



[Redacted]
Insurance Broker

[Redacted]
Chicago IL 60614-1831

Tel. [Redacted]
Fax. [Redacted]

December 22, 1933

Director of News
C-SPAN
444 N. Capitol Street, NW
Suite 412
Washington DC 20001

Dear Director of News:

The American people have given to the news media an enormous power to investigate public officials. In return, some in the media have turned this power to investigate into a power to create scandal, often based on orchestrated innuendoes and allegations. Pursuing information about the sexual lives of our Presidents should not be central to the right of freedom of the press. However, since the media's scrutiny of public officials often focuses on scandal and sex, the time has come to level the playing field. We need to know more about the private lives of media owners, publishers, editors and reporters, including their sexual habits.

Congress should establish a special branch of the FBI to investigate the private lives and sexual habits of people in the media. The time has come to do this because it is increasingly difficult in America to differentiate journalism from propaganda and character assassination. This special FBI branch also should have the power to investigate the private lives and sexual habits of CEOs and major stockholders in large public corporations and banks, as well as top management in pension funds, mutual funds and all other financial institutions that handle public money. If sexual preferences are to become a standard of performance in this country for public officials, then it is only fair to use sex as a standard for rating the performance of those who report the activities of public officials and those who handle public money, which affects our economic destiny. I urge C-SPAN to support this special investigatory branch of the FBI. I will send this letter to other newspapers and television stations urging that they also give their support to this idea.

If, as many of us believe, power can corrupt and absolute power can corrupt absolutely, then the power of the media to report or create scandals about public officials is dangerous. For example, Thomas Paine was a champion of the Common Man during the late 1700s in America, and also a believer in human rights, freedom and equality. In 1946, one

[REDACTED]
Insurance Broker

[REDACTED]
Chicago IL 60614-1831

Tel. [REDACTED]

Fax. [REDACTED]

of Paine's biographers, W. E. Woodward, wrote that Paine was a victim of scandal. Woodward said that "well-to-do notables" wanted to create a republic of aristocracy and wealth in America and found Paine's views a hindrance. Once independence from England was achieved, these aristocrats "actually hired experts in defamation--mud-slingers of the press and unprincipled public speakers--to destroy Paine's reputation."

Since some in the media have their own agenda, the power to create scandal can be used as a form of institutional blackmail by the press over our elected representatives. To establish some balance of power, a special branch of the FBI would provide the public with information about the private lives of media owners and editors, giving us a better picture of motives in any public scandals. It also should serve to neutralize any abuse of power by the media.

The best place to start is with The American Spectator. We should be given information about the private lives and sexual habits of R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr., as editor-in-chief, and of his investigative reporter, David Brock. The American Spectator is in need of money, as you can tell from a recent letter Tyrrell wrote to subscribers asking for financial contributions. In the letter, a copy of which is enclosed, he notes that the contribution can be tax deductible as a donation to an educational foundation set up by the Spectator. The public deserves to know all about this educational foundation. Is it legal, and, if so, why is it legal?

In his letter, Tyrrell refers to "the dominant liberal media." Presumably, conservatives would love to know more about the private lives and sexual habits of liberals in the media. Those Americans who believe the media is owned and controlled by a ruling upper class would be delighted to find out about the private lives and sexual habits of America's ruling class. This should mean a wide spectrum of support for a special branch of the FBI to investigate media owners and editors.

Very truly yours,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Encl.

THE AMERICAN SPECTATOR®

2020 N. 14th Street, P.O. Box 549, Arlington, Virginia 22216-0549

R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.
Editor-in-Chief

November, 1993

Dear Subscriber:

As I write you this letter, Thanksgiving is just around the corner.

Despite the Clintons' occupation of our nation's center stage, we at the American Spectator are thankful for many things.

Chief among them is the help and support that you, as a subscriber, have given to our joint enterprise.

For that commitment and support, we owe you a tremendous debt of thanks.

We are also grateful that 1993 has been a year of continued circulation growth. This speaks to the power of the conservative ideas, values and principles that are the underpinning of our editorial product. It is clear to me that our President's accidental winning percentage of 43% of the vote last year reflects the fact that his cultural, social and economic values are held by a minority of Americans.

Looking back at the Spectator's accomplishments for Year One of the Clinton Era, I am particularly pleased with the impact that our investigative pieces have had in the battle of ideas we are fighting against the dominant liberal media.

If you will help us by joining the Spectator's family of financial contributors today, we can have an even greater impact in that battle next year.

Just a year or two ago, we were lucky if we could afford to commission a handful of in-depth investigative articles.

Of course, those we did publish had tremendous impact, especially David Brock's March 1992 "The Real Anita Hill," which stripped away the mask of liberal hypocrisy and exposed one of the biggest political frauds of our time.

The reverberations from that one piece are still echoing throughout the country today. It is not an exaggeration to say that the Hill-Thomas confrontation may have defined for our generation the nature of the battle we are waging just as the confrontation between Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss did for an earlier generation of American conservatives.

In 1993, through the generosity of our contributors, we have continued to expose, with more investigative articles, the lies, hypocrisies and real motivations behind the actions of America's cultural and governmental elites.

Reports such as Daniel Wattenberg's piece on the Waco massacre (August), Lisa Schiffren's expose of our First Couple's free and easy life at the public trough (August) and Yale Kramer's analysis of the gay-rights movement as expressed through its Broadway propaganda plays (July) skillfully deal with topics that simply would not be touched by other major national publications.

Each of these articles will have a long-term impact on how a growing number of our fellow citizens perceive specific issues. In the war of ideas being waged in a democracy, nothing is more important.

1994 is a year in which the President's policies and the stewardship of the majority Party in Congress will be judged by the voters. The most important task for the Spectator is to continue to dig deep, investing in stories that the one-party media ignores and aggressively marketing those stories to as many of our fellow citizens as we can afford to reach.

To achieve this goal for 1994, I must look to readers of the Spectator like you to deepen your commitment by making a tax-deductible contribution to support our investigative projects.

I regret that I have to turn to our readers, but the need to raise money beyond our subscription and advertising revenues is a reality that the Spectator, and indeed every American journal of opinion, has to face.

Another reality of publishing an opinion magazine is that advertisers shy away from placing their ads with us, because of the perceived "controversial" nature of our editorial product.

If we were to continually increase our subscription rates to cover the cost of doing business, we would inevitably lose readers -- and that, considering the Spectator has a mission beyond making money, is not an option.

Thanks largely to the continued success of our advertising with Rush Limbaugh, our circulation has hit an all-time high.

Nevertheless, increased readership does not yield more disposable income to our publication.

We are obligated to hold in reserve certain amounts of every subscription check as "deferred subscriptions liability." We are regularly assaulted by the U.S. Postal Service, whose voracious appetite for increases in postage rates is matched only by concomitant decreases in the speed of delivery, both of our magazine itself and of the direct mailings we use to recruit new subscribers. Furthermore, the expanded number of pages in our issues result in expanded paper bills from our printer each month.

This is not to say that smaller is better. I would be the last person to wish the Spectator back to the days of 30,000 subscribers.

I think it is important for you to know why, as a partner with me in the Spectator, we need to look for financial help from friends like you to carry out and expand our mission.

In 1994 I would like to continue letting our full-time investigative writers (David Brock and Daniel Wattenberg) follow their own instincts as to stories they want to pursue and write.

I would also like to be able to expand our staff and have another good investigative reporter on hand to undertake certain stories I believe need to be written.

One focus that I have in mind for 1994 is a series of stories on "Clinton's Zoo" -- that oddball collection of tokens, Carter retreats and left-wing zanies that comprise our President's Cabinet.

And I also believe that it is necessary to re-focus attention on the corruption rampant on Capitol Hill, in time for one of our stories to have a beneficial impact on voters before November.

Operating as we do, however, on a shoestring editorial budget, it simply will not be possible for us to invest in another full time investigative writer without your help.

Ron Burr, our publisher, has estimated that to hire a new writer, with the necessary expenses attendant upon researching investigative stories, will require us to raise an additional \$85,000 above our 1994 budget.

To help us raise that money, I sincerely hope that you will be able to make a tax-deductible contribution to the Spectator today.

Although I hesitate to ask for a specific contribution amount from you, we will need a significant group of our friends to contribute at least \$100 to the Spectator now. If you could make a contribution of that much, or even more if possible, I would be especially grateful to you.

Whatever you can contribute, I believe that it will be an investment with benefits you will enjoy in every 1994 issue of our magazine.

Thanks to your support as one of our subscribers, the Spectator has become an influential voice for the conservative ideas and principles that still receive short shrift in the majority media. I hope today that you may deepen your commitment to the Spectator's mission in 1994.

Sincerely,

R. Emmett Tyrrell Jr.

R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.
Editor-in-Chief

P.S. It almost goes without saying that thanks to President Clinton's economic plan, there are fewer and fewer tax deductions still available to us. One of the last remaining ones is a contribution made to the Spectator, through our Educational Foundation. I do hope you will take advantage of that deduction before the year is out! Again, thank you.

P.P.S. Ron Burr and I don't believe we need to encourage friends like you to help the Spectator. But we are so committed to expanding our investigative reporting abilities that if you can contribute \$50 or more to the Spectator now, we would like to send you a special token of our gratitude and appreciation.

Tom Paine

America's Godfather

1737



1809

By **W. E. WOODWARD**

author of **NEW AMERICAN HISTORY,**
THE WAY OUR PEOPLE LIVED, etc.

ILLUSTRATED

nial people were strained to keep up the military enlistments, to supply the fighting patriots with food, clothes and arms. Toward this end Paine's writings were an inspiration of tremendous vitality. We are beginning only now, in our present generation, to realize the full extent of his influence and to accept the historical fact that he kept the American Revolution from breaking down under the weight of defeat, hunger and discord.

With independence won, and the Colonies free of the mother country, the great landowners, the aristocrats, and their henchmen applied themselves to the formation of a new nation. What they had in mind was a republic of aristocracy and wealth, with all the power in the hands of the upper class. Paine soon found himself out of favor as an outsider whose ideas were unacceptable. He was so much concerned with the condition of the underdog in the political and economic scheme, and so outspoken about it that he was looked upon as a dangerous disturber, a jackass who did not have enough sense to keep still, but kept up his braying in season and out of season. There is a time for everything, they said, and while Paine had accomplished a great deal in the movement for independence, he should not attempt to interfere with things which did not concern him.

It was not easy to smear this outspoken, eloquent and brilliant advocate of the common man, for his career was an open book. He had nothing to conceal in his public or private life; there was nothing about him that was deceitful, or wicked or dishonest. The profits earned by his books, which ran into such huge editions, would have made him rich if he had kept them, but he turned them over to the cause of liberty. He was a poor man. He had no love affairs, no secret amours. He did not engage in dubious business transactions. He was so utterly outspoken and unafraid of the truth that he never dreamed of lying about anything, though a little diplomatic playing with genteel and social lies would have been very helpful to him in his career.

What could be done to destroy the reputation of a man of this type? By what form of skillful disparagement could the

public be led to consider Thomas Paine a disreputable, worthless nobody? These questions ran in the minds of men like Gouverneur Morris, Fisher Ames, and other well-to-do notables who looked upon Paine and his views as dangerous. To bring him into disrepute was one of their practical problems and they handled it in a practical way.

They encouraged and, in some instances, actually hired experts in defamation—mud-slingers of the press and unprincipled public speakers—to destroy Paine's reputation. The first thing these specialists in the art of slander did was to create a general impression that Paine was a slobbering drunkard who mumbled in his speech and reeled when he walked.

It is true that he drank whisky, wine and beer, like every other man of the period. A teetotaler, if one could have been found in that liquorish era, would have been considered hardly human. Men got drunk as a matter of course, and that includes preachers as well as laymen, professors as well as students, bankers as well as paupers, senators and voters, mechanics and their employers, sailors and soldiers.

But the experts in the art of slander seized upon Paine's drinking and depicted him as a filthy sot who did not keep himself clean. He stank, they said; his clothes were rags; he was drunk all the time—morning, noon and night—not just in the evening when a gentleman was supposed to be tipsy.

If Thomas Paine had drunk even half the liquor that they said he drank he never could have written anything, but would have died of delirium tremens before he had reached middle age.

His detractors succeeded in destroying his reputation both before and after his death. For a hundred years, or thereabouts, his memory was held in contempt by most Americans. The young people were brought up either in ignorance of what Paine did to help in the War for Independence; or, on the other hand, they were taught all the slanders that have been tacked on to his memory. Public speakers and candidates for office made it a point never to quote from his writings in making their orations, even when such a quotation would be illuminating, for

Seventeen-year-old Tom slipped out of the house with a little bundle of clothes and made his way to Harwich to unite his fortunes with those of *Terrible* and Death. He had not been long on his way before his father learned about it and set forth in pursuit.

Tom reached Harwich, volunteered, was accepted and had a square meal which was hardly over before his father arrived. Captain Death gave him up and Joseph and his son left for home and more staymaking.

The ship sailed on her cruise. In the course of time she encountered a French warship, and in the ensuing battle the *Terrible* was disastrously defeated, losing one hundred and seventy-five of her two hundred men. When Paine heard of it he called himself lucky, and thereafter when he found himself in a desperate situation he relied on luck to save him. And luck did just that, on several occasions.

Two years later, in 1756, he went away again without his father's permission and joined the privateer *King of Prussia*, commanded by a Captain Mendez. Of this adventure nothing whatever is known except the bare fact that he went to sea on that ship. Paine would never say anything about it, but his attitude in respect to this particular exploit is not at all remarkable. He was as reticent about it as about everything that concerned his personal life.

The tendency to falsify the facts about Paine is so well-established and deep-seated that it may be described as a literary disease. It was started by Paine's enemies while he was still living and its purpose was to destroy his influence upon the people by casting aspersions upon his character and his motives. To do that it was necessary to make Paine appear despicable. Today this tendency is still active, and one of its curious features is that it appears frequently in the utterances of Paine's ardent admirers, as well as in the attitude of his enemies. As late as 1941 an author who is undoubtedly an enthusiastic believer in him and his works wrote a novel in which Paine is the central figure. In the course of the narrative the author describes young Tom's life aboard the privateer. The account is purely fanciful and