

cc: S. Trahern ✓

005453 DEC 13 91

Carmel, CA. 93922
December 4, 1991

Mr. Brian Lamb - "Book Notes"
C-Span Suite 155
400 N. Capitol St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Brian:

It was with great interest that I watched "Book Notes", 12-1-91, with Gary Sick discussing his book, October Surprise. When Barbara Honegger's name was mentioned, Mr. Sick stated that he disagreed with her views. Why didn't you ask him to state those issues?

I have since her book is no avail. White House include profile and distinguished Institute.

Writes
a lot

Ms Honegger on "Book Notes" ever since "October Surprise" was published in 1989, to perceptions engineered by the credentials, like Gary Sick, in service as a policy analyst, research associate at the Hoover

Again Barbara Honegger her interview sources for sources used in her book, is a very good one. I have it b

ered Washington's perception that Gary Sick's research has confirmed Several of Mr. Sick's main points in his book, were the same. Either he, Gary Sick, is a very good one. You can't

Barbara Honegger has been unfairly slandered from so many directions! The Republicans are very quick to wave the News Week and the New Republic October Surprise articles to the C-Span cameras, and of course you, Brian, held them up for the viewers. The reason I mention this at all is, in my opinion, if you really care about being fair, you would not hesitate one minute to invite her to appear on Book Notes!! She can give your viewers an up-date to her book, "October Surprise", as well as her very important step by step rebuttal to the News Week article. She is now in the process of writing her rebuttal to the New Republic, and undoubtedly would complete it by the time you invited her to appear on Book Notes.

By the way, Gary Sick had in his possession a copy of her rebuttal at the time of your interview with him. Strange that he did not mention this to you!

cc: S. Trahern ✓

005453 DEC 13 91

[REDACTED]
Carmel, CA. 93922
December 4, 1991

Mr. Brian Lamb - "Book Notes"
C-Span Suite 155
400 N. Capitol St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Brian:

It was with great interest that I watched "Book Notes", 12-1- 91, with Gary Sick discussing his book, October Surprise. When Barbara Honegger's name was mentioned, Mr. Sick stated that he disagreed with many of her views. Why didn't you ask him to state those issues????

I have asked you to have Ms Honegger on "Book Notes" ever since her book "October Surprise" was published in 1989, to no avail. Despite Washington perceptions engineered by the White House, Miss Honegger's credentials, like Gary Sick, include professional White House service as a policy analyst, and distinguished service as a research associate at the Hoover Institute.

Again, contrary to engineered Washington's perception that Barbara Honegger is a "kook", Gary Sick's research has confirmed her interpretation of history. Several of Mr. Sick's main sources for information used in his book, were the same sources used first by Barbara in her book. Either he, Gary Sick, is also a "kook", or she is decidedly not one. You can't have it both ways!

Barbara Honegger has been unfairly slandered from so many directions! The Republicans are very quick to wave the News Week and the New Republic October Surprise articles to the C-Span cameras, and of course you, Brian, held them up for the viewers. The reason I mention this at all is, in my opinion, if you really care about being fair, you would not hesitate one minute to invite her to appear on Book Notes!! She can give your viewers an up-date to her book, "October Surprise", as well as her very important step by step rebuttal to the News Week article. She is now in the process of writing her rebuttal to the New Republic, and undoubtedly would complete it by the time you invited her to appear on Book Notes.

By the way, Gary Sick had in his possession a copy of her rebuttal at the time of your interview with him. Strange that he did not mention this to you!

Also, Barbara Honegger's book, "October Surprise" is still available, and she can tell your viewers how and where it can be purchased. She may be reached at her home phone - - [REDACTED] or her business phone - - [REDACTED] Extension [REDACTED]

I am including with this letter a copy for you of her rebuttal to the News Week article.

IN the interest of having well-informed viewers, I remain

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

November 6, 1991

TO: NEWSWEEK Editor, and all authors and researchers
of Nov, 11 cover story, "The October Surprise"

FROM: Barbara Honegger, Author of OCTOBER SURPRISE
(Tudor, 1989) [REDACTED]

RE: Blatant disregard for facts and irresponsible
bias of your Nov. 11 cover story, "The October
Surprise"

cc: House Rules Committee; Speaker Thomas Foley;
Rep. Lee Hamilton; Sen. Terry Sanford; Rep.
Butler Derrick; Prof. Gary Sick; Representatives
and Senators appointed to the House and Senate
October Surprise investigations; Mr. Abolhassan
Bani-Sadr; other interested parties

It is indeed unfortunate for your readership, the American public and the U.S. Congress that, in its "long investigation including interviews with government officials and other knowledgeable sources," NEWSWEEK did not find the time to contact me--author of the first article and book on the subject and a member of the 1980 Reagan-Bush campaign and White House staff--to check the alleged facts of your Nov. 11 cover story. "The October Surprise." Had you done so, NEWSWEEK would have identified the following factual errors and material omissions before rushing to press before the vote of the House Rules Committee on whether to authorize an official investigation into charges that Rep. Henry Gonzalez has said may plunge the U.S. government into "the greatest Constitutional crisis since the Civil War":

1) On p. 21, NEWSWEEK misstates that I, Ms. Honegger, claimed "in the summer of 1987" that I had been told by a Reagan-Bush campaign staffer in late October 1980, "We don't have to worry about an October Surprise. Dick cut a deal." I first made this claim publicly not in 1987, but in December 1986--immediately following the initial Irangate press reports that finally made sense of my earlier campaign experience. The first public reference to the results of this experience was on the Larry King Show, in early December 1986. Had NEWSWEEK bothered to check with me, you would have known this.

2) On p. 21, NEWSWEEK misstates that the staffer who told me this was a "he." Had you taken the time to call me, or read my book OCTOBER SURPRISE, you would have known that this was a she, not a he. You would also have known that this staffer worked in the campaign for Vice Presidential candidate Bush's former policy director, Stephan Halper, who went on to found Palmer National Bank in Washington, D.C.,

the bank which channeled many of Oliver North's Irangate funds. You would have also known that Mr. Halper asked the campaign's Iran expert and Bush aide, Mr. Michel Smith, to research ways to respond to a Carter October Surprise (pp. 28-29 of my book) and for information on Sadegh Ghotbzadeh, then Iran's foreign minister, who (Ghotbzadeh) wrote a public letter dated Aug. 16, 1980 to the Iranian Parliament informing it that representatives of the U.S. Republican party were then trying to delay release of the U.S. hostages. This Ghotbzadeh letter, significantly, was written contemporaneously with, or just after, the reported mid-August 1980 meeting(s) in Madrid amongst campaign manager William Casey and Iranians Cyrus Hashemi and Mehdi Karrubi at which, according to "Nightline" and Cyrus' brother Jamshid, the principle of an arms for hostages delay was concretized. Text from this "smoking gun" Ghotbzadeh letter was reprinted in the Iranian newspaper ENGELABI ISLAMI ("ISLAMIC REVOLUTION") on Sept. 11, 1980. Speaker Foley, Rep. Hamilton, Rep. Toricelli, Rep. Derrick, and others in Congress have all been provided copies. Had you called me, NEWSWEEK would have also learned that the campaign's Iran expert and associate of Mr. Halper, Michel Smith, was aware of approaches by Houshang Lavi, the Iranian arms dealer acknowledged to have offered an arms-for-hostages deal on or about Oct. 2, 1980 to Richard Allen, Robert McFarlane (then working for Sen. Tower) and Laurence Silberman representing the Reagan-Bush campaign.

3) On p. 21, NEWSWEEK states that I met Mr. Brenneke in Washington, D.C. in August 1988, without mentioning that I was first introduced to Mr. Brenneke by one of your own then reporter/writers, Robert Parry--certainly a substantive omission. The precise date was August 22, 1988. NEWSWEEK goes on in this paragraph to misstate that Brenneke then claimed to me that "he had been present when the deal was done." Had you bothered to contact me, or read my book (pp. 67-69 and Chapter VII), you would have known that Mr. Brenneke specifically first stated to me in August 1988 in Washington that he had NOT been present at reported Paris meetings with Mr. Casey (he later changed his story). NEWSWEEK also misleads the reader into believing that Mr. Brenneke ever said that he was personally present at an Oct. 19, 1980 meeting at the Hotel Raphael. Mr. Brenneke has always claimed that he was NOT at this reported meeting, but only that he heard about it after the fact. He has instead claimed that he was present at a subsequent meeting on or about Oct. 20, 1980, at the Hotel Florida.

4) The most outrageously false statement in your cover story is that "Brenneke confirmed what Honegger already thought: William Casey...had represented the Reagan-Bush campaign." Not only is it a truly amazing feat that NEWSWEEK could be able to determine what anyone THINKS without bothering to even communicate with them orally. Had you read my book (p. 174), in the public domain now for three years, you would have easily learned that I specifically did NOT think that William Casey was involved at all before Mr. Brenneke raised it on Aug. 22, 1988. This revelation, in fact, came as a complete surprise, and I say so in my book.

5) Next, also on p. 21. NEWSWEEK gets the chronological order of my interview with Mr. Brenneke and the release of the PLAYBOY article quoting Mr. Bani Sadr backwards. Mr. Bani Sadr did not "expand his previous story" "two weeks later." as you report. Although the PLAYBOY issue with the Hoffman/Silvers article, "An Election Held Hostage" you refer to was dated October 1988, it was in fact already on the stands in late August 1988, and was placed in front of the podium at my videotaped press conference on October Surprise held at the National Press Club on August 25, 1988. How, with eleven researchers and writers on the story and months of work, did NEWSWEEK manage to get something so simple as the order of these public events so wrong?

Had NEWSWEEK bothered to check with Mr. Bani Sadr before going to press, you would have also learned that the core claim of the NEW REPUBLIC article on October Surprise (Nov. 18, 1991 issue) you refer to on p. 21, that Bani Sadr "retracted his claim that Bush was present (in Paris)" is completely in error. Mr. Bani Sadr has NEVER claimed that he knew that Mr. Bush was in Paris, or in any other way personally involved in October Surprise negotiations, and released a statement countering the NEW REPUBLIC piece to Associated Press in Paris on Nov. 2 making that clear, before you went to press. In my five years of interviewing and corresponding with Mr. Bani Sadr, he has always made it explicitly clear that he had REPORTS of same, but NO KNOWLEDGE, and has always held that he was misquoted by PLAYBOY. I have arranged for a copy (in the original French) of Mr. Bani Sadr's Nov. 2, 1991 statement to Associated Press to be faxed to the House Rules Committee.

In other words, Mr. Bani-Sadr not only did not "expand" his October Surprise information to include the claim that George Bush was in Paris "two weeks after" my first meetings with Mr. Brenneke--NEWSWEEK got the order wrong--Mr. Bani-Sadr never made such a claim AT ALL. Like any researcher, he has sometimes referred to reports of others.

6) On p. 22, NEWSWEEK quotes from the transcript of Mr. Brenneke's sworn in-camera statement to the judge after the trial of Heinrich Rupp, that Rupp flew "Mr. Bush, Mr. Casey and a number of other people to Paris, France, from the U.S. for a meeting with Iranian representatives," while omitting the material fact that, once he had obtained a copy of that same transcript, Mr. Brenneke quickly wrote to Judge Carrigan making it clear that he, Brenneke, had been misquoted by the court reporter in the transcript and that he had NOT said that Mr. Rupp flew Mr. Bush. This clarification letter by Mr. Brenneke to Judge Carrigan was submitted in evidence in Mr. Brenneke's own trial in April-May 1990. which Mr. Brenneke won. Was NEWSWEEK aware of this correction by Mr. Brenneke of his transcript record after the Rupp trial,

or did NEWSWEEK just decide to leave it out?

7) On p. 22, NEWSWEEK commits serious material omissions of fact in reporting on the Brenneke trial. You mention Mr. Gregg's claim that he was not in Paris on Oct. 19 or 20, but leave out the fact that his personal calendar, obtained by the FBI, was BLANK for Oct. 20 (I have made this available to Congressional investigators); and that the only alibi "evidence" Gregg submitted to counter Brenneke's claim--photographs of his allegedly having been at a beach cottage on the days in question--were determined by a professional weather man and defense witness to HAVE BEEN TAKEN NOT THEN, BUT AT SOME OTHER TIME.

NEWSWEEK reports that two Secret Service agents "said they were guarding Bush" at the time, without mentioning that, in cross-examination, these agents acknowledged that they did NOT see Mr. Bush at all times and could not even be sure of the days they had guarded him. NEWSWEEK also failed to mention that the Secret Service records for Mr. Bush are grossly contradictory, placing him arriving at a single event at two different times (impossible), while others state that "Security" was "N/A" (not applicable). Or that the government provided NO such Secret Service records at Mr. Brenneke's trial to contradict his claims. Had NEWSWEEK bothered to read my book, OCTOBER SURPRISE (pp. 98-105), based upon a detailed analysis of Mr. Bush's actual Secret Service records released under F.O.I.A., you would have known that they cannot be relied on as proof of anything. Also, why did NEWSWEEK choose not to report the four or five changing "alibis" Mr. Bush's office has so far put out to cover his alleged activities for the dates in question, Oct. 18-19, 1980?

8) On p. 22, NEWSWEEK reports that Mr. Ari Ben-Menashe "first surfaced as an October Surprise source in 1990," which is off BY FOUR YEARS. Had you bothered to read my book (pp. 248-250), you would have known that one of TIME magazine's top Iran/contra reporter/writers had the October Surprise story and its links to the later Irangate period arms deals in late APRIL 1986--one month before the McFarlane/North/Nir trip to Tehran--but that the article was censored just before it was to have gone to press. That TIME reporter, whose name I left out of the book to protect him (he lost his job anyway), Raji Samghabadi, informed me in early Sept. 1987 in his office at TIME-LIFE headquarters in New York that he had had at least five U.S. and Israeli intelligence sources for that censored story. One of those was ARI BEN MENASHE. Years later, in 1990, when Ben Menashe was unsuccessfully sued by the federal government for illegally shipping planes to Iran, his SOLE defense witness was none other than Raji Samghabadi.

Again, not only did NEWSWEEK get it wrong: your news weekly did not even try to contact those individuals who could have assisted you to get it right.

9) On p. 22, NEWSWEEK attempts to make much of the fact that Ari Ben Menashe claims that the Iran delegation in Paris was "led" by the Ayatollah Mehdi Karrubi, not Cyrus Hashemi and Manucher Gorbaniyar, as claimed by Richard Brenneke; and that Ben Menashe mentions hotel meeting locations different from those named by Brenneke. First, who "leads" a meeting is something very much open to interpretation and differing opinion. Second, NEWSWEEK, failed to mention that, even when Brenneke changed his original story and began claiming that he was present at a negotiating session in Paris, that he consistently maintained that there were numerous OTHER meetings with principals at which he was NOT present, but about which he was informed, and that these meetings occurred at a number of different hotels. The claims of Mr. Brenneke and Mr. Ben Menashe, therefore, are not necessarily inconsistent, and NEWSWEEK is not necessarily correct in stating, on p. 24, that "one of the two men is lying." NEWSWEEK'S introductory paragraph on p. 24, under the head "Meetings and Mixed Messages," also misses the key point that numerous sources have consistently claimed a SERIES of meetings, EACH, in both Madrid AND in Paris.

10) On p. 24, NEWSWEEK mentions that Madrid Plaza Hotel records confirm an "A. Hashemi" and "Jamshid Hashemi" as guests in July 1980, but fails to add that the same hotel records show that a "Robert Gray" was also a guest. Robert Gray was a top official in the 1980 Reagan-Bush campaign under campaign manager William Casey.

11) On p. 24, NEWSWEEK mentions that Jamshid Hashemi would not appear on camera for "Nightline" or "Frontline." Would you want the world to know what you looked like if, in your opinion, your brother had been murdered?

Immediately after this, NEWSWEEK states that Jamshid Hashemi met with his brother, Cyrus, and then Reagan-Bush campaign manager William Casey in Washington, D.C., in March or April 1980. Had you contacted me, or read my book, or read or referenced HIDDEN POWER by Roland Perry, you would have known the significance of the timing of this early meeting. For it was in March of 1980 that the Reagan campaign's high-tech pollsters determined, in the "October Surprise" computer study, that Carter would win the election FOR CERTAIN if he successfully brought the U.S. hostages home within a crucial "window of vulnerability" which opened Oct. 18, 1980 and closed Oct. 25, 1980. Not coincidentally, reported October Surprise pilot Heinrich Rupp claims that he flew Casey to Paris on the OPENING night of that very "window of vulnerability"--October 18, 1980. The reported Paris meetings also fall squarely within this "window," which the campaign leadership approached with utter dread, especially after learning that Khomeini's negotiator, Sadeh Tabatabai, had shocked Carter's negotiator, Warren Christopher, in Bonn, West Germany in mid-September 1980 by stating that Khomeini was prepared to release the hostages to Carter BEFORE the election, given an acceptable agreement on financial arrangements, etc.

6

12) On p. 24, NEWSWEEK's analysis accounting for Casey's whereabouts in London fails to draw the obvious conclusion that July 27 is NOT accounted for. After eleven years, Jamshid Hashemi may have well misremembered that there were two morning sessions, rather than just one. Alternatively, NEWSWEEK's accounting does not rule out the possibility that one of the two morning sessions in Paris may have occurred BEFORE one of the morning sessions in London, especially on July 30. Madrid is only 80 minutes from London by plane. The record of the July 28-29-30 London meetings attended by Casey, reproduced on p. 22, also has varying marks for Mr. Casey (and others). What is the significance of an "X" versus a check, and of the few check-AND-cross marks? This record purports to show that Mr. Casey attended all the sessions on the 30th in London, including the closing session, although NEWSWEEK states on p. 24 that he was interviewed by ABC News in Arlington, Virginia on the 30th without giving the time, E.S.T. This time is critical for determining the accuracy, or not, of the conference attendance record. NEWSWEEK reports on p. 24 that records show Mr. Casey with a room at the Royal Army Medical College for the night of July 27 and 28, without noting that there is no record for the night of July 29--implying that Mr. Casey was elsewhere--perhaps Madrid? This would fit with an early morning meeting--the "second morning session" recalled by Jamshid Hashemi--before the July 30 morning session in London. Thus, NEWSWEEK's conclusion on p. 24, that there is "no possibility that Casey could have held meetings with anyone on two successive days (mornings) in Madrid" is NOT necessarily correct. NEWSWEEK also failed to report that Ed Meese, then the campaign's chief of staff, recently made the flat--and obviously false--public statement that Mr. Casey had not left the country AT ALL during the campaign.

13) On p. 24, NEWSWEEK refers to a recent (Sept. 10, 1991) article in the VILLAGE VOICE by former CIA analyst Frank Snapp, attempting to claim that Brenneke could not have been in Paris on Oct. 19-20, because credit card receipts and calendar notes place him instead in Seattle, Washington on Oct. 17-19 and in Portland, Oregon on Oct. 20, 1980. A careful reading of the VOICE article, however, reveals that Snapp specifically claims, based on these records, that Brenneke "at a judo tournament" in Seattle while he has said he was in Paris. I spoke with Mr. Snapp to get more specifics, and was told by him that the records--which he would not provide to check Brenneke's alleged signature against signatures I have of his made in my presence--showed that Brenneke attended a kendo (not judo) tournament in Seattle while he said he was in Paris. I personally spent two weeks tracking down and interviewing kendo masters in both Seattle and Portland, as well as members of Brenneke's Portland Obukan Kendo Club, to which he belonged at the time of this tournament, and spoke with four eyewitnesses to the tournament. Two recalled Brenneke present on Saturday, Oct. 18, but to the person they

7

all insisted that he was NOT present at all on Oct. 19; and there was no tournament or testing on Oct. 20. Snepp had not contacted any of these sources. As for the purported credit card and hotel records for Oct. 19, Brenneke told me in an interview after the VOICE article was published that he had told Snepp, as he did me, that there is a "second set of records." Snepp did not report this, but mentioned it only as a POSSIBILITY in his closing paragraph. Snepp is also not just a journalist. On the night of August 25, 1988, following my press conference on October Surprise in Washington, D.C., which Snepp attended, he stated to me flatly that I should stop investigating the October Surprise because, by doing so, I was (inadvertently) "interfering with an ongoing covert operation."

14) Again, on p. 24, NEWSWEEK states that Secret Service records provide "solid evidence" that George Bush could not have been in Paris on Oct. 19 or 20, 1980, without mentioning any of the internal inconsistencies in those very records detailed at the end of Chapter II of my book, OCTOBER SURPRISE. NEWSWEEK also cites what the logs show for Mr. Bush for every night but THE critical night--Oct. 18, 1980. Secret Service records for Oct. 18, in fact, END with Mr. Bush's arrival at Washington, D.C. National Airport. It was that very night which was both the opening of the dreaded October Surprise "window of vulnerability" and also the night that Iranian Prime Minister Mohammad Ali Rajai, one of Khomeini's designated hostage negotiators, left New York after having been at the United Nations for three days, during which time he refused to meet with Pres. Carter or his representatives. And self-proclaimed October Surprise pilot Heinrich Rupp has stated that Mr. Bush WAS IN NEW YORK on that night, Oct. 18, 1980. In my book, I state, at the end of Chapter II, that, whereas it is unlikely that Mr. Bush was in Paris, it is highly probable that he met with Rajai in New York after leaving National Airport on the night of October 18, 1980.

15) On p. 24, NEWSWEEK mentions that the Secret Service records show Mr. Bush delivering a speech before the Zionist Organization of America in Washington, D.C. on the night of Oct. 19, without also mentioning that one Secret Service record puts Mr. Bush arriving at the hotel for that speech at 7:00 p.m. while ANOTHER Secret Service record has him arriving at the same hotel for the same speech at 8:12 p.m. So much for the reliability of Secret Service records.

16) On p. 26, NEWSWEEK makes the false statement that the October Surprise theory rests on "the notion that Iran must have gotten U.S. weapons from the Reagan Administration..." In the central chapters of my book, based on records and interviews, I make clear that the arms came from numerous sources, not just from the U.S.--including Israel, Taiwan, South Korea, Eastern bloc countries, and, most significantly, NATO stores in Europe. It is interesting that NEWSWEEK, also on p. 26,

8

then states that the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's research shows that Iran spent approximately \$5 billion on arms between 1980 and 1983, because Robert McFarlane was reported to have been tape recorded during his and North's secret trip to Tehran in late May 1986 reminding the Iranians of a promise of arms of precisely this dollar amount--\$5 billion (Associated Press, 11/29/86, quoting a report in the Greek publication, DIMIKRATIKOS LOGOS, of the same date). \$5 billion also happens to be the approximate difference between the amount of Iran's assets frozen by President Carter and the amount Iran finally agreed to have returned to it, or go to pay off loans, in the Algiers Accord--probably not a coincidence.

17) On p. 25, NEWSWEEK attempts to make light of the fact that Carter's negotiations on the hostages broke down in October 1980, laying this to a diversion of attention by Iran's leaders to the just-begun war with Iraq. NEWSWEEK fails to mention, however, that Iran needed U.S. arms and spare parts at this very time more than ever (Bani Sadr estimated that Iran had only a week's worth of armaments when the war broke out on Sept. 22, 1980), and that shipments of U.S. arms began flowing to Iran through Israel one day after the reported Paris meetings of Oct. 19-21, 1980. NEWSWEEK also states that then speaker of the parliament, Hashemi Rafsanjani (reported to be Cyrus Hashemi's cousin) "tried to resolve the hostage impasse while Carter was still in power." This could not be further from the truth. In fact, a vote on releasing the hostages--for which there was a clear majority in the Majlis, Iran's parliament--was repeatedly delayed until AFTER the Oct. 18-25 "window of vulnerability" was past, and even actively boycotted by hard-line religious mullahs in late October. The Majlis, which Rafsanjani headed, did not take up the question until Nov. 2--three days AFTER William Casey bragged to top Reagan-Bush campaign officials in Washington, D.C. that "if Carter wins now, it won't be because of the hostages" (HIDDEN POWER, by Roland Perry). It is also quite amazing, as NEWSWEEK reports, that Mr. Eric Rouleau "heard no gossip" about a hostage deal with the Reagan campaign at the time, as I have numerous letters from ordinary Iranian businessmen stating that it was common knowledge in Iran BEFORE the election Iran that the hostages would not be released until after Reagan's inauguration; yet for Reagan to HAVE an inauguration required the hostages not be released to Carter before the ELECTION.

NEWSWEEK's closing proposal that Khomeini's nephew or Iran's President Bani Sadr mistook President Carter for candidate Ronald Reagan is farfetched indeed--rather like mistaking George McGovern for Barry Goldwater. For one, Mr. Bani Sadr has categorically ruled out this possibility. It is far more likely, as I point out in my book, OCTOBER SURPRISE, that Cyrus Hashemi was actually a double agent at the July 1-2, 1980 meeting in Madrid. After all, he

had already met with Reagan-Bush campaign manager William Casey in Washington, D.C. in March or April. Secretary of State Muskie, after all, was identified under oath by Richard Allen in Brenneke's trial as one of Allen's sources inside the Carter Administration for information on the hostage situation; and Mr. Muskie was conveniently named one of three members of the Tower Commission, with McFarlane mentor Brent Scowcroft and Senator Tower, for whom McFarlane worked in October 1980 when he (McFarlane) attended the acknowledged arms-for-hostages-offer meeting in Washington, D.C. with Richard Allen and Laurence Silberman. And the "nephew" in question--the son of Khomeini's elder brother, Pasandideh--is alive and well and living in Iran. What, if anything, has he told NEWSWEEK about mistaking Ronald Reagan for President Carter?

18) On p. 19, under the head "Going Mainstream," NEWSWEEK correctly reports that the first U.S. article on possible untoward interference in President Carter's hostage negotiations, involving Henry Kissinger, was in the Dec. 2, 1980 issue of EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW, a publication associated with Lyndon LaRouche (Mr. Bani Sadr was in print in France beginning in 1981). What NEWSWEEK fails to report is the close relationship between the LaRouche organization and the C.I.A. under William Casey in the early years of the Reagan-Bush Administration and that the first official act of the Administration the morning after the Oct. 5, 1986 downing of Hassenfus' plane in Central America--the event which triggered the Iran/contra affair--was a massive SWAT team raid of the offices of EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW in Leesburg, Virginia, on Oct. 6, 1986: and that Oliver North, whose former Vietnam buddy headed that raid, began "cleaning things up" the same morning, at William Casey's urging. As personally repugnant as I find the writings of Lyndon LaRouche, it is nevertheless a fact that one of his handful of aides currently in prison as a result of what is alleged to be a government frame-up is the author of that Dec. 2, 1980 EIR piece on the October Surprise.

19) Finally, it is flatly incorrect that I "compared details" and "swapped stories" with Richard Brenneke, Ari Ben Menashe and Jamshid Hashemi. I am a journalist and author, and Richard Brenneke was a source. Period. I did not know of the existence of, or speak with, Ari Ben Menashe until this year, 1991--three years after the publication of my book, OCTOBER SURPRISE, and five years after beginning my research on the subject. And I have never met with, nor spoken to, Jamshid Hashemi.

The simple truth is, the "conspiracy theory run wild" is not mine, or any other serious researcher's, but NEWSWEEK's.