

# Israel Muzzles American Media

Outside of RPIL, not much has been said of the Israeli hand in the Iranscam puppet, and the editors and owners of most leading publications help keep it that way. Part of the reason is a successful propaganda campaign called "Hasbara."

Following some negative press coverage on Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon and terror bombing of Beirut, the American Jewish Congress held the Hasbara Conference in Jerusalem to discover how to suppress future criticisms of Israel in the U.S. media. Journalists, academics, and advertising executives from the U.S. and Israel attended.

Among the journalists was an editor of the *New Republic*, which the *Jerusalem Post* called "the single most favorable American voice on Israel. Who can say how many divisions that is worth?" There are many divisions of

this sort in the Israeli propaganda army. We never get an accurate picture of Israel, an aggressive, national socialist state that is the prime beneficiary of U.S. overseas welfare, and the cause of so much expensive U.S. military intervention.

The Hasbara Conference, which led to the permanent Hasbara Project, urged the use of intimidation, especially advertiser pressure. If a newspaper mentions anything critical, for example, phones ring off the hook with calls from pro-Israel advertisers. Needless to say, this makes many editors and publishers leery. And it works with non-commercial enterprises as well. When PBS planned to run its *Flashpoint* series on the Middle-East, one small segment aired a few critical comments about Israel. As a result, an intimidation campaign was immediately put into effect. Contributors and politi-

cians brought pressure to bear, and 29 PBS stations dropped the program, including outlets in Washington and New York.

According to Norman Podhoretz, CFR member and neoconservative editor of *Commentary*: "The role of Jews who write in both the Jewish and general press is to defend Israel, and not to join in the attacks on Israel."

Thank goodness this advice is not taken in Israel itself, where the press is much more objective than in the U.S. Reporters like Danny Rubinstein, a West Bank correspondent, regularly report Israeli abuses and torture of Arabs who oppose the occupation of their country. And it was the Israeli press that uncovered the government's massacre of Palestinian refugees at Sabra and Shatila in 1982. I wish our media had just a little of Danny Rubinstein's courage. ■

## Profits in Establishment Bumbles

An incredible situation has arisen inside and outside a family of companies controlled by one of the Establishment's most powerful men. The facts aren't secret, but the press and the market haven't begun to realize their significance. As a result, several most unusual profit opportunities are waiting for the investor willing to take a few chances.

The Establishment's inner circle has a hammerlock on the levers of political and financial power. But when it comes to the business of running a business, the most powerful people in the world can be downright inept.

Look at David Rockefeller. Presidents and prime ministers doff their hats to the most potent puller of strings in the world, but he did a lousy job of running Chase Manhattan bank.

This makes no sense at first blush. But when you reflect on human nature, you realize that businessmen and professionals are only as good as customers and competitors force them to be. When not threatened by normal competitive forces, we all become lazy. Why worry when you have the clout to force others to pay for most of your mistakes?

Trilateralist Harry Oppenheimer is South Africa's most powerful businessman, media mogul, and backer of liberal causes. He is also an example of the David Rockefeller syndrome.

The Anglo-American/DeBeers machine, put together by two generations of the Oppenheimer family, controls much of the press in South Africa. In some years it's accounted for over half the entire trading volume on the Johan-

nesburg Stock Exchange. Its deposits and withdrawals can make or break banks. It's above criticism. And it's as arrogant as the Devil himself.

In the absence of criticism, Anglo-American/DeBeers management has felt no pressure to serve its public shareholders. Why grub for profits when you can spend your time imposing your whims on the rest of humanity?

In recent years, strong personalities have risen to the top of various companies within the Anglo-American/DeBeers group. As long as these men served the Trilateralists on matters of public policy, they were left to run their domains pretty much as they saw fit. Some did well, and some didn't, but all became more independent in running

*Continued on page four*