Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

Agnew Unintentionally Triggers Renewed Round of Anti-Semitism

ONE LITTLE noted and wholly unintentional result of Vice President Agnew's speeches against the press and television is a renewed wave of public expression of anti-Semitism.

It was noticeable at once in this city where local television stations were swamped for three days after Agnew's first speech with obscene phone calls protesting "Jew-Commies on the air." But now, Norman B. Isaacs, executive editor of the Louisville Courier Journal, reports that he has been "literally buried under an avalanche of sick mail."

Isaacs was an obvious tar-



Mankiewicz Braden

get. As president this year of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, it fell to his lot to make a brief reply to the Vice President over the same national networks which carried Agnew's first speech.

In addition, one of the major Jewish organizations reports that professional anti-Semites are using Agnew's speeches to justify their hate campaigns and urging their followers to support him.

OBVIOUSLY, AGNEW did not intend to spray kerosene on a banked fire. But the language he used was the same country club English which has put him in trouble before. For example, at Des Moines, the Vice President referred to "this little group of men who wield a free hand in selecting, presenting and interpreting the great issues . . Television commentators, he said, "live and work in the geographical and intellec-tual confines of Washington, D.C., or New York City . . .

And in Montgomery he talked about "the monopolization of the great public information vehicles . . in fewer and fewer hands" and went on to single out for criticism the New York Times and The Washington Post.

The syntax produced a Pavlovian reaction. The theme that America's press and television is controlled and dominated by a small group of Jews in New York and Washington is dominant among the anti-Semitic lunatic fringe and has been so, at least since the days preceding World War II when the German-American Bund made it an article of faith in order to counteract a press increasingly critical of Adolf Hitler.

That Jews "control com-munications," that Jewish propaganda is "unremitpropaganda is "unremit-ting," that television news is "electric Jews" and that the New York Times and The Washington Post follow the views of The Daily Worker is old stuff to the publishers of the hate sheets. It is not surprising that Gerald L. K. Smith, in a special bulletin to his subscribers dated Nov. 21, called Agnew's Des. Moines speech "a coura-geous address" against the "mindwashing establishment operating tyranically . . . by controlling the source of news in New York City," H. L. Hunt's Life Line called it "patriotic awareness," Human Events printed it with laudatory footnotes and We the People called on its readers to "keep the issue (raised by Agnew)

THE VICE PRESIDENT was unprepared for the reaction from the lunatic right, and he has instructed his staff to answer mail in praise of his alleged anti-Semitism by disclaiming it.

The "little group of men" who control American communications—if there is one—is white Anglo Saxon Protestant—as any head-count of the owners of American media will reveal. But professional anti-Semites are undisturbed by facts. Unless Agnew can escape their embrace, he may one day worry about political consequences.

© 1969. Los Angeles Times