oppressed minority in the media, academia, the entertainment world and parts of the U.S. government. They were ridiculed as "Neanderthals" and denounced as "McCarthyites." They helped keep hope alive in the communist countries when the "doves" were telling us that the victims were content and that it was a mistake to think that they longed for liberation. Their most influential foes were *anti*-anti-communists: people who denied that they had any sympathy for communism but whose goals were often indistinguishable from those of the communists.

Look Who's Claiming Credit

The *anti*-anti-communists in the media, such as columnist Mary McGrory, are now churning out denunciations of the crimes of such communist villains as Nicolae Ceausescu as if they had been their sworn enemies all along. At the same time, they defend the terrorists and communists in Central America, who are trying to establish or consolidate the kinds of regimes that are now crumbling in Eastern Europe. They are ga-ga over Gorbachev, who has yet to free hundreds of political prisoners and who is insisting on maintaining the constitutional primacy of the Communist Party. They are contemptuous of Ronald Reagan, who offended them by calling the Soviet empire "evil," ceded it no new territory and engineered the very first liberation of a communist country, Grenada.

The revelations pouring out of Eastern Europe about the crimes and corruption of the defunct communist regimes have validated Reagan's much derided use of the term "evil empire." Vladimir Pozner, the erstwhile ubiquitous Soviet gift to American TV talk shows, has not been seen telling Nightline and Donahue audiences that the garbage he used to dish out on these shows is "non-operative."

James Reston, on his retirement from The New York Times last November at age 80, was quoted in the Times of Nov. 5 as saying that one of the great pleasures of his life was "what he views as journalism's key role in the eclipse of both fascism and communism." Ironically, on April 30, 1975, Reston wrote approvingly of the journalists' role in the communist conquest of South Vietnam, saying: "Maybe the historians will agree that the reporters and cameras were decisive in the end. They brought the issue of the war to the people, before the Congress and the courts, and forced the withdrawal of American power from Vietnam."

AIM promptly wrote to Reston, reminding him that it took a world war to eclipse fascism. We said we were thinking of giving an award to a reporter or editor employed by our Big Media who had contributed significantly to exposing the evils of communism. We invited him to suggest some names. He has yet to come up with any.

It isn't an impossible task. Robert Bartley, who heads the outstanding team of editorial writers at The Wall Street Journal and Arnaud de Borchgrave, editor-in-chief of The Washington Times, come immediately to mind. John Barron of Reader's Digest has done remarkable work in exposing the machinations of the KGB. There are scores of anti-communist columnists and editors of smaller publications who have earned a place on the honor roll. But we can't recall a Pulitzer Prize being awarded for an anti-communist newspaper article or series since Frederick Woltman of the old New York World-Telegram won in 1947 for a series on communist infiltration of American institutions.

But as James Reston and Time's Strobe Talbott demonstrate, the *anti*-anti-communists don't want to admit that their despised foes were right, much less honor them for having contributed to the eclipse of communism.

THE CASOLO COVER-UP

Our 1989 hypocrisy award goes to The New York Times for a Dec. 25 editorial which in one breath savaged the Salvadoran army as the "prime suspect" in the murder of six Jesuit priests and then excoriated White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater for saying of Jennifer Casolo, the young "church worker" whose yard in San Salvador was found to contain a terrorist arms dump: "There are indications of her involvement, that's for certain." The Times fussed, "Why does the normally careful Marlin Fitzwater feel free to sound like judge and jury?"

The Times could ask itself the same question concerning its rush to judgment in blaming the Salvadoran military for the priests' murders. Indeed, as we suggested in our December-A issue, the murders may turn out to have been the work of the FMLN terrorists. The killings gave the terrorists a much-needed propaganda boost just as their violent Tet-style offensive was failing.

If anything, Marlin Fitzwater was guilty of understatement. The evidence linking Jennifer Casolo to the arms cache found in her garden is strong, and there is abundant reason to doubt her self-portrayal as a religious pacifist with no political agenda. The media have shown scant interest in probing and publicizing this evidence.

On the contrary, they have gone to great lengths to cover it up and focus on the protestations of innocence from Casolo and her friends. Casolo suggests that the arms were buried in her garden to frame her in order to discredit the foreign church people working in El Salvador. Our media's cover-up of the case against Casolo suggests that those who are calling the shots recognize that accurate reporting of the facts will cast doubt on the claims of many self-styled "human rights" and church groups that they are ideological bystanders in the Salvadoran conflict.

AIM Report

NOTES FROM THE EDITOR'S CUFF

By Reed Irvine

January-A 1990

THE FALL OF THE CEAUSESCU REGIME IN RUMANIA AND THE EXECUTION OF THIS communist tyrant on Christmas Day was a most significant milestone in the disintegration of communism. For the first time unarmed people challenged a dictator who had just shown that he would not shrink from shedding the blood of thousands to retain his power and privileges. And the people prevailed. The death of Ceausescu reverberated most strongly in those capitals where communist tyrants continue to rely on Stalinist terror to resist the wave of freedom that has engulfed so much of what used to be the communist world. Castro, Ortega, Deng and perhaps even North Korea's Kim Il-sung have to be wondering when their turn will come.

IT IS NOW APPARENT THAT THE DEMORALIZATION OF THE THE PRIVILEGED CLASSES IN the communist countries was deeper and more widespread than most of us realized. At a 1982 conference, "A World Without Communism: How to Achieve It and What It Will Mean," sponsored by the Council for the Defense of Freedom, Prof. Alexandre Shtromas gave a very prescient talk. ("A World Without Communism," the published transcript of the first conference that dared discuss and plot the unthinkable, the collapse of communism, is available from AIM for only $5.95, postpaid.) Prof. Shtromas said that in the Soviet Union "a totally cynical leadership rules over a totally cynical population." "The Soviet leadership," he pointed out, " cannot get the support of the ideologically-minded, but only the support of corruption. If they are able to corrupt their own lieutenants sufficiently and satisfactorily, I mean the bureaucrats, and if they can also provide some hopeful avenues for material achievement for their own people, they can count on a peaceful situation. If there are not really enough resources for corruption, if it is difficult or even hopeless to advance in a material sense, then the total potential dissent could be transformed into actual, rebellious dissent."

CONTRARY TO THE LINE VLADIMIR POZNER USED TO PEDDLE ON AMERICAN TV, PROF. Shtromas, who was born in Lithuania and imprisoned and then expelled from the Soviet Union in 1961, said people there increasingly believed that any other system would be better than what they had. Paraphrasing Churchill, they liked to say their form of government is the best--except for all others. He saw this as "spelling defeat and breakdown in the Soviet Union," because "any sort of leadership crisis could trigger a crackdown and with it the total and unanimous support of the people for ANY change which might come afterwards." Shtromas pointed out that the earlier threatened collapse of communism in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland had been prevented only by actual or threatened Soviet intervention. In 1989, with the Soviets refusing to intervene, one communist government after another has collapsed in Eastern Europe for the reasons Prof. Shtromas foresaw in June 1982. And who would intervene to save communism in the Soviet Union itself? Shtromas said Soviet intellectuals used to joke, "Of course, the Americans!" They believed that the U.S. had a vested interest in preserving the status quo and avoiding instability.

IN THE LIGHT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR BRENT SCOWCROFT'S TWO POST-Tiananmen-Square trips to China, that joke looks a lot less funny. If the United States is willing to overlook a massacre and shore up Deng Xiao-ping's gerentocracy, Mikhail Gorbachev's chances of being bailed out by Bush look bright indeed.

TIME'S PROMOTION OF GORBACHEV AS THE MAN OF THE DECADE PROBABLY INCREASES the likelihood of this happening. Gorbachev insists that he is trying to save communism, and Time is trying to save Gorbachev. Time editor Strobe Talbott now tells us that those who discounted the Soviet threat were right all along. Talbott, in Time's June 23, 1980 issue, wrote: "The Soviet quest for absolute security has, with good reason, generated insecurity on the part of other nations. The more powerful the Soviets have become in the past two decades, the more they have used their power to aid and abet the forces of violence, instability and radicalism around the world....The Soviet exertions of power abroad have a seemingly irresistible, irreversible quality that makes them much more threatening to world peace than American adventures."