

## **Special Report:**

### **America's Enemies and the Institute for Policy Studies**

**By Cliff Kincaid**

Note: Because of the interest in the revitalization of the "progressive" movement and its support for President Obama, America's Survival, Inc. (ASI) is re-issuing this special report on the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), a part of the "progressive" movement that had close ties to communist regimes and anti-American figures and worked feverishly during the 1980s to undermine President Reagan's policies. This report, authored by ASI President Cliff Kincaid, was published in the mid-1980s.

Much of IPS's work under Obama concerns strengthening international organizations such as the United Nations and obtaining more resources and funding for them.

#### **Contents:**

- Official concern over IPS.
- IPS and the Soviet Union.
- IPS and Cuba.
- IPS and North Vietnam.
- IPS and CIA defector Philip Agee.
- IPS and the Communist Party.

THE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES:

OFFICIAL CONCERN

In 1981, Senator Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.) assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism. He then sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to other members of Congress which led to suspicions that his subcommittee was preparing to launch an investigation into the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), a so-called public policy organization in Washington, D.C. (1)

Denton told his colleagues that the IPS was an organization that, since its inception, "has vigorously engaged in anti-America propaganda." He warned that in a "systematic approach to strengthen its ties with Congress," the IPS was supporting a "network of progressive congressional aides" on Capitol Hill.

Denton called attention to an article in the New York Times magazine about IPS titled "Think Tank on the Left." The article, he said, revealed that IPS was "a research group founded on self-described 'radical' ... 'revolutionary'... and 'marxist'... principles."

In the 1981 book, "Mandate for Leadership," published by the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank with close ties to the Reagan Administration, the IPS was described by Dr. Samuel Francis as being "among the organized internal groups that could become internal security problems..." Francis included IPS in "a

range of radical and New Left groups, some of whose members and leaders have expressed sympathy for North Vietnam and Cuba and who have had influence in federal policymaking in recent years..." (2)

At the time, Dr. Francis was a policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation specializing in international affairs, intelligence issues and the problem of terrorism. He later became a legislative assistant for national security for Sen. John P. East (R-N.C.), a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism.

Similar concern about IPS was expressed by David Martin, who worked as a senior analyst of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Martin is the author of numerous articles and several books, including, "Screening Federal Employees: A Neglected Security Priority."

In an interview, Martin said, "...there's absolutely no doubt in my mind that the IPS does qualify as an organization in which membership would raise serious questions of suitability for employment in sensitive government positions. I base this opinion on a number of facts which I don't think the IPS would challenge.

"First of all, where there are differences between Castro's Cuba and the United States, IPS is invariably on the side of Cuba. Second, IPS displays a uniform enthusiasm for Third World terrorists and revolutionary movements, including the Palestine Liberation Organization. Third, IPS has been heavily involved in anti-U.S. intelligence activities, including the publication of

CounterSpy and collaboration with CIA defector Phillip Agee.

Fourth, it has been directly involved in the creation of subversive cells in the U.S. Armed Forces and has talked about creating a mass soldier organization with a view to 'crippling military effectiveness.' Fifth, its publications and spokesmen have expressed jubilation over the communist victories in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Several of the IPS spokesmen defended the murderous Pol Pot regime against the charge - supported by the testimony of thousands of refugees - that it had killed somewhere between one and two million Cambodians."

Regarding the attitude of IPS and/or its spokesmen toward the Soviet Union, Martin said, "The Soviet Union...also charged at the time that the stories of mass killings (in Cambodia) were Western propaganda. But then, some five years later, at the time of the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, the Soviet Union abandoned Pol Pot. At this point, it started repeating, with additional gory details, the facts about Pol Pot's genocidal record. It was at this point, too, that the IPS spokesmen who had previously defended Pol Pot, turned against him and admitted that they had been mistaken."

"As for IPS's attitude toward the U.S., Saul Landau, one of its leading impresarios, wrote that 'America is a society whose values even George Orwell might not have imagined.' In short, in Landau's eyes and in the eyes of his colleagues, America is far more evil than the ultra-Stalinist tyranny depicted in 1984.

"I could go on and on about the IPS - but in my opinion the record is as consistent as it is frightening." (3)

The late Congressman Larry McDonald (D-Ga.), an acknowledged expert on national security affairs, described the IPS as "a consortium of Marxists pressing for revolutionary change in American domestic and foreign policies through a variety of tactics. However, the single cohesive cord that binds together IPS's multitude of projects and activities is the influencing of U.S. policies along lines favorable to the Soviet Union, its satellites, client states, and controlled terrorist national liberation movements." (4)

#### The IPS and the Soviet Union

In 1983, the Institute for Policy Studies announced that it had established a relationship with two agencies of the Soviet Government - the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada and the U.S.S.R. - U.S.A. Friendship Society. This relationship is designed to facilitate what both sides have referred to in a "joint statement" as "contacts and exchanges of opinion" involving "academicians, scientists, physicians, religious leaders and persons active in promoting arms control and world peace..." (5)

These organizations will sponsor a conference in San Francisco, California, in September 1985. The Soviet delegation will be led by Georgi Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada and a leading Soviet "academician." (6)

The conference is described by one expert as a propaganda attempt by the Soviets "to influence U.S. public opinion on arms issues before the U.S.-Soviet summit meeting in November." (7)

When the IPS and these Soviet organizations tried to stage a similar conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in 1983, twelve members of the U.S. Senate and more than seventy members of the U.S. House of Representatives signed letters to Secretary of State George Shultz warning that the Soviets would attempt to use the conference for intelligence purposes.

In the letter signed by twelve members of the U.S. Senate, including Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and Jeremiah Denton (R-AL), the IPS was described as an organization "which has for 20 years consistently supported foreign policy objectives that serve the interests of the Soviet Union." The Soviet organizations were said to be "known fronts for Soviet intelligence. Their members are not interested in dialogue but rather in exploiting the access afforded them in order to influence U.S. public opinion and American decision makers. The individuals who come to the United States under their auspices frequently misrepresent their affiliations and purposes. We, the undersigned, see no benefit to the United States from facilitating the activities of Soviet intelligence in this country." (8)

In the letter signed by the members of the House, a reference was made to hearings of the House Intelligence Committee, including the release of an Interagency Intelligence Study which "outlined the pattern of use of these academic and

friendship organizations for political influence operations in 'active measures' campaigns."

The congressmen added, "Staff members of the U.S.A. Institute are members of the Communist Party or the Komsomol. One of the U.S.A. Institute's deputy directors is a career KGB officer; and the U.S.A. Institute's activities are carried out at the direction of the KGB, the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and the Foreign Ministry.

"All available evidence indicates that the 'exchanges' and 'dialogue' advertised for the Minneapolis conference are a fraud. American access to Soviet decision makers and ordinary citizens is tightly restricted by the Soviets. But the Soviets want their well-briefed 'dialogue' delegations which are salted with professional KGB officers to have full access to American decision makers and those who influence U.S. public opinion." (9)

The Senators asked that the State Department deny or revoke visas for those Soviets "who have concealed their connection with the KGB, or their connections with the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which engages in clandestine intelligence activities and 'active measures.'"

The congressman asked that Secretary Shultz "direct the (State) Department officials to enforce statutory provisions and deny visas to the Soviet Minneapolis delegation."

Two of the Soviet delegates were subsequently denied visas.

The Interagency Intelligence Study referred to by the congressmen concerned "Soviet active measures," which were defined as the following:

1. Manipulation or control of the media;
2. Written or oral disinformation;
3. Use of foreign communist parties and front organizations;
4. Clandestine radio broadcasting;
5. Economic activities;
6. Military Operations;
7. Other political influence operations. (10)

The strategic objects of active measures campaigns are: "To influence both world and American public opinion against U.S. military, economic and political programs which are perceived as threatening Soviet objectives.

"To demonstrate that the United States is an aggressive, 'colonialist,' and 'imperialist' power.

"To isolate the United States from its allies and friends and discredit those that cooperate with it.

"To demonstrate that the policies and goals of the United States are incompatible with the ambitions of the underdeveloped world.

"To discredit and weaken U.S. intelligence efforts -- particularly those of the CIA -- and expose U.S. intelligence personnel.

"To create a favorable environment for the execution of Soviet foreign policy.



"To undermine the political resolve of the United States and other Western states to protect their interests against Soviet encroachments."

The study identified the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee as a leading agency for the implementation of active measures abroad. It coordinates the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada and "is also known to operate and manipulate some of the semi-official channels of communications between the top Soviet leadership and selected politicians and political parties in the West."

The U.S.A. Institute, as one of many organizations under the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, is later described as helping to "provide occasional in depth research in support of Soviet foreign policy and (to) help identify issues for exploitation in Western countries, particularly the United States. These institutes are frequently utilized by the ID (Information Department) to establish professional contacts with and influence foreign intellectuals and institutions, either through individual meetings or through participation in conferences, seminars and scientific gatherings."

In a section of the study describing the use of "political influence operations" in "active measures" campaigns, it is stated that, "Soviet academicians (including some with high positions in the Soviet party and government hierarchy) are frequently used in political influence operations because they are often accepted as legitimate counterparts of their non-Soviet colleagues. In fact, they frequently act on the basis of

instructions from bodies which control and administer Soviet active measures--the KGB, the International Department, and the International Information Department--even when they are expressing allegedly private or personal opinions.

"Academic conferences on current issues are a prime example of this method of active measures operation. The Soviets take part in such a conference to influence its participants and the political line taken by the conference in directions favorable to Soviet policy interests. Soviet delegates to conferences such as the Pugwash series, which normally deal with disarmament and other international issues, commonly receive guidance from the Central Committee's International Department. The International Department and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs generate ideas for Soviet papers to influence non-Soviet conference participants; the KGB and the ID play a role in the selection of delegates."

John Barron, a former U.S. naval intelligence officer and author of two authoritative books on the KGB, wrote that, "The Institute For U.S.A. and Canada affords disguised Soviet operatives entry into much higher levels of society than does the WPC (World Peace Council, an international Soviet front). Ostensibly, a scholarly branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the Institute is actually a front for the International Department and the KGB. Its quick-witted director, Georgi Arbatov, a long-time intimate of Andropov, is a pudgy man with a melancholy face and the sad eyes of a hound dog. Arbatov in recent years has been a regular commuter to the United States,

where he hobnobs with prominent politicians and airs Soviet views on national television.

"Fully a third of the Institute's staff members are now KGB officers, and its deputy director, KGB Colonel Radomir Bogdanov, privately is referred to among clerical personnel as 'the scholar in epaulets.' After an underling wrote a doctoral dissertation for him, Colonel Bogdanov became Dr. Bogdanov, and to enhance his academic standing further, the Institute allowed him to appear as co-author of two books written by others. Galina Orionova, who fled from the Institute to England in 1979, recalls Col./Dr. Bogdanov in this way: 'He was a drunk, a womanizer and a bully,' she says. 'It was after his arrival that the staff came under renewed pressure to inform against foreign visitors.'

"However he appears to subordinates, Bogdanov is an effective professional who ventures often into the West, peddling the Soviet line and hunting Americans who can be seduced into following it. And once he has memorized what the KGB wants him to say, he can say it smoothly and earnestly." (11)

Stanislav A. Levchenko, who served as a KGB officer from 1971 until his defection to the West in 1979, has stated that, "The leaders of the (U.S.A.-Canada) Institute are involved in a large scale deception game aimed at the American scholars, journalists and political consultants. They foster the myth that the Institute has access to the formulation of confidential positions of the Soviet leaders toward the U.S. and that they are unofficially 'delivering' 'objective' opinions of the Kremlin to respectable American counterparts. There is no evidence to

support this. In fact, in Moscow it is widely known to be untrue. Nonetheless, some American journalists and specialists in foreign policy fall for this myth." (12)

Levchenko said that "Arbatov and his institute even have been involved in so-called Active Measures - activities that include overt and covert propaganda, manipulation of American and Canadian front organizations, forgeries, and other means of deliberate deception."

The U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. Friendship Society is the other Soviet organization which established a relationship with the Institute for Policy Studies. This group is tied to Soviet friendship and cultural societies in countries around the world.

According to the Interagency Study, "the Soviets view these groups (i.e. friendship societies) as political tools, and activities involving them are manipulated by the International Department. They are used as a bridge to people who may be reluctant to participate in organizations that are openly pro-Soviet or sponsored by the local communist parties, and are also available to the local KGB residency as a spotting mechanism for potential active measures and espionage agents."

Edward J. O'Malley, Assistant Director for Intelligence of the FBI, has testified that "Soviet political influence operations in the United States are designed to cultivate contacts with political, business, academic and journalistic leaders and secure their cooperation. This does not require the actual recruitment of the individual, only his cooperation. Typically, the Soviets will play upon themes such as peace,

disarmament, detente and peaceful coexistence to secure the cooperation of their target. Often the Soviets will offer inducements, such as invitations to the U.S.S.R., audiences with high-level Soviet officials, and information to further the individual's career. The major objective of these exercises is to inject the Soviet voice into foreign government, political, business, labor, and academic dialogue in a nonattributable or at least unofficial manner.

"For instance, several Soviet intelligence officers in the United States have cultivated relationships with political and business figures, often using parallel interests or playing upon the ambitions of these individuals in an effort to influence them. Some Soviet intelligence officers have offered their services as 'private' channels to high-level Soviet officials, presumably to impress and influence their American contacts. In some cases, the Soviets probably use these private or informal channels to promote legitimate Soviet concerns or promote Soviet views. It is clear, however, that the Soviets also use these channels to pass a mixture of true, distorted, and even false information.

"Soviet academicians, who are often accepted as legitimate counterparts by American scholars, are nevertheless obliged to obey the instructions of the CPSU if they want to retain their status and travel abroad. Institutes under the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences are frequently used by the CPSU International Department to establish professional contacts with U.S. scholars and scientists for influence purposes. Soviet academicians often

attempt to persuade their American counterparts to accept Soviet views, and they often invite American scholars to the U.S.S.R. as part of a cultivation process." (13)

The relationship between the Institute for Policy Studies and Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada and the U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. Society grew out of what was described in a "joint statement" as "a series of meetings and discussions" held in Moscow, April 6-11, 1982. (14)

The April 1982 meetings were described in the statement as featuring "a broad discussion of issues in the field of Soviet-American relations concentrating on the problems of arms limitation and reduction as well as creating conditions for stable peace."

The members of the U.S. delegation participating in the 1982 meetings included Marcus Raskin, IPS co-founder, and Robert Borosage, director of the IPS. The Soviet officials with whom they met included Georgi Arbatov, head of the Institute on the U.S.A. and Canada, and Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU.

These meetings gave rise to reports in the press that then-Soviet President Brezhnev was considering a possible summit with President Reagan. The meetings also gave rise to a report that the Soviets were considering a "launch on warning" defense posture as a response to President Reagan's planned build-up of America's defense. (15)

In all of these reports the source was said to be a "senior Soviet official" who spoke to the IPS group on the condition he not be identified.

The first joint conference was held May 24-29, 1983 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. It featured 46 Americans as scheduled participants, including IPS co-founders Richard Barnet and Marcus Raskin and 24 Soviets. (16)

The Soviet delegation included six representatives of the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada and five representatives of the U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. Society. (17)

At the time, according to the FBI, the Soviets were engaged in a "political influence operation" as part of an "active measures" campaign aimed at the American peace movement. (18)

In one case, "The KGB used the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences to cultivate an American academician employed with a prominent research agency in the United States. The American scholar targeted by the Soviets did not normally have access to classified information. Therefore, it appears that the Soviets were interested in this individual for active measures purposes because of his position at a prominent research agency." (19)

One investigative reporter who covered the IPS conference reported that "The main theme voiced by the Americans ... was 'trust.' They argued that Americans and Russians would have to learn to trust one another but that this could only be accomplished if the United States took 'concrete measures' to remove Soviet fears of America." (20)

One such measure, he reported, was said to be a nuclear freeze that would block deployment of the MX missile in the U.S. and the NATO missiles in Western Europe. This reporter said that Randall Forsberg, a founder of the nuclear freeze campaign in the U.S., was "very well received by the Soviets."

Forsberg proposed the nuclear freeze at a December 1979 conference of the Mobilization for Survival, an anti-nuclear coalition that includes the Communist Party and the U.S. Peace Council. (21)

The U.S. Peace Council was described by the FBI as a "front" of the Communist Party and an affiliate of the World Peace Council, a Soviet front. The CPUSA, in turn, has been "one of the most loyal and pro-Soviet communist parties in the world and has unfalteringly accepted Soviet direction and funding over the years." (22)

In March 1981, the first national strategy conference of the nuclear freeze campaign was held in Washington, D.C. The Mobilization for Survival newspaper reported that 300 people gathered "from 33 states, Great Britain and the Soviet Union." Forsberg participated, as did Yuri Kapralov of the Soviet embassy, an identified KGB officer. (23)

Forsberg incorporated her nuclear freeze proposal into a document titled, "Call to Halt the Nuclear Arms Race." A 1981 version of the proposal included as endorsers Richard Barnet, co-founder of IPS, and Michael Myerson of the U.S. Peace Council. (24)



Forsberg admitted that she once traveled to Moscow to explain arms control matters and that the "travel arrangements were made...by the U.S. Peace Council." (25) A brochure describing the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, the organization she serves as president, referred to a "lecture" Forsberg gave in 1980 at the Institute for U.S.A. and Canada in Moscow (26). Barnet was listed on the board of Forsberg's institute.

Alan Wolfe, an associate fellow at the IPS and a professor of Sociology at Queens college, has admitted that he was a target of a Soviet political influence operation. In an article for the Nation magazine titled, "I was a Cold War Pawn," (27) Wolfe revealed that when he was a professor at a California university, he was approached by an official from the Soviet Consulate in San Francisco. The Soviets arranged a meeting between Wolfe and an "academic" from the Soviet Institute for the U.S.A. and Canada. This led to Wolfe making a trip to the Soviet Union to lecture at the Institute. In Moscow, Wolfe reported, he discussed his forthcoming book on "anti-Soviet hysteria" in the United States. He was also given a guided tour.

A year and a half later, after moving to New York to accept his teaching job with Queens College, Wolfe said that he was contacted by his Soviet tour guide, who had been transferred from Moscow to New York. After several visits, Wolfe said that he became convinced that the guide "Peter," was "working in some capacity" for the KGB and that "one of his assignments was to maintain regular contact with 'progressive' American writers." Wolfe added, "Quick calls through my network turned up two

friends who also regularly received phone calls from Peter, and while one of them thought him bright and worth talking to, the other shared my impression that the whole business was a waste of time." Wolfe said that he put a stop to the meetings.

Wolfe said that he was later contacted by agents for the FBI, who alerted him to the fact that the Soviets were "attempting to influence the peace movement" and that a major goal of their "disinformation campaign" was "to contact and influence prominent writers."

The FBI agents asked Wolfe what he knew about six Soviets in the U.S., known to be KGB agents. Wolfe said he didn't know any of them. However, he added, "I proceeded to tell the FBI about Peter, on the condition that I not use his name and give no clues about his real identity."

Wolfe said that when he asked why he had been contacted by the FBI in the first place, he was told that his name had been mentioned in a telephone conversation between two alleged KGB agents monitored by the bureau. "They said that you were giving a speech at Hofstra University and that you were probably worth hearing," Wolfe quoted the FBI agents as saying.

Wolfe's conclusion, "I needed no warnings from the FBI to resist Soviet attempts to 'influence' me; Soviet foreign and domestic policies had already accomplished that. If anything, my visit from the FBI had the opposite effect, reminding me of the 1960s and why I had come to distrust my own government so much."

In the same article, Wolfe compared his attitude towards the Soviet Union with that of other writers. He said, "I have yet to

meet a single writer of my generation and temperament who likes the Soviet Union. About the most that can be said for it is that while the United States always supports the wrong side, at least the Soviet Union has helped the cause of progress, sometimes inadvertently, by aiding revolutions in the Third World. That is the best case. Many of my friends on the left hold a far more critical view: that the Russians stand condemned as enemies of human freedom and a curse on the prospects of genuine socialism."

The Interagency Study had said that a strategic objective of Soviet "active measures" was "To demonstrate that the United States is an aggressive, 'colonialist' and 'imperialist' power," and, "to create a favorable environment for the execution of Soviet foreign policy."

Joshua Muravchik, in his 1981 New York Times magazine article on the IPS, reported that IPS co-founder Richard Barnet, in his writings, "often refers to the United States as 'imperialist.' When asked whether the Soviet Union is an imperialist country, he replied, 'It is fundamentally...a status quo power.' In his forthcoming book, Real Security, Barnet says that the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan because it sensed 'its own security slipping away.'" (28)

"Barnet also draws a distinction between the two superpowers in the area of human rights. The United States, he says, is suffering from decline in official respect for human rights, while 'ironically, one area of the world that can point to some

improvement...is the Soviet Union, which...is far from the giant concentration camp that Stalin made it.'" "

Barnet, however, wrote a letter to the Times responding to the Muravchik article. Barnet claimed that, in response to Muravchik's question about the Soviet Union as imperialist, "I answered in the affirmative. According to tapes of our conversation, I told him that the Soviet Union 'has been expansionist,' that it 'evidences some of the classic behavior of an imperialist power,' and that it is becoming 'increasingly less cautious in projecting its military power.'" This, Barnet said, was just one example of the "numerous liberties with the truth Mr. Muravchik has taken."

Muravchik replied, "Mr. Barnet's letter attempts to leave the impression that he did not say what I quoted him as saying about Soviet imperialism, yet it carefully avoids any denial of the quote. He did not answer my question in the affirmative. He said, 'It depends on what you mean.' He said several things, but the heart of his response was that the U.S.S.R. is 'fundamentally looking for...stable relations...it is fundamentally...a status quo power.' Mr. Barnet's tergiversations on this issue contrast sharply with his flat assertion that, 'by any historical definition, the United States is an 'empire' whose 'wars will cease only if (its) society is changed.'" "

In an article for Mother Jones magazine (29), Barnet said the following:

"What are the threats of the 1980s? An energy disaster. An economic crisis in the industrial world and the possible collapse

of the world monetary system. Extremely serious conflicts over access to resources. The Russians created none of these problems for us (emphasis added). The mounting instability in the world is a hallmark of our revolutionary age. The Russians did not create this instability. They are in a position to benefit from it only if we continue to isolate ourselves."

In this article, written shortly after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Barnett said, "...we intend that Afghanistan be restored to peace and neutrality. The Soviet Union has said that they will remove their troops. We welcome an initiative from the countries of the region to press the Soviet Union on that pledge. For our part, as long as there is a reasonable prospect of a prompt Soviet withdrawal, we will oppose any act - such as wholesale arming of the Afghan rebels or Pakistanis - by any country that would prolong the fighting and the Soviet occupation and thereby threaten to widen the war."

Later, Barnett said, "We do not know all the reasons why the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. In large part they acted, as they often do, out of insecurity - in this case to prevent a militant anti-communist state on their border."

He added, "Increasing Russian anxiety about their security also threatens our own. It would be a simpler world if by heightening their fears we could assure our security, but the truth is that we are more threatened by their panic and their blunders than by their master plans."

In his 1981 book, Target America, (30) James Tyson analyzed the IPS and its major personalities. He noted that Barnett

authored a book titled The Giants - Russia and America. Tyson quoted a review by Professor Hollander of Harvard, who said it "shows a revisionist benign attitude towards everything the Soviet Union says and does and a pervading suspiciousness towards American policymakers."

Dr. Rael Jean Isaac, the author of The Coercive Utopians, said the following about how the Soviet Union is portrayed in the writings and publications of IPS fellows, "While the Soviet Union is not always defended as flawless, the United States is consistently portrayed as the aggressor in U.S.-Soviet relations." (31)

She also wrote, "Richard Barnet contrasts 'substantive' and 'procedural' freedoms. We have the 'procedural' freedoms (speech, the press, assembly) while the Soviet Union has the more solid-sounding 'substantive' freedoms (medical care, jobs, housing). Barnet asserts on his own authority that he is sure that Soviet citizens, if given the choice between the two, would select their 'substantive' freedom. What IPS fellows never concede is that the Soviet Union poses any threat to the United States. Soviet behavior is invariably defined as 'defensive' in nature." Her citation for this analysis is the Barnet book on U.S.-Soviet relations, The Giants.

In a reply to the Isaac article (32), Robert Borosage and Peter Weiss of IPS defended Barnet's distinction between "substantive" and "procedural" freedoms as "commonly used by international lawyers and human rights advocates..." They said that Isaac ignored the passage in the book following his making

of such a distinction, in which Barnet quoted Sakharov as saying that procedural freedoms are needed in the Soviet Union. Borosage and Weiss go on to say that Barnet, in his book, also criticized Soviet non-compliance with the Helsinki human rights accords. "Contrary to the Isaac charge that IPS never considers the Soviet Union a threat to the U.S.," they say, "the entire theme of Barnet's study is the threatening and unstable nature of the nuclear arms race."

Isaac, in turn, replied that while Borosage and Weiss were able to provide an example of criticism of the Soviet Union from Barnet's book, such "criticisms are rare, a tiny revulet compared to the flood tide of criticism sent down upon the United States. Indeed, a little later in The Giants, quoted by Weiss and Borosage, Barnet says that while the repression of dissidents is shocking in the light of Soviet legality, the treatment of dissent is lenient compared with many military dictatorships around the world with which the United States has close friendly relations. So even this becomes yet another stick with which to beat the United States." (33)

Later, in her response, she said, "But what is most important is that IPS consistently portrays the Soviet Union as a country that poses no threat to the United States." She said that "typical titles" of IPS publications and books reflect this perspective:

"Our Strangelovian Suspicion of Russian Intent" by Richard Barnet.

"Myths and Realities of the 'Soviet Threat'", identified by Isaac as "published proceedings of a 1979 IPS conference, described in IPS's catalogue as presenting statements that 'debunk the myth of a new Soviet threat.'"

"Dubious Specter: A Second Look at the 'Soviet Threat;' Toward World Disarmament."

Isaac noted that Weiss and Borosage attempted to turn aside the charge that IPS portrays the Soviet Union as non-threatening by saying that "the entire theme of Barnet's study is the threatening and unstable nature of the nuclear arms race." Isaac countered, "What they neglect to mention is that much of Barnet's work is devoted to 'proving' that since World War II the United States military build up and military activities have been entirely the fruit of internal domestic processes. The United States, in Barnet's analysis, is driven by the mentality of its 'national security managers,' the needs of its corporations, etc. The consistent premise is that there is no genuine and significant external threat to the United States, and Soviet behavior is defensive in nature."



## The IPS and Cuba

Orlando Letelier was an official of the Marxist Salvador Allende regime in Chile. He began working for IPS in various capacities after Allende was overthrown by a military coup in 1973.

Many documents were found in Letelier's briefcase after his murder in Washington, D.C. in 1976. One showed that he had received money from Beatrice "Tati" Allende, the daughter of Salvador Allende, who was living in exile in Cuba. (34)

The letter was addressed to Letelier and signed "Tati." It was dated May 8, 1975 and datelined Havana. It said that, "...from here, we will send you, in the name of the party, a thousand dollars (\$1,000) per month to support your work. Now I am sending you five thousand in order not to have to send it monthly."

Beatrice Allende was married to Luis Fernandez Ona, identified by the CIA as a section chief in the Americas Department of the Cuban Communist Party, an arm of Cuban intelligence. (35)

Joshua Muravchik, in his article on IPS for the New York Times magazine, noted that IPS maintained that "Tati" Allende was acting as treasurer of the exiled Popular Unity Party, the coalition which elected Allende President of Chile and which Letelier represented in Washington. Allende herself said, "There is nothing mysterious about the remittance of \$1,000, which we Chileans sent Letelier through our own channels."

"Subsequently," Muravchik added, "two United States intelligence source independently confirmed reports that Letelier had had transactions with people in Cuba via the Cuban diplomatic pouch, courtesy of Julian Torres Rizo, the First Secretary of the Cuban Mission to the United Nations, who was also the head of Cuban intelligence in New York."

Responding to Dr. Rael Jean Isaac's charge that Letelier was operating as an unregistered agent receiving payments from Cuba, IPS officials Borosage and Weiss said, "The basis of the conclusion is utterly false. The U.S. Attorney's office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation reviewed the briefcase papers carefully and, as stated by U.S. Attorney Eugene Propper, in open court, 'found no evidence Letelier was working for any government, either Cuban, Chilean or other.' In fact, the money which Letelier received from Beatrice Allende, Allende's daughter, who at the time lived in exile in Cuba with her Cuban husband, was from funds raised from churches and unions throughout Western Europe to support Chilean refugees and the movement for democratic change." (36)

Isaac, in her response (37), noted that the defenders of Letelier have changed their story on the source of the funds. At first, she noted, Beatrice Allende said the money had been raised by "progressive peoples throughout the world" and did not specify Western Europe. Isaac said the Chilean Socialist Party, of which Allende was treasurer, had many of its leaders living in exile in East Germany. If the money was raised in Western Europe, Isaac asked, "It would have been sent directly to Letelier from Western

Europe, not via Cuba." Later, she added, Letelier's widow, Isabel, said the money had been raised in "Western Europe and the United States." Isaac commented, "For money to have been transferred from the U.S. to Cuba to return to the United States would be even more extraordinary."

Isaac said that Attorney Propper, the prosecutor of Letelier's murderers, made his statement about Letelier not being a foreign agent in pretrial hearings in which he was arguing against defense motions for access to the briefcase papers. "In arguing against the defense motion," Isaac said, "Propper acted in a manner to be expected of a prosecutor, blocking efforts of the defense to open up new lines of inquiry not relevant to the murder charges against them."

Regarding the alleged FBI review of the briefcase papers, Isaac said, "But the FBI had done no counter-intelligence investigation of Letelier, the formal proceeding for investigating someone there is grounds for suspecting served as a foreign agent."

Joshua Muravchik noted in his article that Propper was skeptical of the charge that Letelier was a Cuban agent. Muravchik wrote, "In Propper's view, Letelier, like Salvador Allende, made no bones about his admiration for the Cuban system and could have accepted Cuban assistance not in order to serve Cuban interests, but out of the conviction that this would serve the best interests of Chile."

Herbert Romerstein, a former professional staff member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, contends

that Letelier was, in fact, an "agent of influence" for Cuban intelligence. (38)

Congressman Larry McDonald (D-Ga) charged that the briefcase papers showed that Letelier "served as a Soviet agent operating under the direction of the Cuban DGI." (39)

#### The IPS and North Vietnam

In his New York Times magazine article on the IPS, Joshua Muravchik reported that the co-founders of IPS, Richard Barnet and Marcus Raskin, described American participation in the Vietnam war as "aggressive," "imperialist," "colonialist," and as "genocide."

Muravchik added, "Barnet, Raskin and IPS senior fellow Ralph L. Stavins charged that it was intentional United States policy 'to create widespread civilian casualties,' and that those who formulated and executed the Vietnam war policy were war criminals."

"In 1969," Muravchik reported, "Barnet traveled to North Vietnam, where he spoke at a rally expressing solidarity with the North Vietnamese. Barnet acknowledges that he knew his speech would be used for propaganda purposes."

"I was absolutely certain the speech would be broadcast," Barnet was quoted as telling Muravchik. But Barnet made the remarks anyway because "a scholar says pretty much the same thing wherever he is."

It was reported by Hanoi Radio at the time that Barnet and others "took to the floor to criticize the U.S. aggressive war in Vietnam." Barnet was quoted by Hanoi Radio as saying that the war was "illegal" and "immoral," and that the U.S. Government was issuing "distortions" about its conduct. Barnet said he would return to the U.S. with "the message that the Vietnamese will continue to fight against the aggressors..." (40)

Muravchik revealed that, "The IPS board chairman, Peter Weiss, and his wife, Cora, also made several trips to North Vietnam. Mrs. Weiss's Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam was the only American group Hanoi chose to provide with information about Americans held or missing in Vietnam. Using this monopoly, Mrs. Weiss urged acceptance of Hanoi's terms for ending the war and sought to refute stories - later confirmed by returning prisoners - that American POWs were being mistreated."

After the communist conquest of South Vietnam, Muravchik noted, "Barnet praised postwar Vietnam..." Although Joan Baez and many former anti-war activists had "raised their voices in protest of Hanoi's policies of wholesale imprisonment and deportation, and its general violations of human rights," Muravchik added, "Richard Barnet, Cora Weiss and 17 others placed an advertisement in the New York Times which said that Vietnam "should be hailed for its moderation and for its extraordinary effort to achieve reconciliation among all of its people."

Barnet was given "special thanks" in the preface to Soldiers in Revolt, a 1975 book by David Cortright, which favorably reported on what Cortright called "the struggle within the American military against repression and the Indochina intervention."

"The idea of presenting a historical account of GI resistance," Cortright said, "first occurred to me during my army term in 1970 and 1971. Actual work began in January 1972, when I arrived at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. and occupied much of my time for nearly two and a half years."

"My deepest thanks," wrote Cortright, "must go to the Institute for Policy Studies and the Union Graduate School of Antioch College. The IPS/UGS co-operative graduate program provided a constructive and challenging forum for research and social investigation and offered important assistance throughout my work...The greatest support for this study, without which the entire project would have been impossible, came from the Institute for Policy Studies. The stimulating environment at the Institute - marked by contact with the leading scholar/activists in the country and by association with nearly every major progressive movement in the society - guided every stage of my work. I owe special thanks to Joe Collins, to fellows Len Rodberg and Ralph Stavins, and to the Institute's brilliant co-director Richard Barnet.

"My greatest debt is to my principal advisor over the past two and a half years, Marcus Raskin."

In the introduction to the book, Raskin said that, "In Cortright's account, we learn that the struggle was not only against the war, but also against an authoritarian military machine oiled for world imperialism but sluggish in its purpose and doubtful of its mission."

In the book, Cortright declared that "one of the best prescriptions for the post-Vietnam GI movement" is that "Radicals must join the army." He says, "The role of radicals who purposely join the services to organize has been important throughout the GI movement and remains so today."

He added, "The Progressive Labor Party has been particularly active in encouraging members to join the services. Other organizations should follow suit and send members into the enlisted ranks as an indispensable means of exerting pressure on the armed forces."

In his later capacity as executive director of SANE, Cortright was listed as a leader of a workshop on "economic conversion" at the founding conference of the U.S. Peace Council in 1979. (41)

#### The IPS and Philip Agee

A U.S. Government Interagency Intelligence Study of Soviet active measures revealed that one Soviet objective is, "To discredit and weaken U.S. intelligence efforts - particularly those of the CIA and expose U.S. intelligence personnel."

Philip Agee is the ex-CIA agent who has been trying to identify American intelligence agents in order to destroy their effectiveness. After Joshua Muravchik charged in his New York Times magazine piece that IPS's Transnational Institute had "facilitated" Agee's activities in Europe, the IPS responded in an unpublished "fact sheet" that its efforts on behalf of Agee "were negligible." (42) The document added, "When Agee was booted out of England after a proceeding in which no charges were filed and no evidence presented, IPS's Amsterdam Center provided him with a place to stay while he figured out where he would live. We would make the same decision again. (emphasis added)."

However, the Washington Post reported that Agee was being expelled from Britain because he was told he was "a threat to the nation's security." The story added, "Agee was accused of 'disseminating' undescribed material harmful to Britian's security and maintaing regular contacts with foreign spies. Their country was not named but government sources said this referred to Cuban agents."

The IPS document also claimed, "Ironically, Robert Borosage, now the director of IPS, was a leading opponent of naming names of CIA agents within the community of groups seeking to reform the intelligence agencies."

However, a "special thanks" was given to Borosage in the Winter, 1976, issue of CounterSpy, a publication which did engage in the naming of the names of CIA agents (44). CounterSpy was published by the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate, which



included Philip Agee and IPS co-founder Marcus Raskin on its advisory board.

IPS, in its unpublished "fact sheet," contended that while Raskin was on the organization's "inactive" advisory board, "he never worked with them."

The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security conducted an investigation into the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate on March 26, 1976 (45). Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), who presided, noted that, "On December 23, 1975, Richard S. Welch, a CIA agent, located in Athens, Greece, was shot and killed by unknown assassins. The assassination took place shortly after the identification of Welch as a CIA agent. This identification of Welch appeared in a Washington publication entitled 'CounterSpy,' which is the public identity of the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate. Numerous editorials and newspaper articles written about the assassination of CIA agent Welch have suggested that by exposing Welch, the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate made itself morally responsible for his assassination. The Internal Security Subcommittee neither seeks nor intends to sit in judgement thereon.

"We do intend, however, to examine the activities of this organization - for it is clear that the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate interlocks with revolutionary and terrorist elements in the United States."

The witness before the subcommittee was Rep. Larry McDonald (D-Ga.), who had the following to say about Marcus Raskin and IPS:

"Marcus Raskin's Institute for Policy Studies was accurately characterized by Paul Dickson in 'Think Tanks' as attempting to lay the groundwork for the new society that will replace the present one. It not only has dedicated itself to ushering in the new society by inquiry and experimentation but is also doing what it can to hasten the demise of the present one. Raskin, long a disarmament advocate, was the founder of the New Party in 1968, now called the People's Party, a self-stated socialist organization. For the past fifteen years, Raskin has consistently supported the total dismantling of the Armed Forces; disarmament of not only the Armed Forces, but of police and civilians; and an end to U.S. opposition to foreign guerrilla insurgencies."

The names of both Raskin and Agee were on the letterhead advisory board of the Fifth Estate when, in a December 28, 1975, news release, it issued a "statement" on the assassination of Richard Welch. "We do not condone or support this shooting," it said. "But we do understand why Mr. Welch was killed. This CIA station chief died as a direct result of world-wide hostility which the CIA has helped generate against the United States...The possibility of violent retribution for this exploitation and repression must now be a fact of life with CIA agents."

The statement added, "...if anyone is to blame for Mr. Welch's death, it is the CIA that sent him to Greece to spy and intervene in the affairs of the Greek people and to rendezvous with a death symbolic of the horrible essence of the CIA."

The statement claimed that, "Richard Welch was identified first in 1967 in a German book, Who's Who in the CIA, which has been widely distributed throughout the world. More recently his name appeared in Spanish language newspapers in Peru. Maryknoll priests while in Peru jotted his and other CIA operatives names down and during a visit to Washington, D.C., asked us for confirmation that Welch was indeed with the CIA. By using documents published by the Department of State and freely available to the public, we made this confirmation and reprinted his name in CounterSpy. But his move to Greece was unknown to us and we have had no contact with the Greek newspaper that identified him. It is a fragile coincidence that links CounterSpy to these tragic events."

Referring to CounterSpy's explanation of why Welch was murdered, Rep. McDonald said, "We have heard that theory before - the mugger or murderer is not at fault, the victim had no business being on the street in the first place." McDonald also said that the book, Who's Who in the CIA was published in East Germany and that its author was identified as an East German intelligence agent by the name of Julius Mader.

Ladislav Bittman, former deputy chief of the Disinformation Department of the Czechoslovakia Intelligence Service, told the House Intelligence Committee that the book was actually published "under the name" of Mader and that it was jointly prepared by the Czechoslovak and East German intelligence services. "It took a few years to put together," Bittman said, "About half of the names listed in that book are real CIA operatives. The other

half are people who were just American diplomats or various officials; and it was prepared with the expectation that naturally, many, many Americans operating abroad, diplomats and so on, would be hurt because their names were exposed as CIA officials."

Almost six years later, in a 1981 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of the U.S. Government to revoke Philip Agee's American passport on the ground that his activities "are causing or are likely to cause serious damage to the national security or foreign policy of the United States." (46)

In coming to this decision, the Supreme Court found that the identifications of undercover CIA agents by Agee and his collaborators "divulge classified information, violate Agee's express contract not to make any public statements about Agency matters without prior clearance by the Agency, have prejudiced the ability of the United States to obtain intelligence, and have been followed by episodes of violence against the persons and organizations intended identified." The Court specifically referred to a number of incidents, including the murder of Welch.

In a footnote, the Court noted that "affidavits of the CIA's Deputy Director for Operations set out and support his judgement that Agee's purported identifications are 'thinly-veiled invitations to violence,' that 'Agee's actions could, in today's circumstances, result in someone's death,' and that Agee's conduct has 'markedly increased the likelihood of individuals so identified being the victims of violence.'"

"One of those affidavits," the court said, "also shows that the ultimate effectiveness of Agee's program depends on activities of hostile foreign groups, and that such groups can be expected to engage in physical surveillance, harassment, kidnapping, and, in some extreme cases, murder against U.S. officials abroad."

The Court declared that such disclosures "are clearly not protected by the Constitution," a statement which gave impetus to Congressional efforts to make it illegal for CounterSpy and Covert Action Information Bulletin to name the names of CIA agents.

In his 1975 book, "Inside the Company: CIA Diary," Agee revealed that, "In Havana, the Biblioteca Nacional Jose Martin and the Casa de las Americas provided me with special assistance for research and helped find data available only from government documentation." He added, "Representatives of the Communist Party of Cuba also gave me important encouragement at a time I doubted I would be able to find the additional information I needed." (47)

David Phillips, a former CIA officer who is president of the Association of former Intelligence Officers, said, "Whether Agee is a paid agent of the Cuban intelligence service - a surrogate of the Soviet KGB - is almost beside the point. By definition, his role has been that of an 'agent of influence' responsive to Cuban control." (48)

In an interview published by Tages-Anzeiger of Zurich, Switzerland, Agee was asked for his opinion of

intelligence agencies, the interviewer noting that the KGB used much the same tactics as the CIA. "It depends on their goals and motives," Agee responded. "The CIA is plainly on the wrong side, that is, the capitalistic side. I approve KGB 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 upon the people to free themselves. Between the overdone activities that the CIA initiates and the more modest activities of the KGB there is absolutely no comparison." (49)

#### The IPS and the Communist Party

The Communist Party USA, which the FBI has described as accepting funding and direction from the Soviet Union, has been sympathetic to the IPS, its publications and personnel.

Michael Parenti, a visiting fellow at IPS, is the author of a book on the politics of the mass media, a chapter of which was published in Political Affairs, the theoretical journal of the Communist Party. (50) The Communist Party newspaper Daily World carried an article by Parenti attacking the economic policies of President Reagan. (51)

In an article for the Nation magazine, Parenti wrote that "we as Marxists pledge our lives and our sacred honor" to the "struggle" to expose "the myths of the ruling class," including the "imperialist myth" of the "Giant Red Menace." (52)

Parenti gave a talk at a Karl Marx centennial rally, May 25, 1983, in New York City, sponsored by the American Institute of Marxist Studies and the People's School for Marxist Education. The talk was reprinted in Political Affairs. (53)

Alan Wolfe, an associate fellow at IPS and professor at Queens College, wrote in the Nation magazine, "I am one of those who teach Marxism sympathetically..." (54)

Saul Landau, an IPS associate fellow, has called himself "a Marxist...and I'm proud to be called one." (55)

Michael Parenti wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times which defended Martin Luther King, Jr. against charges that he associated with communists. Parenti said, "It is possible...that King unknowingly or even knowingly associated and cooperated with people who were directly affiliated with the American Communist Party or with other leftist organizations. My question is, so what?" Parenti disputed the claim that "such contacts, arising during the course of a struggle for justice and equality, taint King's reputation now and forever." (56)

Herbert Aptheker, writing in the Daily World, reviewed an IPS publication on Nicaragua and said that its author, Richard B. Fagen, "is sympathetic to the popular movements in Latin America against imperialism and for social advance." Aptheker called his Nicaragua book a "penetrating analysis." He added, "There are precious few positive and stimulating intellectual products coming out of Washington these days; a large proportion are being issued by the non-profit Institute for Policy Studies. Among them is this work on the Nicaraguan revolution." (57)

The Daily World reprinted on its own pages some excerpts of a New York Times column by IPS co-founder Richard Barnet. Titled, "Questions to the next President," the column had appeared during the 1980 presidential campaign. Barnet had accused both President Carter and Republican candidate Ronald Reagan of not pressing hard enough for arms negotiations with the Soviet Union (58).



## References

1. Dated May 1, 1981
2. Mandate for Leadership. Section 28 "The Intelligence Community."
3. Human Events. "How to Keep Soviet Moles Out of Government." August 20, 1983.
4. Congressional Record. May 13, 1980. Pages 2370-2371.
5. Institute for Policy Studies "Press Packet." May 23, 1983.
6. Washington Times. August 23, 1985. Page 1.
7. Ibid.
8. Dated May 17, 1983.
9. Dated May 12, 1983.
10. Soviet Active Measures. Hearings before the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives. July 13, 14; 1982. Pages 31-50.
11. Barron, John. KGB Today: The Hidden Hand. Readers Digest Press 1983. Pages 265,266.
12. Levchenko, Stanislav. Unmasking Moscow's Institute of the U.S.A. Heritage Foundation. December 17, 1982.
13. Statement by the Assistant Director, Intelligence Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Soviet Active Measures. Hearings before the Permanent Select Committee On Intelligence, House of Representatives. July 13,14; 1982. Pages 225,226.
14. Institute for Policy Studies "Press Packet." May 23, 1983.
15. "Soviet Aide is Cautious on Summit Talks Idea," New York Times, April 11, 1982. "Soviet Official Says Summit Possible," Boston Sunday Globe, April 11, 1982. "Soviets Said to Consider Faster Nuclear Missile Launch in Crisis," Washington Post, April 11, 1982.

16. Institute for Policy Studies "Press Packet."  
May 23, 1983.
17. Ibid.
18. Annex to statement of FBI Assistant Director William J. O'Malley. Soviet Active Measures, Hearings Before the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, U.S. House of Representatives, July 13,14; 1982.  
Pages 232-235.
19. Ibid.
20. Rees, John. As quoted in Human Events, "IPS and Soviet Group Hold Joint Conference," June 11, 1983.
21. The Mobilizer. April-May, 1981, Page 6. Mobilization for Survival brochure, 1981.
22. Testimony of Edward J. O'Malley, Assistant FBI Director for Intelligence.
23. Barron, John. KGB Today: The Hidden Hand. Readers Digest Press, 1983.
24. "Call to Halt the Nuclear Arms Race, Proposal for a Mutual U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Weapons Freeze," 1981.
25. As quoted in Human Events, March 19, 1983. Page 5.
26. Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, brochure, 1981.
27. The Nation, January 22, 1983.
28. "The Think Tank on the Left," New York Times Magazine, April 26, 1981.
29. "The 1990 Guide to the Only Way Out," May 1980.
30. Tyson, James. Regnery Gateway, Chicago.
31. Isaac, Rael Jean. Midstream, "The Institute for Policy Studies: Empire on the Left," June/July 1980.
32. Borosage, Robert; and Weiss, Peter; Midstream, "The Fight Around the Institute for Policy Studies, Replies to Rael Jean Isaac," February 1981.

33. Isaac, Rael Jean. Midstream, "The Fight Around the Institute for Policy Studies, Rael Jean Isaac Responds;" February 1981.
34. Reprinted in the Congressional Record, June 23, 1977, page H6439.
35. Muravchik, Joshua; New York Times Magazine, April 26, 1981.
36. Borosage, Robert; and Weiss, Peter; Midstream, "The Fight Around the Institute for Policy Studies, Replies to Rael Jean Isaac."
37. Ibid. "Rael Jean Isaac Responds."
38. Romerstein, Herbert. "Soviet Intelligence in the United States," Intelligence Requirements for the 1980's: Counter Intelligence. National Strategy Information Center, 1980, page 191.
39. Congressional Record, June 23, 1977. Page H6436.
40. Hanoi VNA International Service, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Nov. 13, 1969, page K4.
41. Appendix III, Soviet Covert Action, Hearings Before the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, February 6, 19; 1980.
42. "Fact Sheet: IPS in the New York Times Magazine," May 5, 1981.
43. Nossiter, Bernard D. The Washington Post, datelined November 17, 1976.
44. Volume 2, Issue 4.
45. Subversion of Law Enforcement Intelligence Gathering, Hearings Before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.
46. Supreme Court of the United States. No. 80-83. Decided June 29, 1981.

47. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England.
48. As quoted by Rep. Larry McDonald, Congressional Record, April 7, 1977, page E2153.
49. As quoted in the AIM Report, June II, 1980.
50. May 1981 issue.
51. December 23, 1981.
52. The Nation, April 11, 1981.
53. September 1983 issue.
54. The Nation, "The Penalty of Having Politics," June 19, 1982.
55. As quoted in the Sacramento Bee, March 13, 1985.
56. New York Times, November 1, 1983.
57. Daily World, August 14, 1981.
58. October 30, 1980, issue.