we were filming in Portugal. Lisbon buzzed with talk of the CIA. The New York Times revealed that the Agency was channelling millions of dollars into the Portuguese Socialist Party. Day after day the Western press ran stories about the imminence of a Communist takeover. A year-long campaign of CIA polarization and disinformation was climaxing."

The 1976 proposal listed trips to Vancouver, Canada (October 1975), and to England and Portugal (October-December 1975) and said financing was needed to purchase film footage from Visnews, Pathe, International

Television News and the BBC in London; from Gaumont-Pathe, (Paris-Joinville); and from Sherman Grinberg (Los Angeles). Additionally, the film producers would have "access to new research from Agee's forthcoming book." e

SECURITIES SMALL OFFERING IMPROVEMENTS ACT

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1980

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 7397, the Securities Small Offering Improvements Act, to increase the small offering exemption of the Securities Act of 1933 from \$2 million to \$5 million.

I want to call the attention of all Members of the House to my bill and to explain the reasons this change in the law is needed.

Inflation falls more heavily on small business than any other segment of American industry. Accordingly, capital formation becomes a very expensive proposition. As a matter of fact, the current statutory figure for a small offering exemption is so low that it is not economically feasible to take advantage of it. Administrative costs, legal fees, and registration expenses consume so much that relatively little is left for substantive business purposes.

One constructive remedy is to raise the ceiling of the small offering exemption to a more realistic figure. Today that limit is \$2 million. The Securities Small Offering Improvements Act that I have introduced raises the exemptive level to the more realistic figure of \$5 million. My bill will allow a business to raise as much as \$5 million in capital and still avoid the enormous expense associated with full-scale registration and reporting. In the 95th Congress, we raised this limit from \$1,500,000 to \$2 million; inflation alone necessitates that we now raise it to \$5 million.

In addition to the support of small business, my bill has the backing of the SEC. It is well to note that through its Office of Small Business Policy, the SEC has become sensitized to the specialized needs of smaller businesses. It is through this relatively new office that the SEC has endorsed this bill.

I am also in the process of studying another proposal which would do for debt securities what this bill does for equity securities. The threshold ceiling level of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 needs to be revised upward as well.

I urge my colleagues to support the Securities Small Offering Improvements Act. e

Business As Usual

By Andrew Kopkind

ON COMPANY BUSINESS. Directed by Allan Francovich. Produced by Francovich and Howard Dratch. An Isla Negra Films Production. At the Public Theatre, April 22-27; on Channel 13 as mini series, May 9, 16, and 21.

The business of espionage is intrinsically the stuff of drama: danger, deception, exposure, escape. The principals engaged in such impossible missions go about that business as performers in their parts rather than workers at their jobs, while the rest of us act as an audience eager to be amused by the plots and transported by the romance. It is hard to take spying seriously except as spectacle; after all, both villainy and heroism are merely masks in this play of myths and metaphors.

So it is that all the sensational investigations and splashy exposes of the CIA over the past dozen years have amused the audience more successfully than they have demolished "the Company." The dramatic mystique that surrounds the great espionage agency deflects much of the criticism and blunts most of the attacks, the way the claims of a conjurer's show defeats pure reason. The CIA easily survived the revelations of its most resolute renegade, former-agent Philip Agee, who remains a branded international outlaw while the conspirators he fingered still retain their political powers.

Now Allan Francovich comes along to tilt at the beast—with Agee by his side and the outlaw's book as the basis of his film about the CIA. The odds were stacked against him, but to a remarkable degree Francovich penetrates the CIA's mystique and inflicts real injury to the agency's credibility. His long (three hours), careful, and deliberate chronicle of CIA history

anchors the operations of spying and intelligence-gathering in the structure of American foreign policy, where they must be taken seriously. He has all the familiar horror stories on the record—the CIA's subversion in Chile and Iran, the assassination plots against Castro and Lumumba, the infiltration of labor and student organizations—but the film refuses to treat them as "abuses," as avoidable mistakes or reformable practices. The intelligence function is central to the conduct of America's business in the world, and it is a dirty business at best.

The CIA's methods seem to be madness only out of context, for they are designed to suit U.S. interests in a wide range of situations. The Company trained police to torture political dissidents in Brazil and Uruguay where brutal repression was necessary to keep pro-American regimes in power. It helped foment counterrevolutions in Guatemala and Chile because the elected governments there sought a measure of independence from Washington's control. The CIA engineered a coup in Iran and reinstated the exiled Shah in 1953 because America needed its personal puppet to guarantee supplies of Persian Gulf oil.

Those operations—and the hundreds of others the film notes or details—were not formulated and approved by extremist fanatics or errant rogues, but by the reasonable, tolerant, and liberal officials who run the agency as well as the country. Allen Dulles, Richard Helms, William Colby: these former CIA directors appear on film (as they do in their Washington offices and townhouses) as men of intelligence and taste, any one of whom you could trust with your wristwatch. And yet they have personally ordered more crimes and



The Shah reclaims his Peacock Throne in 1953, with some help from the CIA.

cruelties against men and society than most of the prisoners in their country's jails. Colby, for example, was in charge of the "Phoenix" program in Vietnam which accounted for the savage execution (often by garroting, with piano wire) of 10,000 civilians believed to be unsympathetic to the American cause. Human life and freedom are not highly valued in Langley, Virginia.

It is the banality of the CIA's evil, its ordinariness that Francovich catches and

CONTINUED

conveys with impressive force. It's not easy for a filmmaker to hold the attention of an audience for three hours with the most extravagant devices and outrageous images, and much less so when extravagance and outrage specifically contradict the message. *On Company Business* is sometimes plodding and over-extended, but it succeeds as a film because it is true to its thesis: that the total accumulation of CIA activities and their myriad connections to the American imperial system must be recorded and analyzed if the meaning of the Company's historical role is to be understood.

The movie's technique is straightforward: CIA activities are recounted by critics such as Agee, Victor Marchetti, and John Stockwell. They are extensively illustrated by old and new film clips of the U.S.-backed attacks on Allende's presidential headquarters, Stevenson's pathetic speech at the United Nations denying American participation in the Bay of Pigs invasion, the Shah returning

to Tehran with his CIA escort. And then they are rationalized, justified, or denied by Company men.

The pace is hardly fleeting, and the process could be deadening if Francovich were not so confident and controlled in laying out his line. The record he presents is long, if necessarily incomplete, and there is not much which is sensationally new or strikingly revelatory to anyone who has followed the CIA stories over the years.

But slowly the movie began to produce an effect I never expected: it summons up a spring of anger I thought had dried long ago, exhausted by the excessive demands of politics in an age of turmoil. When the images of all the American presidents who used the CIA flashed on the screen in a final coda of official hypocrisy, I felt like shouting curses at them aloud—the folksy Truman, the heroic Eisenhower, the self-righteous Kennedy, the sinister Johnson, the deceitful Nixon, the bland Carter. These are the villains as much as their hired assassins and dirty tricksters, and at last their masks have been removed. E

Books and the Arts

Stanley Kauffmann on films

From Dark to Light

This is the spring of the historical documentary—here is another. *On Company Business* is a three-hour job on the CIA made by Allan Francovich and Howard Drach which, after playing at Filmex in Los Angeles, had its New York premier in the valuable film series at the Public Theater. Composed in the now-standard form of interwoven newsreels and new interviews, but well composed, the three hours trace the formation of the CIA after World War II and its operations in a number of countries since then, with heavy emphasis on the agency's intent to influence politics in those countries rather than to gather intelligence. As with *The Trials of Alger Hiss*, the film's ostensible tone is objectivity and there certainly are spokesmen for the CIA's point of view, like David Atlee Phillips who is candid but firmly loyal; but—again as with *Hiss*—the very choice of subject, indeed the very carefulness of the balance, ironically leaves little doubt about the filmmakers' sympathies.

Among the ex-members of the CIA who criticize it are Philip Agee, Victor Marchetti, and John Stockwell, who give their versions of grim activities in several of the countries. A. J. Langguth, former Latin-American correspondent of the *New York Times*, makes particularly pungent comments about Dan Mitrione, who was murdered in Uruguay by terrorists. (Costa-Gavras treated the subject in *State of Siege*, but the actual recording of Mitrione conversing with one of his kidnapers outdoes the film.) Edward Korry, US ambassador to Chile during the Allende regime, is still bemused by Nixon's venom on the subject of Allende. Laura Allende, the sister of the president, speaks of her dead brother with touching dignity. (A

pithy supplement to *Power of the People*, reviewed last week.)

Not a great deal in *On Company Business* will be startling to those who read newspapers and magazines and who have done a little reading between lines. For example, Marchetti says here that, after Richard Helms, the former CIA director, was convicted of perjury, Helms said that if he hanged, a lot of others would hang with him, including Nixon and Ford. Helms was let off with a \$2000 fine and a suspended sentence. The implication was plain at the time; Marchetti brings it forward.

Still, the film reminds and strengthens. Two matters—again not news—stood out for me: the connections between the AFL-CIO and the CIA, though stoutly denied by George Meany and others in interspliced newsreel clips; and the statements that decisions on major CIA moves—from political pressure to engagement of the Mafia for assassination attempts—are made by the president of the US. Over and over again we are told that this or that action goes back to the Oval Office, whoever the tenant.

A sum of 15 or 20 minutes could have been snipped out of this film to its advantage. As with *Hiss*, Francovich and Drach accumulated so much material which interested them that they dimmed a bit on the balance between that material and the endurance of an audience. After a while, the impact weakens simply by repetition.

But the film's final effect is terribly disquieting. Like every reasonably alert person, I've known something about the shocking actions of the CIA—sometimes shocking in their ineptness—and I've shared the widespread reaction of outrage, not least that an espionage

system should be used as a terrorist-political instrument. It's not hard to understand Iran's present feelings toward the US after seeing the torture rooms of the shah's secret police and after hearing an ex-official of the CIA, who dealt principally with Iran, state that the shah was pretty much a mouth-piece for US decisions. But isn't my outrage pharisaical? Isn't it a global amplification of New York City's feelings about the Woman's House of Detention that used to be in Greenwich Village? That women's prison was torn down because it was in the middle of town and we all had to look at it. Whatever went on there still goes on elsewhere, some place where we don't have to look at the building every day and be reminded of it. Isn't what we want a less visible, smarter, cleaner CIA that does what it has to do—in favor of progressive foreign governments rather than reactionary ones? Are we objecting to the CIA or its inefficiencies and choices of support?

EXCERPTED

ARTICLE REPRODUCED
ON PAGE 312THE BALTIMORE SUN
8 May 1980

TV & radio

**Hold the bouquets: documentary
on the CIA is as subtle as a brick****Bill Carter**

The commercial networks are doing their usual sweep-period handstands this month to try to get you to stay in your living room on these lovely spring evenings.

They are trotting out the big movies, the mini-series, the specials featuring big-name stars, all for the sake of building up audiences for their local affiliates, who need a break in sweep months because that's when the advertisers look at the ratings to decide where they are going to spend their money.

Just in case the prospect of another two-part run of the remake of "King Kong" doesn't give you goosebumps (or apebumps); or you don't quiver with excitement at the lure of watching 90 minutes of the National Cheerleading Championships; or you fall short of hyperventilating in anticipation of Rona Barrett interviewing Bo Derek, Kristy McNichol, Kenny Rogers—and their mothers; or your heart fails to palpitate with lust over the very thought of a TV movie about a videotape dating service called "The Love Tapes," maybe you will find some more worthy diversion in a couple of public television's somewhat more cerebral offerings this week.

Such as the beginning of the three-part examination of the CIA, which will be the entry the next three weeks in "Non-Fiction Television," the series of independently produced documentaries that runs on Channels 22 and 67 Fridays at 9.

Tomorrow night's first part of "On Company Business," as this documentary is called, takes a look back at the agency's history, and sets the tone for the series, a tone that will probably not send joy rushing into the hearts of the those anxious to rehabilitate the CIA's image.

That image took quite a beating during and after the Watergate scandals, and the beating is going to be resumed in this comprehensive examination of some of the agency's more outrageous activities. Those now-familiar tales of assassination plots, conspiracies to overthrow governments, pay-offs to more favored tyrants, are resurrected tomorrow night and over the next two weeks, as this documentary sets out to detail the relationship of the CIA to American foreign policy over the past three years.

The relationship described in this show is intimate indeed. "On Company Business" is not a film that takes even a half-hearted stab at objectivity. Its point of view is transparent throughout. It is making a case for the dangers of allowing an intelligence organization to exercise its power unchecked by the government on whose behalf it is supposed to be acting.

The presence of some of the agency's more vocal critics—including Philip Agee and Victor Marchetti, former agents who have published highly critical books about the agency—indicates this is no bouquet to the CIA.

Part one has some trouble getting going, largely because the documentary takes the form of a chronological study, using old newsreel footage interspersed with inter-

views, to outline the agency's beginnings. Like other independent documentaries, which believe the "modern" approach is to leave out all narration, this one attempts to fill in the gaps with the interviews.

It is not the best technique for this kind of documentary. A narrator definitely would have helped. This kind of film seems to presume that anybody watching already knows plenty about the subject, a conceit that only a show aiming for airing in the elite world of public television would dare.

But as the show progresses it becomes much more absorbing—provided you can get past the imperfect technique. There is certainly much to ponder in the skulduggery of the CIA over the past 30 years.

Part two will concentrate on how the CIA has attempted to shape public opinion in America, specifically as regards American activity in Latin America in the 1950s. Part three examines in detail the CIA's part in the overthrow of the Allende regime in Chile. It also includes suggestions for the future role of the CIA from both the agency critics and some supporters, such as William Colby, a former director of central intelligence.

Obviously the source of this film must always be remembered in considering its message. It is an independent film and that immediately sets it apart from a network documentary, which probably would never take on a subject such as the activities of the CIA with its point of view hanging out.

—o—

8 May 1980

CIA study: tedious fascinating

By Arthur Unger

For those of us who have been secretly yearning for a strengthening of the CIA so that it once again could have the power to act effectively in such places as Iran and Cuba, there is a long, tedious, redundant, but provocatively effective film which should be required viewing.



TELEVISION PREVIEW

In either its long TV form or in (one hopes) a shortened theatrical version, "On Company Business" (PBS, Fridays, May 9, 16, 23, 9-10 p.m., check local listings for premieres and repeats) focuses its attention on the Central Intelligence Agency from its inception to the present day, and on what the program sees as its horrendous misjudgments, its atrocious mischief, all of its major faults which the free flow of information in this country has allowed producers Howard Drach and producer/director Allan Francovich to gather, collate, and present for the edification of generations of Americans with short memories.

Whatever good the CIA has accomplished is seldom, if ever, mentioned (assuming that the film's creators believe that such actions are a reasonable part of the record).

Stylistically, "On Company Business" follows the pattern of such a recent Marcel Ophul opus as "The Sorrow and the Pity," interspersing talking head interviews with newsreel shots and location-establishing footage. There is no commentary other than the repetitiously one-note attitudes of such witnesses as Philip Agee, William Colby, Richard Helms, James Wilcott, Victor Marchetti, David Phillips, and John Stockwell. It is a paranoid film which ascribes just about every anti-Soviet event of the past few decades to

Mercenary from Angola: one-sided view

undercover CIA activities.

It is difficult to emerge (weary and disoriented) from a three-hour viewing of this film without believing that the CIA has altered the way of political life not only of America but of the world as well. The concept of deniability, feasibility, foreign policy mischiefs are discussed openly by ex-CIA personnel and anti-CIA authors who argue both for and against such tactics. Are these due to misguided idealism, to paranoia, to economic necessity, to changing times, to new forms of diplomacy? Is it really in our national interest? Do we have it under control now?

Such are the questions this three-hour film raises while offering no solutions. The viewer can formulate his own additional questions: Should the system be changed? How? Can we champion human rights at the same time as we abridge them in other parts of the world?

The emphasis on Chile, Cuba, Iran, and Angola reflect the director's special interests but it is apparent that evidence of other CIA "mischief" could be uncovered if there is the will. The film discovers what it considers our own amoral, unethical, undemocratic, autocratic, maniacal, criminal activities, but never once does it take an honest look at the rest of the world and what it is doing along similar lines. Seldom does it find any viable alternatives.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
8 May 1980

Producer defends anti-CIA program

By Arthur Unger

New York

Producer-director Allan Francovich doesn't flinch for a moment when his interviewer opens the discussion by telling him his three-hour film is too long and should be cut to 90 minutes.

He seats himself carefully in a comfortable chair in the interviewer's home and says calmly: "Well, it has already won prizes and much acclaim in foreign film festivals in its three-hour length. . . ." That seems to end his consideration of the idea of cutting a work which is obviously a labor of love.

INTERVIEW

Mr. Francovich looks and sounds like a 1960s campus activist finally getting revenge for the way-out accusations he once aimed at the CIA, which were laughed off as outrageous then, but later proved to be mostly true. However, he insists that he was not a college activist. He lived and was educated in Latin America, attended college in Lima, Peru, and Paris. Well, throw in a few years at Notre Dame and the University of California at Berkeley and you may find a little campus activism.

Why is there not an interview in the film with the current head of the CIA?

"People won't make factual statements on current situations. People like Colby and Phillips and Agge talk openly because they are not in the establishment like Stansfield Turner, who will never talk in any detail about anything of substance."

Is Mr. Francovich a leftist politically?

"Left, liberal. But that has little to do with the film. An enormous effort went into testing everything that is in the film. There is nothing that could not be backed up by a lot of other information. A lot of the CIA intervention during the early years was a natural response to Stalin."

"I made a deliberate effort to make sure that this would not be the kind of film that those student activists would make. I think if you do have a certain perspective on things, it has to be tested against the historical record. For instance, it's quite different to interview some student activist who's been involved against the current regime in Chile and have him tell you something and then to sit down with the former ambassador to Chile or Laure Allende. You get real perspective that way."

Do we need the CIA at all?

"I think there's a need for intelligence. But a lot of what the CIA has been doing is not intelligence."

It is actively involved in intervening in these countries, penetrating all kinds of institutions of power. There is no reason to think that the same people who are doing this won't use the same methods here in the US sooner or later. The cases are becoming more and more frequent. This kind of manipulation simply does not work in the long run."

But isn't Russia doing the same kind of political mischief and manipulation?

"I don't know. I've asked people in the CIA and I've been told that, at least in Latin America, the Russians operate in a different way. If you look at the historical record, the CIA has been essentially running Iran for the last 30 years despite the fact that the country borders on the Soviet Union. There would be every reason for the Soviet Union to dominate Iran as much as the US dominates Guatemala. . . ."

Or Cuba? What about the Soviet attempt to dominate Cuba?

Mr. Francovich looks a bit embarrassed. "Well, you have to ask yourself: The Russians are helping Cuba but do they have control over the Cuban government?"

Probably.

"Well, in my film Victor Marchetti, who was a high-ranking CIA official at the time that Castro came to power, believes to this day that Castro was Cuban nationalist until Nixon and the CIA started a whole campaign of destabilization, attacks, assassination attempts, etc. against the Cuban regime. Marchetti believes it was our policies at that stage which pushed Castro into the arms of the Soviets."

"If you start intervening in a country like Cuba or Iran, what you are doing is gradually pushing them until they will get help from wherever they can get it . . . usually the Soviets. You are polarizing the world rather than treating these countries with some respect and accepting that these countries have every right to take the position which they think they should in the world. If you run sabotage missions, burn cane fields, poison livestock, try to murder leaders as we did in Cuba for many years, you can't expect those people to love you. . . ."

"If the CIA is allowed to proceed in the next 20 years the way they have proceeded in the past 20, it is simply going to force those countries into closer contact with Russia and

But what makes Mr. Francovich so certain that Russia and China are not doing very similar things?

"I think they are obviously involved in furthering their national ends, but I think their way of operating is different. For instance, Russia provides a lot of help to countries in Africa. They had a long-standing relationship with the Angolans before the Portuguese were kicked out. And what they were doing was providing training and arms. . . ."

Is that so different from what we were doing? Mightn't a filmmaker find the same kind of atrocity stories about the KGB which this movie uncovers about the CIA?

"It's hard for me to say."

Wouldn't it be hard for you to gather information? Wouldn't you lack the freedom which allows you to do this kind of film here?

"Yes. But I would leave that kind of show to CBS or NBC or ABC."

Does Mr. Francovich feel the CIA is now under control? It is a question asked in the third hour of the film.

"I think it has always been under control. If I wanted to summarize what the film says, I think it says that the CIA really is not the problem. You have to look deeper, ask yourself what the foreign policy of this country is. And you have to look at the CIA as an instrument for serving this policy. Why is it that over the years this country has seen fit to support all kinds of people who are being hated? So, does Mr. F. believe there is a secret cabal leading our relations with foreign countries?"

"No. There are certain goals, dynamics that are inherent in our economy. If you were president of Bell Helicopter, you are not going to let them take away \$300 million that you are making out of the Shah's regime just because some guy in the State Department or even the CIA says that in the long range this will be counterproductive. . . ."

Does Mr. F. want the CIA to be dissolved?

"No. I think it is part of government. But the very nature of this beast is to do things in such a way that the US government itself can disclaim responsibility. I think that has to change."

But hasn't all diplomacy changed? Mightn't it be that the age of top-hat-and-tail diplomacy is over, that CIA "mischief diplomacy" is the way all the major powers will be handling foreign relations from now on? Perhaps what Mr. F. is yearning for is a return to an era that will never come back?

"No, I don't think so. That is always the rationale."

9 May 1980

By Tom Shales

"On Company Business," a three-part, critical history of the CIA and the world, begins tonight at 10 on Channel 28 with an overview of the agency from its post World War II beginnings and on through such debacles as the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961.

The film, by Howard Dratch and Alan Francovich, lists CIA defector Philip Agee as a "special consult-

TV Previews

ant," and he is extensively interviewed on camera. Grateful acknowledgement is made to something called The Foundation for Open Company Inc. Hence there is little pretense of this being an objective report. Anyone approaching it without that realization is in for a sleigh ride.

That it lacks neutrality does not automatically mean it lacks value, however, and the filmmakers manage to raise disturbing questions about the CIA and how it grew and grew and grew, not so much like Topsy as The Blob. Born in the midst of Cold War anti-Communist fervor, the agency was charged with increased global housecleaning chores until, says former CIA officer David Atlee Phillips, it reached a state in which "intelligence was asked to do what armies should have done."

The history is told, semi-chronologically, without narration but with the running commentary of old newsreels setting the scenes for various CIA intrigues and adventures. Apart from the central intelligence of the film, the newsreel announcers come booming back from yesteryear with an almost halcyon, simplistic interpretation of world events. This was a time when it was us against them and there was no doubt about us.

Thus a 1943 Movietone newsreel about elections in Italy speaks of "Italian Reds" and a "Communist peril." A later newsreel conjures a Commie takeover of an American town; "First, the mayor is hustled off to jail." Even the Bay of Pigs goes through the laundry, as charges that the United States was involved are "quickly, forcefully" denied by Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations.

And the aftermath of this botched mission, unequalled in our history until Jimmy Carter's abortive Iranian rescue mission, is polished into the "tragic epilog to a gallant venture."

The figure of history repeating itself does haunt the program, which includes early footage of the shah of Iran being miraculously reposed after being briefly deposed; a CIA outing more cogently documented in an NBC News report on the Mideast last year.

President Eisenhower's press secretary, James Hagerty, also sounds eerily contemporary when in newsreel footage he declares, "There is a limit to what the United States can, in self-respect, endure." Alas, that limit seems to have been raised in direct proportion to the degree to which the CIA has been exposed and restrained in recent years.

The documentary is more impressionistic than methodical, and its view of the CIA as a runaway train, or at least a runaway caboose, does not seem tempered by world realities. A recitation of American espionage disgraces at this precise moment is certainly discomfiting, though not necessarily in a very useful way.

There is also the disturbing prospect that some of the Cold War tirades against the Soviet Union and its plans for world domination may have been hysterically stated in their time but seem not entirely funny or preposterous today. "On Company Business" may be as much a tunnel-vision documentary as a television documentary, but it deserves to be shown.

EXCERPTED

BOSTON GLOBE
 26 May 1980

CIA film took 5 years

By Tom Jory
 Associated Press

NEW YORK — Film makers Allan Francovich and Howard Dratch spent nearly five years making "On Company Business," determined to produce a thoughtful, fully documented history of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"We were not trying to be another Seymour Hersh," Dratch says, referring to the former New York Times reporter who broke a number of stories on the CIA in the mid-1970s. "Our objective was a 30-year overview that would have a cumulative power unlike the immediate impact of a newspaper expose."

"Our approach was, let's sit back and look at the CIA in a careful, intelligent way." Their product is a three-hour, three-part documentary to be aired by WGBH-TV (Channel 2) tonight, tomorrow and Thursday at 10:30 p.m.

Much of the motivation for the project came during the congressional inquiry into CIA activities that followed Watergate. The agency revealed for the first time — among other things — interference in the domestic affairs of other countries.

The two film makers conducted about 50 interviews with persons with first-hand knowledge of the agency and its business, and spent months looking at film in this country and abroad that would support and illustrate what they had learned.

"We were dealing with an opaque kind of subject," Dratch says, "and that compelled us to cross-reference anything one person said that what another told us."

"We felt a demand," says Francovich, "for being extraordinarily careful with the film. A lot of what we did not use in the final version is there to document what we did use."

The documentary traces a history of US foreign policy, with the CIA as the common thread, from the end of World War II, through the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, the Korean conflict, the Cold War, the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, Vietnam, the coup in Chile and the revolution in Iran.

Among those interviewed on film are former CIA officers Philip Agee, Victor Marchetti, David Atlee Phillips and John Stockwell.

The two filmmakers say they encountered no official resistance to their work. "But generally speaking," Francovich says, "when someone gives an interview, they give it for a reason."

"The reason a lot of people were going public at the time," he says, referring to the period during and immediately after the congressional investigation, "was to protect themselves as these revelations about CIA activities were made. And, of course, there were those with axes to grind."

"We were trying to get beyond all these ax-grinders," he says, "and look at the history of this institution. One of the shocking revelations was that the CIA was not running out of control, was not a rogue elephant, and that some of the things it had done with the knowledge of the President and in the name of the American people were pretty horrible."

"The leadership of the CIA," Dratch says, "came across as well-trained, well-mannered people with the best intentions, but with a definition of national interest that seems to be turning the world against the United States."

The first installment reviews the creation and early operation of the CIA, including the agency's involvement with the labor movement in Europe in the late 1940s and early '50s.

Part II examines the agency's methods of manipulating public opinion, using CIA activities in Latin America in illustration. The concluding chapter considers the CIA's role in events that led up to the 1973 coup in Chile, and explores CIA accountability to the American public.

"On Company Business" was completed with a grant from the Independent Documentary Fund, which is administered by the Television Laboratory at New York's public TV station, WNET.

BETTY BEALE

Special to The Washington Star

It Was a Long Day
For the Roosevelts

Perplexity and outrage were being expressed by a group of Washingtonians who were sitting by the pool at the Archie Roosevelts' house Sunday afternoon.

The anger and bewilderment had nothing to do with Archie and Lucky's celebration of their 30th wedding anniversary which was a super success. Indeed, the only astonishing thing was that they managed to be warm and hospitable at an all-day entertainment feat that began at 1 p.m. and lasted until 9 p.m. Most people were invited to come to their Georgetown house between 3 and 9 and didn't know that the six-hour at-home had been preceded by a luncheon for out-of-town guests!

The party also celebrated the engagement of Theodore Roosevelt's great grandson and Archie's son, Tweed Roosevelt, to attractive Candace MacGuigan who will be married June 7. Tweed, who's in his mid-30s, works with a management consultant firm in Boston.

The steady in-flow of guests who included Egyptian Ambassador Ashraf Ghorbal, Italian Ambassador Paolo Pansa Cedronio, Jean Bakker, the John Broses, the John Colvins, the Phil Buchens, Bill Blair, Ruth and Wiley Buchanan, Joy and Bruce Sundlun, chic oil company president Jean Lindsey who flew in for it, and the Bill Gorogs were treated to a changing and delectable fare. The buffet went from a many-dish Brazilian luncheon to an ample cocktail collation with a hot chicken and rice dish added at suppertime.

Out by the pool at one point, Betty Burton, bachelor lawyer Michael Butler and former high CIA official and later assistant secretary of Defense Jack Maury were discussing WETA's three-part TV series, "On Company Business," which (according to WETA) was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation.

Betty Burton asked why, we in the public, should be paying for a program that discredits our own CIA? Butler felt the same way and Maury, who served in intelligence for 33 years, went so far as to say, "If I had seen those films without knowing where they originated, I would have guessed they had to come from one of three places — Moscow, Prague or Havana." Why Prague, he was asked? "Because Prague is one of the major outlets for Soviet propoganda in the West."

"I recall," continued Maury, "one of the most knowledgeable defectors from the Russian intelligence service said, 'Our first priority was always to put out the eyes of the enemy by discrediting and disrupting his intelligence service.'"

He also recalled that Philip Agee, who was the consultant to the WETA TV series and was quoted most extensively in it, wrote in an article in the June-1975 Esquire: "I aspire to be a Communist and a revolutionary."

Former CIA Director Bill Colby and former CIA Chief of Latin-American Operations David Phillips have both called Agee the CIA's first defector, said Maury, and he has been deported from England, Holland, and France and is not allowed to enter Italy.

(Both Colby and Phillips appear briefly in the film but, says David Phillips, who is active in the Association of Foreign Intelligence Officers — AFIO — both were filmed three years ago and their answers to specific questions were lifted out of context and "selectively edited." AFIO, reveals Phillips, had asked WETA for a half-hour to rebut the three-hour series.)

Roosevelt biographers Edmund and Sylvia Morris were at the Roosevelt party. Edmund, whose "Rise of Theodore Roosevelt" was hailed as the definitive book on TR last year, is writing the second volume now and wonders if there won't be a third. The second, that begins with his presidency, will be called "Theodore Roosevelt, Rex."

Sylvia brought with her her own just-published volume, "Edith Kermit Roosevelt: Portrait of a First Lady," to give to Lucky and Archie. Like Edmund's first volume, it, too, has been selected as a Book-of-the-Month.

ARTICLE
ON PAGE B-8THE WASHINGTON POST
28 May 1980**A Complaint to PBS**

The Association of Former Intelligence Officers has asked the Public Broadcasting Service for a half-hour to respond to the recent three-hour documentary called "On Company Business," which was put together by independent producers . . .

In a telegram to PBS President Lawrence K. Grossman . . . Association President John F. Blake called "On Company Business" . . . "a tententious television review of intelligence history and function," adding that "we are astounded that PBS offered a forum for an alleged documentary which carries the sordid imprimatur of Phil Agee, special consultant."

Blake's telegram identifies Agee as the "CIA's first defector" . . .

The telegram also said the association's 3,000 members "are dismayed and shocked that PBS has devoted three hours to devious, insidious and at times false history on an issue of public interest—the role of intelligence operations in American foreign policy."

Grossman said yesterday that PBS hadn't had a chance to study the request . . . but Barry Chase, PBS' director of current affairs programming, said it doesn't seem likely the request for the half-hour will be granted.


Said Chase: "The telegram conven-

iently ignores the fact that William Colby and David Atlee Phillips, both articulate defenders of the CIA, appeared on the program . . . and their telegram appears to be a viscerally negative reaction to the appearance of Agee . . ."

Phillips, who is a former chief of CIA operations in Latin America and is now board chairman of the association, said yesterday that in addition to the complaints made in the telegram . . . both he and former CIA director Colby were interviewed for the series "three, maybe 3 1/2 years ago" and that neither he nor Colby would have agreed to be interviewed if "we'd known that subsequently we'd be appearing with Agee in the way the program was presented" . . .

The documentary . . . which aired over three Fridays on PBS during May . . . was produced by Allan Francovich and Howard Dratch . . .

THIS WEEK'S NEWS FROM


Inside Washington**Your Tax Dollars at Work****PBS Special
Rips Into CIA**

The taxpayer-financed Public Broadcasting System (PBS) has been featuring a three-part TV series on the Central Intelligence Agency called "On Company Business." The major thrust of the series: that the CIA, in the name of fighting communism, has been waging a wicked war against genuine nationalist movements all over the world. Judging from the series, in fact, communism has never been a threat.

Put together by Allan Francovich and Howard Dratch of the Isla Negra-Bianca Films in Berkeley, Calif., the film was financed through a PBS-administered fund whose major contributions come from the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts. The anti-CIA tone of the film is not particularly surprising, especially when one becomes aware of the raging anti-CIA sentiments of Francovich and Dratch.

HUMAN EVENTS has a copy of the proposal for the film project that Francovich and Dratch were circulating as far back as 1976, hoping to get funding for its completion. This proposal, also called "On Company Business," was not the one they eventually submitted to PBS, but Dratch, contacted in New York by us, admitted that it was the genesis of the antiseptically worded outline that was finally accepted.

GUARDIAN
11 June 1980

Was CIA ever 'leashed'?

"ON COMPANY BUSINESS"

Directed by Allan Francovich
Produced by Francovich and Howard Dratch
An Isla Negra Films Production
On Public Television—May 9, 16 and 23

By BETSY STONE

At a time when President Jimmy Carter, liberal politicians and the news media are all calling for loosening restraints on the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) a new documentary is confirming what critics of the U.S. imperial system have always known—that, far from being "leashed," the CIA has been freely exporting destabilization techniques, torture devices, assassination plots and chemical and biological warfare in order to protect U.S. economic and political interests against communist and decolonization movements throughout the world.

"On Company Business" penetrates what is left of the CIA's mythic image as an organization out of control, engaging in James Bond type missions of sensation and romance. What we are shown instead is an organization whose criminal operations were conceived and condoned by six American Presidents as well as liberal leaders in government and business.

Weaving historic film clips of presidential speeches, congressional hearings and international events with recent interviews of former Agency officials and critics, producers Allan Francovich and Howard Dratch present a meticulously documented chronicle of the development of the CIA as the operational and clandestine arm of U.S. foreign policy.

Filed chronologically, "On Company Business" was shown over three consecutive weeks on public television's nonfiction TV series. Part One following the CIA's dirty tricks after World War 2, when the key to protecting U.S. corporate interests was to rescue the economies of Western Europe, thus insuring U.S. domination of the power vacuum created on the continent after the war. Hence, the Marshall Plan which sank \$17 billion into Western Europe between 1947 and 1951 and at the same time allowed the CIA to infiltrate Europe's economic and political communities, with labor movements being the prime targets. As former CIA director William Colby remarked of that period, "Stalin was seen as the new totalitarianism—our job was to conduct the subversive level of the struggle."

The second half of Part One begins the chronicle of CIA assassination plots, with the focus on Jack and Robert Kennedy's obsession with murdering Fidel Castro. Former

CIA Director Richard Helms insists before a congressional committee that top government officials on the National Security Council and in the Defense Department knew of the anti-Castro plots. At the same time, the film shows President Kennedy at a 1961 press conference, Adlai Stevenson representing the U.S. at the UN, and CIA director John McCone—all categorically denying U.S. involvement in the Bay of Pigs operation.

Then, just to let us know that the CIA is still trying to fool all of the people most of the time, William Colby tells the filmmakers that, well, yes, the CIA did try to kill Castro, but there is no evidence that it's been involved in other assassination attempts. Quick camera cut to a newsreel of Congolese leader, Patrice Lumumba being arrested by military forces led by General Mobutu, the CIA-supported puppet. As a Senate committee has documented and as former CIA operative John Stockwell confirms in this film, it was not for want of trying that the CIA didn't directly kill Lumumba, sending highly toxic poisons to the Congo as part of its attempt to kill the leftist leader.

1960s ACTIVITY

Part 2 of the film picks up in the early 1960s with U.S. hysteria over liberation movements in Latin America at an all time high.

Forged documents, false information, media manipulation, infiltration of labor unions, training of foreign police in methods of torture and interrogation were all systematically used to destabilize any movement or government in Latin America which attempted to break away from U.S. political or multinational control. Particular emphasis is placed on CIA activities in Ecuador, (where former CIA agent Phillip Agee says that the CIA "spread hysterical outcries against the growth of 'communism' and stressed the disintegration of family and religion under communism") as well as operations in Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Greece. In Part 3, special attention is given to the CIA's destabilization program in Chile and its covert battle against the Marxist, anti-imperialist MPLA forces in Angola.

One of the film's most chilling segments is the description given by A.J. Langguth, author of the book "Hidden Terrors," concerning the CIA's training of Latin American police under the auspices of the Public Safety Mission of the Agency for International Development (AID).

Langguth explains how AID official Dan

Mitriane worked at the International Police Academy and later moved to Uruguay where he trained police in matters of intelligence collection and repression techniques in order to help them control the growth of leftist political movements. Mitriane was later kidnaped and murdered by Uruguay's leading revolutionary group, the Tupamaros.

"On Company Business" is exhaustively thorough in recounting most of the CIA activities abroad, including its operations in Europe, Latin America, Iran and Africa. What is glaringly absent, however, is any presentation on the CIA's activities in Vietnam. It is unfortunate that William Colby—who is the epitome of the cool and reasonable public relations man for the CIA—is not challenged for his management of the infamous Phoenix program in Vietnam. It was under this assassination program, designed to "neutralize" the political infrastructure of the National Liberation Front, that some 20,587 suspected NLF cadre were killed in the first two-and-a-half years of the program's operation.

Also absent is any mention of CIA illegalities in the U.S. where, under operation Chaos, the agency blatantly violated its legislative charter which prohibits it from conducting activities within the U.S. by spying on more than 700 U.S. citizens and 1000 domestic organizations.

And finally, little of the film is addressed to the question of oversight, except for a short segment in which we are given the sense that not one in Congress, save Rep. Ron Dellums (L. Calif.) is concerned with reform. We are not told of the work of numerous individuals and organizations who have been trying to build movement to work against intelligence agency abuses. In fact, the only people who we see challenging the intelligence community are all former CIA agents and whistleblowers such as Agee, Victor Marchetti and Stockwell.

The film fails to make the struggle against the CIA appear relevant to the lives of ordinary U.S. citizens. While it is clear that the filmmakers do not see the agency's actions merely as random abuses, we should be shown how the struggle against the CIA can and should be part of Americans' struggle against U.S. imperialism.

Despite these flaws, however, "On Company Business" is a film with a good story, excellent footage and tight analysis. Despite certain numbness acquired after being barraged for years with media hype on CIA misconduct, this film still evokes feelings of awe and anger.

PBS Propaganda Goes Too Far

By M. STANTON EVANS

Any lingering doubts about the need to abolish the Public Broadcasting Service have now been laid conclusively to rest.

PBS pretty well sealed the verdict a few weeks back when it broadcast a three-part series called "On Company Business"—a blast at the Central Intelligence Agency as seen by renegade agent Philip Agee and others of his ilk. The purpose of the series, as the producers put it when the project was announced, was to tell "the story of 30 years of CIA subversion, murder, bribery and torture as told by an insider"—meaning Agee.

Viewers were not informed that Agee in recent years has been actively working the other side of the street—in behalf of America's enemies. Agee himself makes no bones about his sympathies in the matter, though innocents watching PBS were not brought in on the secret. In a 1975 interview, for example, he was quoted as saying his allegiance was with the Communists in their struggle with the evil "capitalists."

"The CIA," he said, "is plainly on the wrong side, that is, the capitalistic side. I approve KGB [Soviet intelligence] activities, Communist activities in general, when they are to the advantage of the oppressed. In fact, the KGB is not doing enough in this regard, because the USSR depends on the people to free themselves. Between the overdone activities the CIA initiates and the more modest activities of the KGB there is no comparison."

In other words, the Communists are good guys—although a bit too "modest" in their efforts. The bad guys are the capitalistic Americans. These sympathies were underscored by an article Agee did for *Esquire*, in which he expressed his admiration for Communist Cuba, acknowledged he had done a lot of "research" in that Socialist-paradise, and otherwise spewed out Marxist boilerplate.

In this revealing article, Agee said "I aspire to be a Communist and a revolutionary." Although saying he wasn't versed in Marxist doctrine and that his Communist aspirations did not require a foreign model, he had obviously absorbed enough of the creed to denounce America in class struggle terms for alleged "social and economic injustice" committed in the interests of the evil corporations.

In further explanation of his views, Agee added: "I came to reject gradualist reform as the path to a better society." And: "I had come by now to acknowledge socialist revolution as the historical process that would lead to a higher form of social and economic organization. Not only had I comprehended what I was *against*, but also what I was *for*."

What Agee is "for" and "against" is further exemplified in the pattern of his expose activities, which focus exclusively on the supposed evils of the CIA while having nothing critical to say about the Soviet intelligence network or its stooges in the Cuban DGI.

Much of the background on Agee and the slanted nature of the PBS presentation are spelled out in a recent newsletter from Accuracy in Media. This watchdog organization wants to know why PBS would air a three-hour onslaught against our intelligence service from the standpoint of a Soviet apologist—without even identifying him as such. On the past record, AIM probably won't get much satisfaction.

PBS has indulged in similar shenanigans before, such as a dithering

tribute to sports in Communist Cuba and a sanitized look at life in the ghastly police state of North Korea. When responsible parties at the network were taken to task for these blatant offerings, they showed little willingness to concede their error or mend their ways.

The usual defense provided for such programming is that it is covered by "freedom of the press," but that is an evasion. Presumably, any private news outlet could pump forth similar slanted offerings and, while people would vehemently protest, there would be no question about the journalistic right to such expressions.

PBS, however, is not a private outlet. It is heavily funded by the government and would not survive for very long without such funding. Which means that U.S. taxpayers are being compelled to foot the bill for the blatant pro-Soviet propaganda of Agee and others like him. As one such taxpayer, I consider this to be an outrageous violation of my constitutional rights.

The case for having a public broadcast system is weak-to-nonexistent anyway, since there is no good reason in a free society to have government involved in such activity. When the system is used to disseminate the unabashed propaganda of America's enemies, it is long since time to shut it down.

Page Denied