Early Risers Get News Show on NBC Starting in July

New York—On July 5, NBC will inaugurate a new early-morning news program called Early Today, which most affiliates will broadcast at 6:30 A.M. as a lead-in to the Today show. (Some stations will carry it at 6.) According to Today producer Steve Friedman, the program will be a half hour of fast-paced hard news, including sports, business reports, weather and overnight headlines. It will also include a five-minute live segment titled “The Issue Is . . . ,” a debate between two figures involved in a topical subject.

The regular Today cast (except Chris Wallace) will be the on-screen talent for the new venture. Says producer Friedman: “The format will be quick, short pieces for the person who goes off to work early, or who gets up to go jogging. Its style will be kind of all-news radio that you can see.”

Why does NBC need a national early-bird news service? Part of the reason, obviously, is that ABC plans a 6 A.M. news broadcast to commence in September—which David Hartman will not be part of. NBC wants to beat its competition to the punch. Another reason is to dissuade affiliates from using Ted Turner’s Cable News Network during late-night and early-morning hours when NBC’s live feed is closed down. A third reason is simply to enhance NBC’s profitability, says a network official: “Television can’t charge much more per minute for its commercials, so it needs more minutes to sell. This is one way of getting them.”

NBC’s blockbuster miniseries Marco Polo was the big ratings winner Sunday night (May 16) when it premiered with a three-hour episode. Although many local newspaper critics found the opening segment slow-moving and tedious, audiences chose it by wide margins over a three-hour comedy pastiche called “Hollywood: The Gift of Laughter,” which ABC glued together out of old film clips to send into battle against Marco Polo.

Nationwide, the NBC program garnered a 22.1 rating and 37 per cent of the audience over the three hours.
—Neil Hickey

Washington—Television viewers are not likely to see the testimony of actress Jodie Foster that was videotaped for use in the trial of John Hinckley Jr., accused assailant of President Reagan. TV cameras were not allowed in the courtroom and, in a ruling made at the beginning of the trial, Judge Barrington D. Parker decided that Foster’s deposition would be treated like the testimony of any other witness. Therefore, it was not available for replay on news shows.

Lawyers for ABC, CBS, NBC and CNN argued that the videotape was an exhibit rather than testimony. The network attorneys appealed Judge Parker’s decision and asked for expedited treatment of the appeal so that, should the decision be overturned, the tapes would still be newsworthy. However, the Federal Appeals Court for the District of Columbia turned down the request for prompt consideration and the networks are now likely to drop
As We See It

Recently, we asked some State Department officials to evaluate television coverage of events overseas. They jumped at the chance to tell us—diplomatically, of course—where TV news goes wrong.

First and foremost was TV's tendency to "hype"—or overlay—stories. From coverage of our hostages in Tehran, to "bang-bang" footage in El Salvador, to the violence on the Israeli-occupied West Bank (while ignoring equal violence in Lebanon), the people we spoke to felt that by playing up crisis aspects of stories, TV was not giving viewers enough background to let them comprehend what was going on.

El Salvador coverage, says one, "is a classic example of how television concentrates on the dramatic to the exclusion of everything else." Most Americans, he pointed out, were surprised by the huge turnout for the Salvadoran elections. Why? TV news had concentrated on threats by the guerrillas to disrupt them through violence.

A second example was reporting last year's AWACS debate. The people at State feel too much time was spent counting Senate votes and too little looking at the issues involved in the sale. Indeed, TV news spent more time dealing with AWACS as a pro-or-anti-Israel issue than exploring the diplomatic and business undercurrents that finally pressured the Senate to vote in favor of the Administration.

Can foreign reporting be improved? At State, the mood is optimistic. Network commentators, such as NBC's John Chancellor and CBS's Bill Moyers, can add depth to nightly news. More specialists would help, too.

The people at State believe that as long as TV news concentrates on crises, viewers will never learn enough about foreign affairs. The solution may lie in exempting news programs from the scramble to be first. World news is too important to be defined by the demands of the ratings race.

TV Update: Continued

Since Barney Miller and the men of the 12th Precinct will no longer need their badges, cell door or duty roster (ABC telecast the last episode of Barney Miller on May 20), actor Hal Linden has donated the props to the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History.

Museum director Roger Kennedy said that the Smithsonian considered Barney Miller a show "directly related to life as it is" and therefore appropriate for display as a piece of American culture. The "artifacts"—as they are now called—will join Archie Bunker's chair, Fonzie's jacket and Kermit the Frog as part of the museum's permanent collection. —Rebecca Lee

Hollywood—NBC is not for sale. That's the message that RCA chairman Thornton Bradshaw delivered to the annual convention of NBC affiliates here. There has been continued speculation that RCA, NBC's parent company, would sell the network because of its lackluster performance. "I don't know how RCA could get along without NBC," Bradshaw told the affiliates. "If you think that in an indirect way of telling you that NBC is not for sale, it's true. NBC is not." Raymond Timothy, the president of the NBC TV network, also assured the affiliates that NBC was not on the block by telling the group that RCA would sell Hertz and Coronet (carpets) and use the "revenue... for its core businesses": broadcasting and communications.

RCA and NBC officials made these unusual announcements partly to prevent the defection of affiliates to other more profitable networks. ABC, in particular, has aggressively attempted to woo NBC's strongest affiliates away. NBC is vulnerable to these raids because of its repeated third-place finishes in the prime-time ratings race. —Frank Swertlow
November 15, 1982

Mr. Scott Shirai
1625 St. Louis Drive
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Dear Scott:

Your thoughtful letter and kind words are most appreciated. It was my pleasure to join you for the election night program.

I look forward to seeing you again in the near future. May you enjoy continued success in your endeavors.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcg
The Honorable Dan Inouye  
Rm. 6104, Prince Kuhio Federal Building  
Honolulu, HI. 96813  

Dear Senator Inouye:  

Thank you so very much for sharing some of your time and valuable comments with us and the listeners of KGU Radio on general election night. Your remarks were very well received.  

Although I am no longer working full-time in the media, I expect to make other cameo appearances in the future and hope to be able to ask again for your assistance.  

Again, many, many thanks for your kokua. Continued success in all your endeavors.  

No ke aloha,  

Scott Shirai  
1625 St. Louis Dr.  
Honolulu, HI. 96816
August 12, 1982

Mr. George Chaplin
Editor-in-Chief
HONOLULU ADVERTISER
P. O. Box 3110
Honolulu, Hawaii 96802

Dear Mr. Chaplin:

Senator Inouye has written the enclosed article, with the thought that its publication in a future Sunday edition might be timely and interesting for the people of Hawaii.

Your assistance is most appreciated.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT: mcb
Enclosure
BY DANIEL K. INOUYE
UNITED STATES SENATOR

The ill-conceived Reagan Administration proposal to sell Fort DeRussy, in whole or piecemeal, is a symptom of much deeper problems afflicting Federal planning in Hawaii.

Cohesive, long-range Federal planning simply does not exist. Each Federal agency pursues its planning programs with little inter-agency discussion, and none whatsoever with non-Federal planners. The only opportunity for public comment occurs when specific projects near the construction stage. This is often too late to allow major revisions to these projects, and this approach fails to provide an extended, sweeping outlook on our planning problems.

Fort DeRussy has satisfactorily served both the military and our local community for many years. The injection of Washington politics, without adequate background study, has done nothing more than arouse and unite Hawaii officials -- Democrat and Republican alike -- in agreeing that DeRussy should be left alone. It illustrates the great potential for harm to the local community that can be caused by the lack of Federal planning.

Many other planning issues in Hawaii would benefit from a system of organized discussion among Federal, State and county representatives: the disposition of excess Federal land;
the future of Kalaupapa; the use of Kahoolawe; siting of a general aviation airport; continuation of school Impact Aid.

In my opinion, the time and energy wasted on many controversies might be much better spent initiating a comprehensive plan for Federal property in Hawaii. The land in question is sizable--some 403,000 acres, or about 10 percent of the State of Hawaii. The percentage is even higher--about 14 percent--on Oahu, where major military installations such as Pearl Harbor and Schofield Barracks consume large areas of prime land.

A serious effort was made to gather local and Federal officials in Hawaii together for in-depth planning discussions a few years ago.

In 1979 I introduced legislation to establish a Temporary Federal Intergovernmental Planning Commission for Hawaii, to discuss and draft a plan to the Year 2000 for all Federal holdings affecting non-Federal land. The commission would have been composed of 23 representatives of county, State and Federal governments.

Such a commission had never been attempted before in any other state, nor, to my knowledge, ever since.

This concept had enthusiastic support from the State Legislature, which unanimously adopted a joint resolution endorsing the idea. Representatives of Federal agencies in Hawaii were also receptive.
On August 21, 1979, members of the Hawaii Congressional delegation met with Federal officials in Hawaii, including those of the military services, to discuss the pending Congressional measure and informally lay the groundwork for the commission.

Because of the rigid military command structure, the military representatives required authorization from their superiors in Washington, D.C. before they could proceed in this venture.

Unfortunately, it soon became clear that the Pentagon took a dim view of this concept. The military superiors expressed a fear of other states undertaking the same planning, which might "tie the hands" of national defense strategists. While neither reason appeared particularly convincing, the Pentagon was adamant in its refusal to participate in this commission.

Without the cooperation of the military, whose holdings comprise the bulk of Federal land important to local plans, the commission's work would have been meaningless. The opposition of the Defense Department doomed the pending Congressional measure and ended the preliminary discussions in Hawaii.

It is perhaps overly optimistic to assume that this panel might have forestalled much of the misunderstanding surrounding Fort DeRussy and other matters. However, it
would have provided a plan thoroughly documenting the best potential use of Federal land in Hawaii, with the interests of our community and nation in mind.

With Hawaii's record of farsighted planning and spirit of cooperation among leaders, the opportunity for success for this concept was most favorable in Hawaii.

Unfortunately, until Pentagon planners can be convinced to adopt a more progressive attitude towards development of its vast land holdings, responsible planning in Hawaii will remain an elusive goal.
8/11/82

SENATOR:
I drafted the attached article for possible submission to the STAR-BULLETIN or ADVERTISER.
It focuses on your attempt to provide long-range Federal planning in Hawaii, an approach which could have avoided problems such as the DeRussy debate. (Frank and Alvey have both reviewed this favorably.)

gregg
The ill-conceived Reagan Administration proposal to sell Fort DeRussy, in whole or piecemeal, is a symptom of much deeper problems afflicting Federal planning in Hawaii.

Cohesive, long-range Federal planning simply does not exist. Each Federal agency pursues its planning programs with little inter-agency discussion, and none whatsoever with non-Federal planners. The only opportunity for public comment occurs when specific projects near the construction stage. This is often too late to allow major revisions to these projects, and this approach fails to provide an extended, sweeping outlook on our planning problems.

Fort DeRussy has satisfactorily served both the military and our local community for many years. The injection of Washington politics, without adequate background study, has done nothing more than arouse and unite Hawaii officials — Democrat and Republican alike — in agreeing that DeRussy should be left alone. It illustrates the great potential for harm to the local community that can be caused by the lack of Federal planning.

There is no shortage of other planning issues in Hawaii that would benefit from a system of organized discussion among Federal, State and county representatives: the disposition of excess Federal land; the future of Kalaupapa; the use of Kahoolawe; siting of a general aviation airport; continuation of school Impact Aid.

In my opinion, the time and energy wasted on many controversies might be much better spent initiating a comprehensive plan for Federal property in Hawaii. The land in question is sizable—some 403,000 acres, or about 10 percent of the State of Hawaii.
The percentage is even higher—about 14 percent—on Oahu, where sizable military installations such as Pearl Harbor and Schofield Barracks consume large areas of prime land.

A serious effort was made to gather local and Federal officials in Hawaii together for in-depth planning discussions a few years ago.

In 1979 I introduced legislation to establish a Temporary Federal Intergovernmental Planning Commission for Hawaii, to discuss and draft a plan to the Year 2000 for all Federal land affecting non-Federal property. The commission would have been composed of 23 representatives of county, State and Federal governments.

This concept had enthusiastic support from the State Legislature, which unanimously adopted a joint resolution endorsing the idea. Representatives of Federal agencies in Hawaii were also receptive.

On August 21, 1979, members of the Hawaii Congressional delegation met with Federal officials in Hawaii, including those of the military services, to discuss the pending Congressional measure and informally lay the groundwork for the Commission.

Such a commision had never been attempted before in any other state, nor, to my knowledge, ever since.

Because of the rigid military command structure, the military representatives required authorization from their superiors in Washington D.C. before they could proceed in this venture.
Unfortunately, it soon became clear that the Pentagon took a dim view of this concept. The military superiors expressed a fear of other states undertaking the same planning, which might "tie the hands" of national defense strategists. While neither reason appeared particularly convincing, the Pentagon was adamant in its refusal to participate in this Commission.

Without the cooperation of the military, whose holdings comprise the bulk of Federal land important to local plans, the Commission's work would have been meaningless. The opposition of the Defense Department doomed the pending Congressional measure and ended the preliminary discussions in Hawaii.

It is perhaps overly optimistic to assume that this panel might have forestalled much of the misunderstanding surrounding Fort DeRussy and other matters. However, it would have provided a plan thoroughly documenting the best potential use of Federal land in Hawaii, with the interests of our community and nation in mind.

With Hawaii's record of progressive planning and spirit of cooperation among leaders, the opportunity for success for this concept was most favorable in Hawaii.

Unfortunately, until Pentagon planners can be convinced to adopt a more progressive attitude towards development of its vast land holdings, responsible planning in Hawaii will remain an elusive goal.

-end-
July 23, 1982

Mr. J. K. Chun
J. K. Chun & Associates
Kowin Building, Suite 102
830 W. Wilcox
Montebello, California 90640

Dear Mr. Chun:

Senator Inouye is currently in Hawaii, but in his behalf, I wish to thank you for your letter regarding your recent discussions with Dr. Henry L. Wong.

I know that the Senator sincerely hopes that your film production will prove to be successful.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance in the future.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT: mcb
Hon. Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Russell Senate Building, suite 105
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you for your letter of June 9, 1982, recommending me to Mr. Hideto Kono, Director, Hawaii Department of Planning and Economic Development.

Last week, I had the privilege of meeting the Administrator of Mr. Kono's Hawaii Film Office, Dr. Henry L. Wong, in Los Angeles. We discussed our forthcoming contemporary documentary film at great length and concluded that an in-depth look behind-the-scene at Hawaii's successful growth in the areas of Business, Government, and Industry will be of great public interest particularly since Hawaii's Statehood Silver Anniversary is only 2 years away.

In view of our optimism on the success of this project, I plan to meet Dr. Wong again next month in Hawaii. His professional assistance and input will certainly enable me to expand my final outline in preparation for the script which hopefully will be completed soon.

I appreciate your faithful encouragement, and we shall do our utmost to capture on film, the true, inspirational spirit of the leaders and the people of Hawaii.

Respectfully yours,

J.K. Chun
Producer

JKC:gl
J.K. Chun & Associates  
Kowin Building, suite 102  
830 N. Wilcox  
Montebello, California 90640

Hon. Daniel K. Inouye  
United States Senate  
Russell Senate Building, suite 102  
Washington, D.C. 20510

VIA AIR MAIL
Hon. Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Russell Senate Building, suite 105
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you for your letter of June 9, 1982, recommending me to Mr. Hideto Kono, Director, Hawaii Department of Planning and Economic Development.

Last week, I had the privilege of meeting the Administrator of Mr. Kono's Hawaii Film Office, Dr. Henry L. Wong, in Los Angeles. We discussed our forthcoming contemporary documentary film at great length and concluded that an in-depth look behind-the-scene at Hawaii's successful growth in the areas of Business, Government, and Industry will be of great public interest particularly since Hawaii's Statehood Silver Anniversary is only 2 years away.

In view of our optimism on the success of this project, I plan to meet Dr. Wong again next month in Hawaii. His professional assistance and input will certainly enable me to expand my final outline in preparation for the script which hopefully will be completed soon.

I appreciate your faithful encouragement, and we shall do our utmost to capture on film, the true, inspirational spirit of the leaders and the people of Hawaii.

Respectfully yours,

J.K. Chun
Producer

JKC:gl

(213) 725-0966
June 9, 1982

Mr. J. K. Chun
Associate Producer
VAL PRODUCTIONS
411 San Luis Rey Road
Arcadia, California 91006

Dear Mr. Chun:

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your recent letters sharing your plans to produce an educational documentary film on Hawaii.

Hawaii's role as a laboratory for alternative energy projects is an important one. Funds for research and development in alternative energy have been sharply curtailed by the current Administration, but this work continues on a limited scale in the areas of geothermal, ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC), and wind power.

For further information in this field, may I suggest:

Mr. Hideto Kono, Director
Department of Planning and Economic Development
250 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Telephone: (808) 548-3033

May you meet with much success in this project. Please let me know if I can be of further service to you in your work.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcb

bcc: Mr. Hideto Kono
June 4, 1982

Hon. Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Room 105, Russell Senate Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

We regret that in view of your recent return to the islands, you did not receive our letter of May 11 outlining our plans to produce an educational up-to-date documentary film on Hawaii.

Val Productions is very much interested in soliciting your advice in developing our format to zero-in on the LEADERS OF HAWAII in Government, Business, etc. and capture a glimpse of the people behind Hawaii's successful growth.

For example, we are considering to devote a vital segment of our production to film Hawaii's role as the NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY. We presume this area has created jobs and new industries as well as attacking the energy crisis.

Any advice or assistance your office could provide will be appreciated.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

J.K. Chun
Associate Producer
May 17, 1982

Mr. J. K. Chun
Associate Producer
VAL PRODUCTIONS
411 San Luis Rey Road
Arcadia, California 91006

Dear Mr. Chun:

On behalf of Senator Inouye, who is currently in Hawaii, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter regarding your plans to film an educational documentary on Hawaii.

I will share your letter with the Senator when he returns to the office.

I am certain that the Senator will be interested in further details of your work as they develop. Please let us know how we can be of assistance to you in this project.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT: mcb
May 11, 1982

Hon. Daniel K. Inoye
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inoye:

We are planning to produce an educational documentary on Hawaii and we wish to solicit your advice on how to improve our material so that it would best serve the cosmopolitan image of your state.

At present, we wish to avoid filming another travelogue about Hawaii because it would become more or less tourist orientated. As for filming a Hawaiian drama, the success of "HAWAII-FIVE-O" which is distributed world wide already speaks for itself.

Instead of the usual theme, and this is where your valuable advice is needed, we are developing a format to focus or zero-in on the **LEADERS OF HAWAII** in Government, Business, Entertainment, Sports, etc.

We hope you will share our opinion that the motion picture and T.V. audience would be fascinated in capturing a glimpse of the people behind Hawaii's successful growth.

As a former native of Hawaii (my family still have businesses there), I am proud of our economic, social, and political achievements so why not tell about it? Our success in the islands should be an inspiration to our young people today.

VAL PRODUCTIONS, under James Val, Producer, has had two Emmy Award Nominations; and we/hoping that with the cooperation of your office, and the people of Hawaii, we will film a real WINNER this year.

Respectfully yours,

J.K. Chun
Associate Producer

JKC:gl

411 SAN LUIS REY ROAD • ARCADIA, CALIFORNIA 91006 • (213) 447-5574
Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, Senator (Hawaii)
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

VIA AIR MAIL
MEMORANDUM

83 Radio/TV Messages

7-27-82

SENATOR:

This is draft text for message to KAIM RADIO fundraiser.

If OK, we can tape your message here and send tape cassette to KAIM.

--gregg

[Signature]

[Date: 7/29/82]
This is Dan Inouye.

I am pleased to participate in KAIM Radio's 10th annual Sharathon Week.

KAIM Radio is well known for providing spiritual thought and guidance to its listening public.

It is my belief that one of the most precious features of Hawaii is our tradition of sharing with others and caring for those in need.

As a public official who has had the honor of serving Hawaii for many years, I am well aware of the strength that we gain through this sense of unity.

Such human values as the love and respect for one's fellow man, can be too easily overlooked in times of economic crisis and the rush for self-fulfillment.

In my service in our nation's capital, I have long sought to convey to the national level, the message of understanding and friendship that is a trademark of our Hawaiian Islands.

To do so is to strengthen our nation in a common bond of hope and inspiration that can overcome the most severe of obstacles or challenges.

It is my hope that this spirit of compassion will continue to guide the people of Hawaii as a vital element of our destiny.

-End-
KAIM Radio Sharathon Begins August 2nd

KAIM RADIO IS THE MOST POWERFUL AM STATION IN HAWAII: 50,000 WATTS. THIS INCREASES THE KAIM AM SIGNAL FROM 2 TO 5 TIMES IN HAWAII, AND BEAMS KAIM TO THE PACIFIC BASIN. A REAL MISSIONARY RADIO STATION, KAIM IS 87 ON THE DIAL.

TO PAY THE INCREASED OPERATING EXPENSES, KAIM'S 10TH ANNUAL SHARATHON WEEK BEGINS MONDAY, AUGUST 2ND. ALL KAIM AND KAIM-FM REGULAR PROGRAMS WILL BE SUSPENDED UNTIL MIDNIGHT, SATURDAY. THE GOAL IS TO UNDERWRITE 24-HOURS' OPERATION FOR KAIM IN THE SHARATHON YEAR: AUGUST '82 THROUGH JULY '83. THE SHARATHON IS TO RAISE THE LISTENERS' SHARE OF THE YEAR'S OPERATING EXPENSES.

KAIM HAS BEEN AN INSPIRATIONAL BROADCASTER FOR NEARLY 30 YEARS. THE POWER INCREASE CAME UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF MR. DANIEL S. C. LIU, PRESIDENT, AND DR. BILLY GRAHAM, A DIRECTOR OF KAIM. MR. HEI WAI WONG, LOCAL BUSINESSMAN, AND REV. LOREN CUNNINGHAM, FOUNDER OF YOUTH WITH A MISSION IN KAILUA-KONA, SERVE ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF KAIM.

THOUSANDS OF HAWAII'S PEOPLE GIVE TAX-DEDUCTIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO KAIM AND ARE PARTNERS IN THE OUTREACH. A THANKSGIVING CELEBRATION COMMEMORATED THE ACTUAL INCREASE TO 50,000 WATTS.
THE NEW TRANSMITTER IS LOCATED ON WEST MOLOKA'I, WHERE KAIM'S TWIN 290-FT. TALL TOWERS ARE SITUATED. A PRAISE CELEBRATION WAS HELD AT THE SITE ON JUNE 19TH.

EACH DAY OF SHARATHON WEEK, WE WILL BE SALUTING SPECIAL FRIENDS IN OUR COMMUNITY OF CONCERNS:

- Monday, August 2nd
- Tuesday, August 3rd
- Wednesday, August 4th
- Thursday, August 5th
- Friday, August 6th
- Saturday, August 7th

"Church Appreciation Day"
"Public Officials Day"
"Christian Business & Professional People"
"Senior Citizens' Day"
"Military Day"
"Family Appreciation Day"

THE KAIM SHARATHON, WITH 30 CO-HOST PASTORS AND 100 VOLUNTEERS, WILL BE BROADCAST SIMULTANEOUSLY ON KAIM AND KAIM-FM. KAIM-FM WILL CONCLUDE ITS DAY AT 10 P.M. WHILE KAIM-AM WILL BE ON-THE-AIR FOR 24 HOURS DURING THIS WEEK.

KAIM RADIO IS LICENSED BY THE CHRISTIAN BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION, WHICH PLANS SHORTLY TO BUILD A SIMILAR BROADCAST STATION IN HILO: KFSH-FM.

-30-

CLIFF SCOTT, GENERAL MANAGER 732-6602
JUDY TANOUYE, NEWS DIRECTOR 732-6603
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE: AUGUST 3, 1982
IN HAWAII

TO: SALLY WATANABE
FROM: JINNY OKANO

I WILL BRING FOLLOWING TO SENATOR’S ATTENTION IN HAWAII, HOWEVER, PLEASE CHECK WITH HIM AGAIN UPON HIS RETURN.

MS. JUDY TANOUYE
KAIM RADIO STATION
3555 Harding Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii

called to invite Senator Inouye to participate in their "SHARE-A-THON WEEK" which will be Monday, August 2, 1982 to Saturday, August 7, 1982.

Would like Senator to come by the station on Tuesday, August 3, 1982 to give comments (live) on what he did to serve the community. They are reserving August 3rd to dedicate it to an elected official or public worker.

If Senator cannot come by the station, he may write his comments and submit or he may stop by the station and tape his comments before Tuesday, August 3, 1982.

Ms. Tanouye can be reached at 732-6602.

P. Release

Christian station fundraising pledges, support role of P. officials in life of public
- why P. support needed (ex: prepare draft+
telecopy to Honolulu office)
SENATOR: GEN' WESTMORELAND IS ASKING YOU TO CALL ON CONGRESS AND THE FCC TO INVESTIGATE THIS MATTER. I FEEL IT IS NOT IN YOUR INTERESTS TO GET INVOLVED. THEREFORE, THE LETTER IS WORDED THE WAY IT IS FOR THIS REASON.

FRANK
June 7, 1982

General William C. Westmoreland, USA (ret.)
Box 1059
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Dear General Westmoreland:

Thank you for your letter of June 1, 1982, concerning your experience with CBS. I regret that you have encountered this difficulty and feel that you have vindicated yourself from this matter in a very commendatory way since this incident.

Thank you again for sharing your concerns and a copy of ANATOMY OF A SMEAR with me.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcbl
June 1, 1982

Honorable Daniel F. Inouye
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Daniel:

On January 23, 1982, CBS News aired a 90-minute documentary titled "The Uncounted Enemy: A Vietnam Deception." This program raised serious allegations regarding my reputation as commander of U.S. military forces in Vietnam. This program was given extensive advance publicity both in print and in broadcast media.

Three days later, on January 26, 1982, Lieutenant-General Daniel Graham and I, assisted by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, Dr. George Carver, Lieutenant-General Phillip Davidson and Colonel Charles Morris, held a lengthy press conference at the Army-Navy Club rebutting scurrilous accusations made by Mike Wallace and George Crile and requesting an apology from CBS News.

In the ensuing weeks, the media, both print and broadcast, gave extensive coverage to my controversy with CBS. Now, a benchmark cover article, confirming many of the issues I raised in my press conference, has been published in the May 29, 1982 edition of TV Guide, which I enclose for your perusal. "Anatomy of a Smear: How CBS News Broke the Rules and 'Got' General William Westmoreland" is the result of a two-month investigation by TV Guide into the making of "Uncounted Enemy." This particular article is of note because TV Guide is read weekly by over 17 million people and because it is the television medium's own trumpet condemning reporting practices employed by the top-rated news broadcast network.

Reporters Don Kowet and Sally Bedell disclose that:

CBS began the project already convinced that a conspiracy had been perpetrated, and turned a deaf ear toward evidence that suggested otherwise.
CBS paid $25,000 to a consultant on the program without adequately investigating his 14-year quest to prove the program's conspiracy theory.

CBS violated its own official guidelines by rehearsing its paid consultant before he was interviewed on camera.

CBS screened for a sympathetic witness - in order to persuade him to redo his on-camera interview - the statements of other witnesses already on film. But CBS never offered the targets of its conspiracy charge any opportunity before their interviews, to hear their accusers, or to have a second chance before the cameras.

CBS asked sympathetic witnesses soft questions, while grilling unfriendly witnesses with prosecutorial zeal.

CBS misrepresented the accounts of events provided by some witnesses, while ignoring altogether other witnesses who might have been able to challenge CBS's assertions.

CBS pulled quotes out of context in one case to imply incorrectly that Westmoreland was familiar with a meeting where estimates of the enemy were arbitrarily slashed - a familiarity that was crucial to proving the conspiracy.

CBS's own paid consultant now doubts the documentary's premise of a Westmoreland-led conspiracy.

Though the investigation revealed a total disregard of journalistic ethics by CBS, a greater issue is raised in the article's final paragraph:

Are the network news divisions, with their immense power to influence the public's ideas about politics and recent history, doing enough to keep their own houses in order? If this documentary is any evidence, then the answer may be no. The inaccuracies, distortions and violations of journalistic standards in "The Uncounted Enemy" suggest that television "safe guards" for fairness and accuracy need tightening, if not wholesale revision. (emphasis added).

The question posed in this paragraph begs for an answer.
To that end, and because the first amendment was stretched beyond all constitutional bounds, I hope that you will join with your colleagues in calling for an investigation of this journalistic travesty. An examination of those charges by the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission would seem appropriate.

Based on long-standing commitments, I will be out of the country for the next several weeks, and therefore, have made arrangements with the firm of Alcalde, Henderson & O'Bannon to answer any questions you may have or to put you in contact with me. Specifically, you may notify Hector Alcalde, Dave Henderson or Stephen Boynton locally at (703) 841-0626.

I understand the demands placed on you during this most difficult session of Congress and would greatly appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

William C. Westmoreland

WCM/c
Encl.
How CBS News Broke the Rules and 'Got' Gen. Westmoreland
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“Tonight, we’re going to present evidence of what we have come to believe was a conscious effort—indeed, a conspiracy—at the highest levels of American military intelligence to suppress and alter critical intelligence on the enemy in the year leading up to the Tet Offensive.”

Thus, on the evening of Jan. 23, 1982, CBS News correspondent Mike Wallace introduced a 90-minute documentary titled “The Uncounted Enemy: A Vietnam Deception.” What followed was a powerful and polished examination of a sensitive chapter of our recent history. Using the compelling testimony of ex-military officers, the program attacked the reputation of Gen. William Westmoreland, the former commander of U.S. military forces in Vietnam.

The evidence amassed by CBS seemed to prove the U.S. military's intelligence operation in Vietnam, led by General Westmoreland, conspired to deceive President Lyndon Johnson, the Congress and the American public. Beginning in 1967, the documentary charged, Westmoreland had systematically underreported to his superiors the size and strength of the enemy, in order to make it appear that he was indeed winning the “war of attrition.”

Three days after the show, Westmoreland and Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, an ex-military-intelligence officer, held a two-hour press conference in Washington to denounce the documentary and to demand in vain an apology from CBS. Newsweek magazine, a New York Times editorial and columnist William F. Buckley all accepted the program’s central premise—that Westmoreland had deliberately concealed crucial intelligence from President Johnson. But the Times and The Washington Post also published rebuttals from Walt —

Rostow and Gen. Maxwell Taylor (two former Johnson Administration advisers) challenging that premise. Soon it became clear that there were huge discrepancies between the documentary's portrayal of events and the version vehemently argued by the show's critics, many of them former officials with firsthand knowledge whose accounts were not included in the show.

The documentary was an ambitious attempt to shed light on one of the most important debates in recent American history: the question of responsibility for our humiliating loss of a war that cost the lives of 57,000 Americans and inflicted wounds on the society and economy of this country that are still far from healed.

The seriousness of the charges made in the documentary, and the strong criticism it aroused, led TV GUIDE to undertake a two-month investigation of the making of "The Uncounted Enemy." Its purpose was not to confirm or deny the existence of the "conspiracy" that CBS's journalists say existed. Instead, we wanted to examine how they sought to document their charges against military intelligence and General Westmoreland himself.

Our investigation disclosed that:

- CBS began the project already convinced that a conspiracy had been perpetrated, and turned a deaf ear toward evidence that suggested otherwise.
- CBS paid $25,000 to a consultant on the program without adequately investigating his 14-year quest to prove the program's conspiracy theory.
- CBS violated its own official guidelines by rehearsing its paid consultant before he was interviewed on camera.
- CBS screened for a sympathetic witness—in order to persuade him to redo his on-camera interview—the statements of other witnesses already on film. But CBS never offered the targets of its conspiracy charge any opportunity, before their interviews, to hear their accusers, or to have a second chance before the cameras.
- CBS asked sympathetic witnesses soft questions, while grilling unfriendly witnesses with prosecutorial zeal.
- CBS misrepresented the accounts of events provided by some witnesses, while ignoring altogether other witnesses who might have been able to challenge CBS's assertions.
- CBS pulled quotes out of context, in one case to imply incorrectly that Westmoreland was familiar with a meeting where estimates of the enemy were arbitrarily slashed—a familiarity that was crucial to proving the conspiracy.
- CBS's own paid consultant now

CBS producer George Crile did some on-camera interviews himself
doubts the documentary's premise of a Westmoreland-led conspiracy.

"Sam Adams’ role was to provide the research from which we began our reporting. He was not the man who determined what went into the broadcast or how it was cast... The weight of the show was not the Sam Adams story." —George Crile

In early November 1980, CBS Reports producer George Crile flew to Virginia to visit Sam Adams at his farmhouse. The purpose of Crile's visit was to reexamine a
controversy that in 1967 and 1968 had raged between the Central Intelligence Agency and Gen. William Westmoreland's MACV (Military Assistance Command, Vietnam) over the enemy "order of battle"—the official size and composition of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong fighting forces in Vietnam. The intelligence controversy focused on the size of the enemy force, and whether certain categories of the enemy, particularly shadowy organizations called Self-Defense and Secret Self-Defense (composed mainly of women, youths and older men, and often unarmed) were significant enough a threat to be listed in the order of battle as soldiers. Sam Adams, the only CIA analyst then studying that question full-time, argued that they should; the military said they should not.

In 1975, Adams had written an article about the controversy for Harper's magazine, where George Crile had been his editor. Now, five years later, Crile was visiting Adams in Virginia because he thought that the order-of-battle story might make a CBS documentary. He wanted to consult Adams' "chronologies."

On long, lined, yellow legal pads, in a tight, tiny scrawl, Adams had recorded every detail he could gather, crucial or just curious, of the 1967-68 order-of-battle controversy. His "master chronology" was now 140 pages long; if typed out, Adams estimates, it would fill 500 to 600 pages.

This master chronology was a principal weapon in Adams' crusade to prove that military-intelligence officers in Vietnam had conspired to conceal the true strength of the enemy.

From his most recent interviews, Adams had concluded that in 1967 MACV not only had intentionally underreported enemy troop strength in South Vietnam but had suppressed reports of hordes of enemy soldiers infiltrating into South Vietnam down the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Adams was convinced that the faked estimates and suppressed infiltration reports had left the American Army and American President unprepared for the all-out attack the enemy launched on Vietnam's Tet holiday—Jan. 30, 1968.

"I told George what these people had told me," says Adams, "and George got real interested. George said, "I'll write something up.' I read his proposal," Adams adds, "and it pretty well followed what these guys had said and what was in their letters."

"Conspiracy... was a characterization which we agreed to use in the script only at the very end, after reviewing everything in the show."

—George Crile

In fact, the notion of a "conspiracy" was the central premise of the project from its inception. On Nov. 24, 1980, when George Crile sent his "blue sheet" (the proposal a producer submits to get his documentary idea approved) to his executive producer, Howard Stringer, its nine section headings included: "THE CONSPIRACY," "THE KEY CONSPIRATOR TAKES CHARGE," "THE CONSPIRACY IS FORCED TO EXPAND" and "THE CONSPIRACY CONTINUES."

In his 1980 blue sheet, Crile proposed to document "how the U.S. Military command in Vietnam entered into an elaborate conspiracy to deceive Washington and the American public as to the nature and size of the enemy we were fighting."

Crile went on to suggest "that a number of very high officials—General Westmoreland included—participated in a conspiracy that robbed this country of the ability to make critical judgments about its most vital security interests during →
a time of war."

That blue sheet’s scenarios, key witnesses, villains—and its “conspiracy”—would appear virtually intact in the CBS documentary that aired more than a year later.

Early in January 1981, CBS gave Cricle provisional approval. A $25,000 budget was authorized for preliminary interviews. It was decided that if the documentary was given the go-ahead, Mike Wallace would be its chief correspondent.

Cricle’s main source in the search for interviewees was a list of 60 former intelligence officers, a list Adams calls “probably the most important single document I supplied George.” Carefully selecting from the list men whose testimony might support the conspiracy theory, Cricle by April 1981 had enough interviews on film. he believed, to demonstrate that the documentary could be done. At a series of screenings, Roger Colloff, a CBS News vice president, and executive producer Howard Stringer (Cricle’s supervisor) viewed “selects”—segments of interviews chosen by Cricle.

“We all decided there was a broadcast,” says Colloff, “and that it made sense to proceed.”

CBS approved the documentary. The project was given a budget of $225,000. Other interviews were filmed, with Cricle, the correspondent, relying largely on Sam Adams’ expertise and Adams’ chronologies. Mike Wallace would interview only Sam Adams himself; the two main “conspirators,” Generals Westmoreland and Graham; and Walt Rostow, former adviser to President Lyndon Johnson.

“I have told [Sam Adams] I would see if we could pay him for his research. . . . I made it clear to him, however, that this might not be possible—among other reasons because he is sure to be a key interview in the show.—George Cricle’s blue sheet, Nov. 24, 1980

Payling for Adams’ research and expertise turned out to be possible. CBS News signed him on as a consultant—and paid him $25,000. (Hiring consultants is a common practice for news organizations undertaking complicated investigative stories.) And despite the reservations Cricle expressed in the blue sheet, CBS News executives permitted Adams to tell his story on camera.

CBS disclosed in the documentary that Adams was a consultant. But viewers had no way of knowing the extent to which his dual role—as consultant and key witness—gave Adams an uncommon privilege in the presence of CBS’s most feared inquisitor, Mike Wallace.

Adams took part in “chronology sessions” in George Cricle’s office. Adams would sit there with stacks of his yellow legal pads bulging out of a duffle bag. He would read aloud to Cricle and Alex Alben, the show’s researcher, the catechism—in exquisite detail—of the order-of-battle “conspiracy” as he had recorded it. When Cricle and Adams weren’t around, staffers working on the documentary called these chronology sessions “The Adams Chronicles.”

Mike Wallace never attended those sessions. Busy with 60 Minutes before May 1981, Wallace had met Sam Adams only twice, briefly.

Wallace says he was “curious” about Adams’ story. He says he regarded Adams as “an expert—he had been studying the subject.” But Wallace also realized that at the root of Adams’ expertise lay an obsession. “One man’s obsession”—a word often used when people talked about Adams—“is another man’s truth,” Wallace says. “I admire a man who is obsessed with the truth.”

However, neither Wallace nor Cricle’s bosses, Colloff and Stringer, ever did any more to examine Adams’ credibility than simply sit down and chat with him.

“Mike Wallace’s role was to be the Edward Bennett Williams in a law trial, with his junior partner, me, preparing the case.”—George Cricle

Wallace was scheduled to interview Sam Adams, CBS’s paid consultant, on May 12 at Adams’ farm. Adams has confirmed that, five days before the interview, he traveled to New York and spent two →
Come and listen to the most famous names in jazz. Some time this year, somewhere near you, they'll be playing and singing their unforgettable sounds. Don't miss them.

You're looking at all you'll ever need to treat 95% of your first aid needs.

New CLINICYDIN.™
It fights infection and aids healing.

It fights the broadest spectrum of germs in minor injuries because it contains 3 different antibiotics. They're the same ingredients doctors most often recommend for treating infection.

New CLINICAINE.™
It kills germs and kills pain.

It combines an antibacterial agent with an anesthetic for treating minor cuts, scrapes, and burns. It's available in squeeze spray. And pump spray, for no mess, no waste application.

New CLINICORT.™
It stops the itch and fights the rash.

It contains hydrocortisone, the most effective itch and rash medication you can buy without a prescription. And it's available in cream form. And pump spray, for no-touch application.

**Read and follow label directions. Products bearing Red Cross trademark have no connection whatever with the American National Red Cross.**
KOOL JAZZ FESTIVALS, 1982

Washington, D.C. May 29-30
San Diego May 30-June 5
Orlando June 4-13
Philadelphia June 7-13
Pittsburgh June 13-20
Atlanta June 21-27
Hampton, Va. June 24-27
New York June 25-July 4
Cincinnati July 12-18
Minneapolis St. Paul July 13-18
Seattle July 30-Aug. 6
Milwaukee Aug. 11-15
Newport, R.I. Aug. 21-22
Chicago Aug. 30-Sept. 5
Detroit Sept. 1-6
New Orleans Sept. 15-19
Houston Sept. 16-19
Dallas Ft. Worth Sept. 23-26
San Francisco Oct. 16-22
Los Angeles Nov. 5-10

There's only one way to play it.
KOOL FILTERED KING S. 100's
MENTHOL

Free Festival brochure
Write to P.O. Box 2526
Highland Park, Illinois 60035
or call 513-321-5557
Specify dry or dikes.

In his interview with Adams, Wallace did act like an Edward Bennett Williams examining a "friendly witness" (Alben's term) who could support his case. Asking Adams tough questions, says Wallace, "never occurred to me. My understanding was we were getting his charges on the record—whistle-blower's charges, if you will." He adds: "And then we would go from there to find out whether what he said was so or not so."

Wallace went from the Adams interview to the Westmoreland interview—this time as an adversary, not an ally.

Crile telephoned General Westmoreland at his home in Charleston, S.C., →
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continued
days, May 7 and May 8, at CBS. He was not able to recall the purpose of that visit. "But I can tell you what it wasn't," Adams volunteers. "I wasn't going over the questions for my interview. For my interview with Mike Wallace I went in cold turkey."

However, we have learned that prior to sitting down with Wallace, Adams was coached extensively at CBS News on the questioning he would be facing. Such rehearsals are forbidden by CBS's own published ethical guidelines for journalists, guidelines that expressly prohibit "interviews which are not spontaneous and unrehearsed."

"Literally, they did a mock interview," a CBS source told TV GUIDE. "George and Alex [Alben, the researcher] ran through the questions in chronological order—the ones basically used by Wallace. Not only did they do a run-through—they gave Sam definite feedback on his answers. It was a conscious effort to rehearse the whole interview, from top to bottom."

Alex Alben recalls that he and Crile did have a "long session" with Adams. "It would be incorrect to use the word 'coached'—in the sense of 'Oh Sam, say this again, use a better word, do it this way, use this phrase'," says Alben. "It would be, 'Sam, you've told us your account of your meeting with Gains Hawkins on such and such a day.' And he would say [repeat] it—and I'm sure, if it's any sort of coaching, it was that Sam knew essentially what would be covered."
on May 10, 1981, to arrange the Wallace interview for later that week in New York.

George Crile insists that he discussed fully with Westmoreland subjects to be covered in the interview. But Westmoreland disagrees. "The discussion on the phone was very vague," says Westmoreland. Crile told Westmoreland he would send him a letter confirming the topics to be covered.

Westmoreland arrived in New York on Friday, May 15, the day before the interview. On that same day, Crile wrote the letter of confirmation and had it dropped off at Westmoreland's hotel. The letter listed five topics that Wallace would cover. The real subject of the interview and the documentary—"What about the controversy between the CIA and the military over enemy-strength estimates?"—stood fourth on the list.

In the documentary, Westmoreland seemed the picture of guilt—darting his eyes and licking his lips, in a state of agitation. During many of his answers, he stammered and fumbled—in contrast to Sam Adams, who was relaxed and expansive. Westmoreland was, in fact, so angered by the tone and tenor of Wallace's questions that, in an early break for a tape change, he turned to Crile and said, "You rattlesnaked me." Later, during the taping, he snapped at Wallace, "I can't remember figures like that. You have done some research. I haven't done any research. I'm just reflecting on my memory."

Nevertheless, an examination of the unedited 102 pages of their encounter reveals that Westmoreland made his case more effectively off-screen than on.

Some of Westmoreland's denials would be included in the CBS documentary, but none of his most convincing explanations. For instance, on at least 10 different occasions Westmoreland argued that the relatively small size of the enemy force that attacked during the Tet Offensive demonstrated that, rather than underestimating the strength of the enemy, the military had overestimated it.

Not once, however, was this opposing argument offered in the show.

The segment of the Westmoreland interview that, in the documentary, would seem most incriminating focused on infiltration. CBS knew that in the fall of 1967, MACV's official infiltration figures—the number of regular North Vietnamese soldiers coming down the Ho Chi Minh Trail into South Vietnam—had never climbed above 8000 per month. But Crile had interviewed several MACV infiltration analysts who claimed that during the five months before Tet, they had been submitting infiltration estimates of more than 25,000 per month. The analysts also claimed that their superiors blocked these reports to keep enemy-strength figures low, to make it appear as if allied forces were wearing down the enemy.

To Wallace's surprise, when he asked Westmoreland what the monthly figures were just before Tet, Westmoreland replied "... in the magnitude of about 20,000 a month."

The documentary would juxtapose this statement with a statement of only 5500-6000 infiltrators a month that Westmoreland had made on Meet the Press in November 1967. "There wasn't any doubt in the Westmoreland interview," says Wallace. "He said it [20,000] at least three times." Wallace believes he gave Westmoreland "the opportunity to refresh his memory over and over."

However, the full transcript shows that Westmoreland expressed doubts when Wallace asked him about the discrepancy. The lower number, said Westmoreland, "was the rate that took place during the summer. But it did pick up. I would have to look at the reports before I could answer that question."

Westmoreland looked, and on June 9—seven months before air date—he sent Wallace and Crile at CBS what he says he considered at the time a correction, which said that the official MACV documents confirmed 5500-6000 through December. Then the numbers jumped in January to more than 20,000. Wallace and Crile did not tell their superiors about this correction, and it didn't appear on the show.
Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham was a tough interview: out of 90 minutes, only 20 seconds of denials aired

In May, a few weeks after Wallace cross-examined Westmoreland, George Crile interviewed a man he regarded as a key witness for the CBS case. George Allen had been Sam Adams’ immediate superior at the CIA. He was a longtime Adams defender. However, Allen says he “tried to dissuade Crile from even doing the show, because I thought they were making a mountain out of a molehill.”

Crile was dissatisfied with George Allen’s interview. So he and Allen agreed to do it over again. However, before that second interview, Crile led the ex-CIA officer into a CBS screening room. Crile then proceeded to screen for Allen interviews already filmed, including segments of interviews with Col. Gains Hawkins, Gen. Joseph McChristian and ex-CIA analyst Joe Hovey, all of whose testimony Crile intended to use in the documentary to support the conspiracy charge against Generals Westmoreland and Graham.

“It was something I did to try to help George Allen speak with the dignity he did off camera,” says George Crile.

“As I recall,” says Allen, “Crile had in mind that my memory might be refreshed if I saw a bit of what others had to say at that point.”

By affording Allen an opportunity to compare his views with those of interviewees already on film, Crile was permitting Allen to hear parts of the accusations against “conspirators” Westmoreland and Graham while denying the generals either an opportunity to hear the voices of their accusers before the interviews or to redo their interviews.

Mike Wallace’s next interview, on June 3, 1981, was with Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, a leathery, pugnacious champion of the military’s hardest line. Out of 90 minutes, Graham—one of CBS’s two key “conspirators”—showed up a mere 20 seconds on camera to deny the two basic charges against him: that he blocked infiltration reports in the fall of 1967, and that after the enemy’s Tet Offensive, he engineered a cover-up by asking intelligence officers to alter MACV’s historical record of the order-of-battle data stored in the military’s computer.

“Walt Rostow’s position after the broadcast was completely different from his position during our interview... What he said in his letter to The New York Times is diametrically opposed to what he was telling us before. That’s the essence of it.”

—George Crile

On July 24, 1981, Mike Wallace sat down for a three-hour session with Walt Rostow, the adviser responsible for funneling to Lyndon Johnson information flowing from Vietnam. Rostow could tell Wallace exactly what the President did or did not know about the intelligence controversy over enemy strength. He repeatedly denied to Wallace that critical intelligence had been kept from President Johnson. Nevertheless, after a considerable expenditure of time, money and effort, CBS would deem not one second of Walt Rostow’s interview worthy of airing.

“I’m satisfied,” says Wallace, “that in sum he added nothing to an understanding —
of this particular controversy."

Fifteen days after the CBS broadcast, in a letter in the Feb. 7, 1982 New York Times, Rostow wrote that President Johnson had been fully aware of both the enemy order-of-battle debate and of Hanoi’s planned all-out offensive.

"If Rostow had said in the interview with you what he said in the letter," we asked George Crile, "would that have been worthy of including in the broadcast?"

"Yes, sure," said Crile. "It would have caused us to believe that somehow a back-channel [a private message] had gone from Westmoreland to the White House."

TV GUIDE has learned that—contrary to CBS’s assertions—Rostow did make to Mike Wallace every point he made later in his New York Times letter. The complete, unedited 112-page transcript of the Rostow interview reveals that Rostow assured Wallace that Johnson "knew that starting in the autumn of 1967 that . . . the North Vietnamese regulars were infiltrating at a higher rate." The President, Rostow said, "was following the number of the particular North Vietnamese units that were coming down, which he got straight from communications intelligence" that Rostow characterized as "of an unimpeachable kind."

On the order-of-battle controversy, Rostow told Wallace, "The point is [Johnson] did understand that . . . there was a debate and it was a debate essentially about whether they had underestimated in the past the scale of that category that you just described to me [guerrilla militia and political cadre]."

Yet CBS "killed" that Rostow interview in its entirety. By September—four months before air date—says researcher Alex Alben, Crile and Wallace had finished their on-camera interviewing. But CBS still had not sought out a number of officials pivotal to the controversy covered by the program: Ellsworth Bunker, the U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam; Ambassador Robert Komer, head of the Vietnam "Pacification Program"; George Carver, the CIA official in charge of Vietnamese affairs; Col. Charles Morris, chief of intelligence production at MACV; and his immediate superior, Gen. Phillip Davidson Jr., the top military-intelligence officer in Vietnam.

Davidson, whose name had threaded through the CBS research, was the most important of all these omissions. "If the figures on enemy strength were going to be manipulated, I had to do it," Davidson told us. "Westmoreland gave no orders about intelligence matters that didn’t go through me." Davidson, in fact, was the single most powerful intelligence officer in all of Vietnam.

At one point, during a portion of his interview with Wallace that was not broadcast, an angry Westmoreland, tired of trying to answer questions his intelligence chief was better qualified to answer, asked Wallace why he had not spoken to Davidson. Wallace’s response reveals why CBS had not talked to him.

"General Davidson is a very, very sick man," Wallace replied. "We want very much to talk to . . ."

Wallace and researcher Alben say Crile told them Davidson was very ill and that Crile had tried to reach Davidson repeatedly by telephone. Crile himself told us that he had tried to telephone Davidson but that no one had answered.

We reached Davidson at his home in Texas. Davidson said that as far as he knows CBS had "made absolutely no effort to get hold of me. They did not telephone me. They did not write me."

Davidson told us that in 1974 he had suffered from cancer that had been treated successfully. "For the past eight years," Davidson said, "I have been healthy"—a fact that we verified, after receiving Davidson’s permission, with his private physician, Dr. Mauro Gangai, director of the Urology Clinic at the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas.

* * *

With the documentary completed and the Jan. 23 broadcast only weeks away, George Crile suddenly decided to interview two principal characters he had pre-
Vietnam: Said the general who was the top military-intelligence officer in Vietnam: 'CBS did not telephone me. They did not write me.'

George Carver, the superior of George Allen; Crile had interviewed Allen extensively on camera. Carver was the CIA's expert on the order-of-battle controversy and had firsthand knowledge of decisions that George Allen could only speculate about. Crile had not interviewed Carver on camera, he says, because "we had cables, internal CIA memos and reports which explicitly documented Carver's actions throughout the period."

Carver also says he gave Crile information that contradicted the show.

On Jan. 22, the day before the broadcast, CBS ran a full-page ad that appeared in both The New York Times and The Washington Post. It showed a group of men sitting around a table. Emblazoned across that table in thick letters was the word: CONSPIRACY. The following evening, after more than a year of research and the expenditure of an estimated $350,000, CBS aired "The Uncounted Enemy: A Vietnam Deception."

Our own comparison of the broadcast transcripts with our interviews and the unedited transcripts of CBS's interviews reveals repeated journalistic lapses. Two incidents in particular demonstrate how, throughout the documentary, CBS produced distorted accounts of events to support its case.

The McChristian-Hawkins Briefing:
The first piece of evidence in the documentary concerned a briefing in which Gen. Joseph McChristian (Gen. Phillip Davidson's predecessor), the chief of the military's intelligence in Vietnam, and Col. Gains Hawkins, MACV's expert on the Vietcong, told Westmoreland about documents showing that the enemy's forces were larger than had been previously believed. CBS alleged that Westmoreland subsequently "suppressed" this report.

In presenting its evidence, however, CBS misrepresented statements from both McChristian and Hawkins. Their comments about three separate incidents were woven together into what seemed to be one pivotal meeting.

TV GUIDE's study of the official unedited transcripts of George Crile's interviews with McChristian and Hawkins reveals that McChristian was discussing a cable about enemy strength that he took to Westmoreland. Hawkins, however, was talking about two separate briefings he gave to Westmoreland in "the main briefing room" at MACV's headquarters.

McChristian never told Crile he felt Westmoreland was "suppressing" his report. Said McChristian in the transcript (but not in the show): "He [Westmoreland] asked me to leave that cable with him 'cause he wanted to review it. Shortly thereafter I left the country, and I don't know for a fact actually what happened to that message."

When Crile tried to get McChristian to pinpoint the report as the reason for his transfer, McChristian told Crile that he had been notified of his transfer "some time before" he gave Westmoreland the cable. "George," said McChristian, "I don't think there was a connection in my trying to increase the estimate, because the trend on enemy strength was constantly going up." Instead, McChristian said, he suspected that he might have been transferred at the instigation of Lyndon Johnson's special ambassador to Vietnam, Robert Komer. "Komer came there to take over some of the operations which I had initiated," McChristian told Crile, "and I believe I was looked upon as being in the way of Mr. Komer."
Those explanations did not appear on camera. Instead, CBS said, "Shortly after Westmoreland suppressed his intelligence chief's report, General Joseph McChristian was transferred out of Vietnam," a strong implication that the report and the transfer were indeed linked.

The 300,000 Ceiling: CBS's "smoking gun" (Sam Adams' term), proving a Westmoreland-led conspiracy, was an order Westmoreland allegedly gave to his MACV delegation attending a National Intelligence Estimates Board meeting at CIA headquarters in Langley, Va. "The head of MACV's delegation told us," said Mike Wallace in the documentary, "that General Westmoreland had, in fact, personally instructed him not to allow the total to go over 300,000."

Crine: "Wasn't there a ceiling put on the estimates by General Westmoreland? Weren't your colleagues instructed, ordered, not to let those estimates exceed a certain amount?"

Col. George Hamscher: "We can't live with a figure higher than so and so."

Crine: "300,000 . . ."

Hamscher: "... is the message we got."

"When you look at it," admits Sam Adams, "it looks as if Hamscher is the head of the MACV delegation." George Crile says this juxtaposition of Hamscher was "not intentional." The fact is, of course, that Hamscher was not the head of the MACV delegation. He didn't belong to MACV, but to another branch of military intelligence based in Hawaii.

The real head of the MACV delegation—the man CBS says received that order—was Gen. George Godding.

Sam Adams says the reason Godding wasn't identified was "the same old problem . . . the mention of too many names." General Godding has another explanation. He says, "I never quoted any figures" to CBS. Says Godding, "I told CBS that I had the basis to negotiate . . . it was no conspiracy at all. The material that we carried back [to Langley] at that time was the best estimate that we had."

The documentary also said that Col. Gains Hawkins was "carrying out orders [stipulating a ceiling] that originated from General Westmoreland." But TV Guide's examination of CBS's official unedited transcript of the interview with Hawkins reveals that Hawkins told Crile no fewer than four times that he had not been given a numerical ceiling before the Langley meeting. Hawkins said to Crile that he had espoused what he felt was the "command position"—the level of enemy strength set at 296,000 by the May order-of-battle report.

Sam Adams became concerned that statements made after the broadcast cast doubt on the show's central premise

Ex-CIA man Adams was CBS's paid consultant.

"Who told you that? Anyone?" asked Crile. "No one told me, I deduced it. And I defended it willingly. I was not given any specific orders," Hawkins told Crile.

All these statements by Hawkins fell to the editing-room floor.

Beyond these pivotal incidents, CBS engaged in various forms of journalistic sleight-of-hand, including quotations taken out of context and their meanings distorted.

In one case, Westmoreland was shown reacting to Col. George Hamscher's account of a Pentagon meeting in August 1967, when military officers allegedly slashed totals of enemy units arbitrarily, to keep under the 300,000 ceiling.
“Now who actually did the cutting, I don’t know,” said Westmoreland in the documentary. “It could have been my chief of staff. I don’t know. But I didn’t get involved in this personally.”

In the unedited transcript of the Westmoreland interview, however, Westmoreland delivered this statement in response to a question from Wallace about an entirely different meeting—one that took place not at the Pentagon but in Saigon, where the CIA and MACV reached agreement on the order-of-battle controversy.

By inserting Westmoreland’s answer to a question about the Saigon meeting after George Hamscher’s account in the documentary of a Pentagon meeting, CBS improperly made it seem as if Westmoreland were acknowledging that he knew a Pentagon meeting had occurred.

“Adams has chronicled [the] conspiracy with unbelievable detail all the way to General Westmoreland’s doorstep. It is for us to go beyond. . . . The task will be to follow the trail of the conspiracy to see how far up the chain of command it goes.”

—George Crile’s blue sheet, Nov. 24, 1980

A few days after Westmoreland and Graham held their press conference to protest the documentary, Sam Adams showed up at CBS. He was concerned, he said, that statements made since the documentary by Rostow and others cast doubt on the show’s premise—that Westmoreland had been concealing evidence from Lyndon Johnson.

Adams has since repeated this concern to TV GUIDE. He says that in helping to prepare the CBS show, he felt more acutely than George Crile that the conspiracy originated in the White House, not with Westmoreland. “The problem was,” says Adams, “once you get above Westmoreland, my evidence at that time was marginally circumstantial—of the rumor variety.”

Now, however, Adams is convinced that Westmoreland was “acting as a go-between rather than an instigator. In other words, he was a deputy sinner, rather than the chief sinner.” Consequently, says Adams, “what I am doing, in my book, is I’m trying to get the smoking guns into the White House.”

White Sam Adams strides up Pennsylvania Avenue, eager to plant his fresh conspiracy on the White House lawn, viewers of “The Uncounted Enemy” are left with the memory of a 90-minute documentary misshapen by personal bias and poor supervision. It seems clear from his actions that George Crile began work on the documentary already so firmly convinced of the conspiracy theory that he leaned far too heavily on the expertise of Sam Adams. It is just as clear that he was so persuaded by Adams’ view of events that in several instances he failed to include in the documentary information from authoritative sources that cast doubt on Adams—and Crile’s—theory.

It is equally true that Crile’s supervisors at CBS News failed to oversee his work effectively. Presumably, it was part of their job to ask tough questions, to demand that their producer explore every lead and make every effort to include all relevant points about the controversy.

We do not know whether Crile and his colleagues were right about General Westmoreland and his military-intelligence operation. We can say, however, that “The Uncounted Enemy” was often arbitrary and unfair in its approach to a subject that surely demanded all the objectivity and thoroughness that the journalists of CBS News could muster.

The network’s lapses in the making of this documentary also raise larger questions. Are the network news divisions, with their immense power to influence the public’s ideas about politics and recent history, doing enough to keep their own houses in order? If this documentary is any evidence, then the answer may be no. The inaccuracies, distortions and violations of journalistic standards in “The Uncounted Enemy” suggest that television news “safeguards” for fairness and accuracy need tightening, if not wholesale revision.
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May 24, 1982

Mr. Scott Shirai
News Director
KGU
605 Kapiolani Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Scott:

It was a pleasure to have the opportunity to convey my congratulations on KGU Radio's recent 60th birthday. As a long-time listener, I appreciate the significant role that KGU has played in the Hawaiian Islands over the years.

May you enjoy many more decades of continued success.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcb
May 17, 1982

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
105 Russell Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you so very much for taking a few moments from your busy schedule to share in our 60th birthday celebration last Friday evening at the Moana Hotel. Despite only three hours of sleep and all that flying, I must say you looked a lot more alert than most of us.

Again, many, many mahalos for your kindness. Best wishes, too, to Maggie and Kenney.

Aloha,

Scott Shirai
News Director
April 15, 1982

Mr. James D. "Mike" McKeVitt  
Director of Federal Legislation  
National Federation of Independent Business  
490 L'Enfant Plaza East, S.W.  
Suite 3206  
Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Mr. McKeVitt:

I wish to thank you for your letter informing me of the new radio program prepared by the National Federation of Independent Business. I am certain that it will be appreciated by small-business operators in Hawaii as a means of expanding the coverage of Washington events.

I look forward to being of assistance in this endeavor.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE  
United States Senator

DKI: jmp1
April 13, 1982

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

NFIB is about to begin distribution of a radio program called "Assignment: Small Business." This two-minute program will feature interviews with VIPs and other responsible spokespersons. It is designed to tell the small-business owner how action in Washington affects his or her business.

If you are doing a weekly or monthly radio program for Hawaii, we would like to be on your mailing list so that we can glean audio cuts on business and economic issues. Of course we will return all tapes to your office or the Senate Recording Studio, whichever you prefer.

We realize not all your programs are about such issues. We know that even those programs that do address your issues may be more oriented toward your constituents than small-business people at large. However, many times you will say something that relates to a subject that we are covering on our radio program.

If you have a particular bill in the pipeline which is of interest to us--pro or con--send an audio tape comment to NFIB. We may be able to use your remarks. Also, we will want our producer to do one-on-one interviews with you on key issues of concern to our listeners.

We have contracted veteran newsman Duff Thomas to produce and air this program and others. His experience and knowledge greatly enhance "Assignment: Small Business." You and your press secretary can expect to hear from him soon.

Sincerely,

James D. "Mike" McKeveit
Director of Federal Legislation

JDM:kmv.85F
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Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510
March 15, 1982

Mr. L. Chung
5295 Kalanianaole Hwy.
Honolulu, HI 96821

Dear Mr. Chung:

In behalf of Senator Inouye, who is currently in Hawaii, I would like to thank you for your letter concerning the IV documentary on Vietnam. I know the Senator will appreciate learning of your views about this important matter. As soon as Senator Inouye returns to the office, I will bring your letter to his attention.

Thanks again for sharing your concerns with him.

Aloha,

FRANK J. KELLY
Legislative Assistant

FKM:mcib
Dear Senator Inouye:

I write in the faint hope that letters such as this will help you see your Duty to the People more clearly.

CBS news recently aired a television documentary about Vietnam and William Westmoreland. It raised disturbing questions about Westmoreland's conduct which, if true, was a high crime and treason. What is really posed now as an important and basic question is whether high ranking military are as accountable for their actions as Presidents (Watergate) or Congressmen (Abseam). There has been a remarkable lack of interest by the National Press in following up the CBS charges.

Watergate and Abseam cost no lives. The concealment of the Viet Cong build up for Tet may well have caused the deaths of many Americans. I hope you will agree that the charges arising from the CBS telecast are serious enough to warrant direct action by you to seek a thorough and public inquiry. "Equal Justice Under Law" should be more than a slick slogan to which lip service only is paid.

I am hoping that you will give some serious thought to this serious matter. No citizen in the service of his country ought to be immune from accounting to his fellow citizens. If it is not elected representatives of the People, like yourself, who seek such an accounting from the prominent and powerful, who will??

It is also my hope that your notions of Duty and Conscience in some degree coincide with mine. It would be a great comfort to know that some elected representatives of the People do indeed, now and again, harbor thoughts apart from curry ing popular favor and winning reelection.

Very truly yours,

L. Chung

5255 Kalanianaole Hwy
Honolulu, HI 96821

cc CBS News
New York, NY
Senator Daniel Inouye
US Senate
Washington, D.C.
December 11, 1981

Mr. Saul Bekoff
Director - Western Region
National Jewish Hospital and Research Center
National Asthma Center
4929 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 548
Los Angeles, California 90010

Dear Mr. Bekoff:

I wish to thank you for your thoughtful letter regarding my recent interview on the CBS Morning News on the anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Your kind words are deeply appreciated.

I have enclosed the material you requested, for use in the publication of your dinner invitations.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mc
Enclosures
December 8, 1981

Senator Daniel K. Inouye  
U. S. Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator:

I saw you on the Charles Kuralt Morning Show yesterday re the segment on Pearl Harbor. You came across as good as always!

It also reminded me that perhaps you would like to have us use a new photograph in our invitation, rather than the old one we have. Would you be good enough to have your secretary send me a recent photo and updated bio material at her early convenience.

The Dinner promises to be a great one, and Bob Pfeiffer is really "on the ball."

With kind regards and Aloha.

Cordially,

Saul Bekoff  
Director - Western Region

SB:rb
December 11, 1981

Mr. Tony Janak
621 Junard Blvd.
W. Hempstead, NY 11552

Dear Mr. Janak:

Thank you for so thoughtfully providing me with a tape of the December 7, 1981, program aired by CBX-TV on the anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack.

Your kindness is deeply appreciated.

Please know that you have my very best wishes on your recent retirement. May the future bring you and your loved ones much happiness and fulfillment.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcb
December 7, 1981

Dear Senator:

How nice to hear your beautiful voice.

Sending along an audio clip from CBS this morning, and I've added some Hawaiian Music on both sides (in stereo).

Just retired recently, after 41 years at CBS.

Cordially,

Tony Janak

PS: Don Ho/ Kilma/ Ed Kenny Music:

I have tape on disk.
December 15, 1981

Mr. David C. McClung
33 South King Street, #412
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Dave:

Thank you for a copy of your December 8, 1981 letter to Mr. David Hartman of Good Morning America, regarding the segment shown on his TV program concerning the Americans of Japanese ancestry. I appreciate your sharing this matter with me but more particularly, correcting the misinformation that was enunciated by the commentator about this matter.

Thanks again for your letter.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mcb
December 8, 1981

Mr. David Hartman  
Good Morning America  
7 West 66 Street  
New York, NY  10023  

Dear Mr. Hartman:

I have enjoyed very much watching your show for at least one and one-half hours almost every morning. You seem to have a feeling for facts and for the human aspects of stories.

Yesterday I talked to Miss De Maze. The reason I called her was that I had watched your program dealing with the December 7 attack on Pearl Harbor.

There was something in your program that triggered me to do what I have meant to do for several years. The local ABC affiliate has shown, several times, the series, "The Big Battles."

I was often upset that when the sequence on the campaign in Italy was shown, which referred to the AJAs in Hawaii, the commentator said in effect that these AJAs had been given the choice of going to an internment camp or joining the army.

The fact of the matter is that when Pearl Harbor was attacked, the local recruiting stations could not really handle the number of AJAs that volunteered for service. It is absolutely untrue that a choice was needed or given. They did it out of their loyalty to the United States.

It should be pointed out, when the 442nd Regimental Combat Team which rescued the Lost Battalion, their casualty rate was much higher than the rate suffered by the battalion that they saved.

It should be further noted that the 442nd Regimental Combat Team was the most highly decorated of any in the European Theater. I believe that the series on television was not produced by ABC. It is probably being shown by other stations on contract. I would like to have the comments corrected.
Mr. David Hartman  
Page 2  
December 8, 1981  

The senior Senator from Hawaii, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, left his right arm in that campaign in Italy. I personally served in the Territorial and State House of Representatives with Tadao Beppu, who was the Speaker of the House while I was the President of the Senate. He was one of the many that were disabled during that campaign.  

I would hope that you, David, would do something to correct the impression of millions of Americans that the AJAs did what they did as an alternative to jail, but rather, did it because they felt and knew that they were Americans.  

Thank you much, David. We do enjoy your program.  

Aloha,  

DAVID C. McCLUNG  

David C. McClung  

P.S. We have some personal records that have been kept that if you would like to see, we would make them available. We would have to be guaranteed that they would be returned.
Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
U. S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510
November 18, 1981

Mr. Richard F. Schaller  
General Manager  
KAILU Television  
150-B Puuhale Road  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

Dear Mr. Schaller:

I wish to thank you for your recent letter informing me of Channel 13's plans to operate a full-time, full-service news organization. Please accept my congratulations and best wishes on this important step forward.

You may be assured of my cooperation with your news staff in your service to the people of Hawaii.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE  
United States Senator

DKI: mcB
November 3, 1981

Senator Daniel K. Inouye
469 Ewa Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Senator Inouye:

I am pleased to be able to inform you that as part of a continuing effort to better serve our viewers, Channel 13 has inaugurated a full-time, full-service news organization as of November 1, 1981. We will broadcast three 5-minute newscasts each evening, seven nights a week, at 7:00PM, 8:30PM and 9:30PM.

The Channel 13 News will feature national and international news gathered from the worldwide facilities of United Press International, but will emphasize local events covered through our own Electronic News Gathering resources.

Larry Zerke, veteran broadcast newsman, has been named News Director and will anchor from Sunday through Thursday. He will be assisted by Ron Wood, well-known radio personality.

I would appreciate your passing this information along to the appropriate individuals in your organization.

Let me assure you that the Channel 13 News Staff will do its best to serve its viewers and the people of the State of Hawaii.

Meaalo and Aloha,

Richard F. Schaller
General Manager

RFS:gf
September 15, 1981

Ms. Sandra Matsukawa Hu
Account Executive
Botsford Ketchum Public Relations
55 Union Street
San Francisco, California 94111

Dear Ms. Hu:

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your proposed news release on behalf of the Papaya Administrative Committee. It meets with my approval, with the minor changes noted.

Also, in response to your telephone request, I have enclosed a color slide. It may be returned to my Washington office.

I am happy to be of assistance in promoting Hawaiian papayas, and hope for success in your publicity campaign.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:mc8
Enclosure
PAPAYAS—A TASTE OF THE 50TH STATE

What is American cuisine? It's a delicious potpourri of regional specialties based on foods available in the area and reflecting the ethnic food cultures of its settlers. If you travel across the country, you can sample a wealth of different dishes that contribute to the remarkable diversity and richness of American cuisine.

Americans treasure our regional foods. If we're transplanted from one section of the country to another we're likely to take some cherished regional food preferences with us to remember the home left behind.

That is certainly true of Senator and Mrs. Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii who make Washington D. C. their home during the winter months when Congress is in session. Exciting as our capital is, the Inouyes can't help but miss their beautiful 50th State -- the gracious atmosphere, inviting climate and distinctively delicious cuisine.

(more)
Although they can't control the weather, the Inouyes can and do enjoy the taste of Hawaii even on the Mainland. Thanks to modern transportation and an impressive agricultural industry in Hawaii, many of the tropical fruits, nuts and other products of the Islands are available on the Mainland today as well.

"I like to start the day with a papaya half," says Senator Inouye. "We Hawaiians eat papaya for breakfast in the same way Mainlanders drink orange juice. It's a delicious fruit." With a papaya half contributing almost twice the U. S. Recommended Daily Allowance of vitamin C and 70 percent of the U. S. RDA for vitamin A for only 78 calories, you can be assured of excellent nutrition, as well as flavor.

Senator and Mrs. Inouye, like all Hawaiians, enjoy a variety of fresh fruits. "We often have big fruit salads with lots of papayas, pineapple and bananas for lunch or a light supper," says Mrs. Inouye, "or I serve chicken, shrimp or tuna salad in a papaya half or pineapple shell. A meal never seems complete without plenty of fresh fruit."

Mrs. Inouye likes to include Hawaiian fruits in the menu when she entertains, too. "Our Mainland guests enjoy a taste of Hawaii as much as we do," she says. One of her favorite desserts is a glamorous but easy to make papaya cheesecake. "I puree papayas to blend into the cheese mixture so you get the wonderful taste of papayas with every bite. The cheesecake takes on a beautiful golden-orange color "Mrs. Inouye explains," and the texture is light, and airy -- not too rich after a heavy meal."

(more)
Mrs. Inouye's papaya cheesecake is a delicious dessert to enjoy this fall and during the holidays because papayas are at their peak season right now. As the Inouyes and their guests will certainly agree, enjoying a taste of Hawaii is the next best thing to being there this fall.

(more)
PAPAYA CHEESE PIE MACADAMIA

2 Hawaiian papayas, peeled, halved and seeded
1 tablespoon cornstarch
1 pound cream cheese, softened
1/2 cup sugar
3 eggs
1 teaspoon grated lemon peel
1 9-inch baked pastry shell
Sweetened whipped cream
Chopped macadamia nuts

Puree one papaya half in blender to make 1/2 cup. Combine puree with cornstarch; set aside. In mixing bowl beat cream cheese with sugar to blend well. Mix in eggs and peel, then stir in reserved papaya puree. Pour into crust. Bake in 375 degree oven 25 to 30 minutes until just set. Cool. Garnish with remaining papayas, sliced, whipped cream and chopped nuts.

Makes 6 to 8 servings.

###

THIS RECIPE HAS BEEN TESTED BY A CONSUMER TEST PANELIST.
SENATOR:
Attached press release is proposed by ad agency for Hawaii papaya growers. It uses you and Mrs. Inouye to endorse the eating of papayas, and would be distributed nationwide. It takes some liberties, but I had suggested to the agency that they draft it in the most effective manner.

--FOR YOUR OK.

--gregg
September 11, 1981

Mr. Gregg Takayama  
Office of Senator Daniel K. Inouye  
Room 105  
Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Gregg:

Here's a copy of the release written on behalf of the Papaya Administrative Committee that will feature Senator Inouye. The PAC, with offices located in Honolulu, represents Hawaii's papaya industry and Botsford Ketchum serves as its public relations agency.

As we have discussed, our agency is distributing two recipe releases about Hawaii to support the large papaya crop expected this year. The releases will be sent to newspaper food editors on a nationwide basis.

One release deals with Jean Ariyoshi, her role as Hawaii's first lady, and how she serves papayas and other Hawaiian fruits to distinguished guests, as well as to her own family. The second release would center on Senator Inouye and how tropical fruits such as papayas keep him in close touch with Hawaii.

At your suggestion, I've written up what we would like to say. Being from Hawaii myself, and as former food editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, I think I have a feeling for the subject and I don't think the senator would find anything detrimental or negative about the article.

If the Senator approves the article, please initial the copy and return it to me, or send me a short note of approval—whichever you prefer.

Thank you for your cooperation. Our goal with these releases is to create a demand for Hawaiian papayas and help Hawaii's agricultural industry. Senator Inouye's support will contribute greatly towards our efforts.

Sincerely,

Sandra Matsukawa Hu  
Account Executive

SMH/bg
September 15, 1981

Mr. Brian E. Loughran  
General Manager  
KGU Radio  
605 Kapiolani Blvd.  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Loughran:

I appreciate your thoughtful letter regarding my recent visit to your station. I found our chat most interesting and enjoyable.

Thank you for your invitation to visit again. Please be assured that I will do so, when my schedule permits.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE  
United States Senator

DKI: mcb
21 August 1981

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
U.S. Senate
Room 6014
Prince Kuhio Federal Building
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Senator Inouye:

Thank you for your visit to our station. If I'd realized we were going to talk as long as we did, I'd have made you more comfortable. On your next visit please be our guest. I'm sure our listening audience would enjoy hearing your views. With forewarning from your office we can have our News Director and Public Affairs Director alerted to conduct a meaningful interview.

With Warmest Aloha,

Brian E. Loughran
General Manager

BL/mr
The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
U.S. Senate
Room 6014
Prince Kuhio Federal Building
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
August 24, 1981

Ms. Marlène Moss
Associate Producer, Newsbag
WTTG - Metromedia
5151 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Dear Ms. Moss:

On behalf of Senator Inouye, who is currently in Hawaii, I wish to thank you for a copy of your August 12, 1981 letter to the President of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

If we can be of assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT: mcb
August 12, 1981

President
Hawaii Visitors Bureau
2270 Kalakaua Avenue, Suite 801
Po. Box 8527
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Sir:

Newsbag is a half hour of news, features, and fun, which is televised every Saturday morning on WTTG TV, Channel 5, in Washington, D.C. Our audience is composed primarily of young people ages 8 thru 15.

We are interested in doing a series entitled "All Around the Mulberry Bush". In this series we hope to take a look at each of our beautiful and diverse states, and to show our audience some of the great reasons to visit and vacation here in America the Beautiful!

Your help in making this series possible is greatly appreciated. We are requesting from you footage—either film or video tape which could be used in our program. Color slides and brochures would also be appreciated. All material sent to us will be promptly returned unless otherwise specified.

Thank you in advance for helping to make this special Newsbag series a success!

Very truly yours,

Marlene Moss
Associate Producer, Newsbag

cc: Senator Daniel K. Inouye
July 9, 1981

Mr. Christopher R. Conybeare
570 Auahi St., Rm. 222B (Box 72)
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Conybeare:

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter regarding the visit of Vicki Keith and Jerry Rochford of Windward Video to Washington.

We are happy to be of whatever assistance we can in your "Future of Public TV" documentary.

The Senate Radio-Television Gallery has informed me that there will be no problem in obtaining temporary press credentials for them to watch the Senate floor proceedings from the Press Gallery. Please have them contact me when they are in town.

Aloha,

BREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT:mcb
June 26, 1981

Greg Takayama
105 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Greg;

Enclosed, please find excerpts from our Hawaii Committee for the Humanities grant proposal. This should give you necessary background on the "Future of Public TV" documentary that we discussed on June 11, 1981.

Vicki Keith and Jerry Rochford of Winward Video will be in Washington, DC the week of July 19, 1981. Their primary assignments will involve coverage of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting board meeting and interviews with persons directly concerned with Public TV, Arts and Humanities decisions.

In addition Vicki and Jerry will touch base with you for necessary background regarding the Senate. Also, if you can be of help securing temporary press credentials it would be greatly appreciated.

Since Vicki and Jerry's shooting schedule will keep them on the road I will continue to serve as the coordinator for this effort. Please feel free to contact me with questions and suggestions. Note; my office address and phone are different than those listed on this letterhead. Contact me at:

570 Auahi St. Rm.222B (Box 72)
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
808/538-3522

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Christopher R. Conybeare

47-166 iuuu st., kaneohe, hi. 96744/239-8398/538-2474
Dear Hawaii Committee for the Humanities Members,

You will notice some changes in the scope of our final proposal, compared to the preliminary proposal submitted in March. We had originally thought it possible to examine the crossroads at which public television seems to have arrived by focusing on our local public television station, its programming, its policies, its plans in light of prospective federal budget cuts, and its relationship with the community.

After talking at length with Jim Young, general manager of KHET, and with Ruth Lieban, Media Task Force and KHET Community Advisory Board member, we have decided that some changes in the project, as outlined in the preliminary proposal, are needed.

We are concerned that, by looking at only Hawaii Public Television, without examining the federal legislation, economic, philosophical, and political considerations behind the move to cut public TV, arts and humanities budgets, we might be concentrating on only the "receiving end" of the system—that is, the part of PBS least able to discuss the philosophical reasoning behind the policy—local public TV is in a largely "reactive" position, not a decision-making one, in terms of federal policy. Public broadcasting locally is a sensitive area, politics are heavily involved due to Hawaii's considerable legislative funding, and we got the impression from Jim Young that, while this issue is important, a documentary about only Hawaii public television might put the station in a defensive or adversary position with the project.

After having talked with Ruth Lieban, who gave us extensive background information about the work of the Community Advisory Board and KHET, we realized that this is a very sensitive area which could best be examined by looking at the issue on a broader level, putting Hawaii in perspective as part of the larger system.

We think our expanded approach is a much more effective one. We will be able to look at the role of public television, arts and humanities in our society and at the role/responsibility of government in supporting these activities. We can focus on Hawaii's situation as an example of the whole, then look at the issue in larger terms, by talking to people directly involved on a national level. We think this approach will enhance the participation of our local public tv station in the project. We hope, if the project is funded, to offer it locally and nationally for PBS broadcast.

We understand that the committee had some concerns about the preliminary proposal, and we realize that to submit a final proposal with an increased budget might seem insensitive to these concerns. However, we think an "expanded approach" will make a better public television documentary and a more comprehensive humanities project as well.

Thank you for your consideration of our proposal,

Vicki Keith

Vicki Keith (representative of sponsoring org.)

47-166 iuiu st., kaneohe, hi. 96744 / 239-8398 / 538-2474
Name of sponsoring organization(s): WINDWARD VIDEO

Title of proposed project: THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC TELEVISION
Location: Videotaping done on Oahu and the mainland; broadcast & forum on Oahu
Estimated attendance: 7,500 (Hawaii audience)
Time frame: From: MAY 15 To: OCT. 15 No. of months: 5
Name of principal humanities scholar: DONALD TOPPING
Name of project director: CHRISTOPHER CONYBEARE
Amount of Sponsor Cost-Share (in-kind & cash): $37,375.00
Amount of Grant Funds Requested:
  HCH Cost-Share (outright funds): $35,000.00
  Gifts & Matching Funds (185% of Third Party Gifts): $35,000.00
Amount of Third Party Gifts: $0

Please check program category within which the proposed project falls:
A. On-going/regular HCH program  B. HCH experimental program categories
   ___Public Policy Issues   ___Public Concerns
   ___Local/State/Ethnic History   ___Humanities for Humanities' Sake

Text of summary: (Explain objectives, specific topic to be addressed, activities involvement of humanities scholars and disciplines, and background of target audience) USE ONLY SPACE PROVIDED

The "Future of Public Television" Project proposes to produce a one-hour video documentary and to conduct a public forum on the public policy issue of proposed federal budget cuts to public television, the arts and humanities.

We intend to examine the role/responsibility of government in the subsidy of cultural, artistic and educational activities; the role of public television in reflecting/transmitting the values of a diverse culture, the relationship between public television and the local community, and the possible consequences of budget cuts on public television, both on a local and national level.

The major activity of the project will be the one-hour video production, which will involve taping interviews and footage on Oahu as well as in Washington, D.C. and New York. Academic humanists will be involved in the script preparation, review, and final edit of the program, and will participate in planning the public forum, to be held on Oahu and televised throughout the state. Humanist concerns as well as public policy concerns will be incorporated in the video documentary, and in the discussion (public forum) to follow. Disciplines of linguistics, philosophy, law, political science and the classics will be incorporated in determining the direction and scope of the videotape. We hope to have the tape and public forum broadcast in Hawaii, and plan to present it as well for national broadcast. We plan to attract through publicity an audience which will represent a wide spectrum of Hawaii's population, and now estimate that audience to be about 7,500, based on projections of viewing audience.
FINAL PROJECT PROPOSAL AND GRANT APPLICATION

PLEASE TYPE

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name, address and phone number of applicant(s)/sponsoring organization(s) and name and title of representative(s):

Name(s): Victoria Keith
Address: 47-164 Iuui St.
        Kaneohe, Hi. 96744
Phone: 239-8398
Representative(s):
Title(s): Director
Signature(s): Victoria Keith

2. Brief description of applicant(s)/sponsoring organization(s). PLEASE ATTACH

3. Name, discipline and institutional affiliation of principal humanities scholar:

Name: Donald M. Topping
Office phone: 948-8930

Discipline of the humanities (history, philosophy, literature, comparative religion, etc.): Linguistics

Institutional affiliation: Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai`

The undersigned principal humanities scholar acknowledges that he/she has been centrally involved in the development and planning of the proposed project and will be centrally involved in its implementation and evaluation, if approved by the HCH.

Signature: Donald M. Topping

4. Name, address and phone number of the project director(s):

Name(s): Christopher Conybeare
Address: 570 Auahi St., Rm. 222B
        Honolulu, Hi.
Phone: 538-3522
5. Title of project: THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC TELEVISION

6. Is this a new project: Yes X No ___
   If no, briefly explain present status and provide reason for this application:

7. If funds are being requested for media/audio-visual productions (films, videotapes, slides/tapes, exhibits, displays, etc.) or oral history tapings, please list existing organizations, institutions and agencies which have been contacted to determine if resources similar to the one proposed herein have been produced or undertaken:
   KHET (Hawaii Public Television); Public Broadcasting System; American Film Institute; Corporation for Public Broadcasting

8. Has financial assistance for this project been requested or received from other sources or third parties? Yes ____ No X
   If yes, please list names of third party sources contacted and amount of gifts expected or received:

   $________
   $________
   $________

   PLEASE SUBSTITUTE GIFTS AND MATCHING PROJECT BUDGET FORM (4 COLUMN BUDGET FORM) FOR THE ATTACHED BUDGET FORM.

9. Will members of the target audience be assessed any fee or charge related to this project? Yes ____ No X
   If yes, state the amount of fee or charge per participant and explain how the income received will be used:

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
B. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. OBJECTIVES OF PROPOSED PROJECT:

a. To examine, through a video documentary and public forum, the public policy issue of federal budget cuts to public television, (including arts and humanities cuts which affect public television) particularly the philosophy and values behind those who support the budget cuts and those who oppose them, and the effects of those budget cuts on public television, both nationally and locally.

b. To examine the present condition and possible future of public television, including the philosophy behind public television programming and policy; influences, if any, felt by increasing corporate underwriting of public TV programming, and the extent to which the public feels its needs and values are reflected by public broadcasting, both locally and nationally.

c. To produce a one-hour video documentary which examines in depth the present condition and future possibilities of public television, both on a national and local level. Our desire is to produce a program which could be as relevant to a local audience as to a national one, since all states will be affected by the federal cuts to public television. By using Hawaii as an example, on a small scale, of what is happening nationally, and by talking to people who represent Congress, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting System, Arts and Humanities Endowments, national corporations, and academic humanists, we hope to put into perspective the situation that all local stations and communities will find themselves in.

d. To provide a forum for the discussion of these issues, including the policy concerns as well as the values underlying these issues. The contributions of academic humanists regarding public television, humanities and arts, and government's role in the support of such programs, will be a part of both the forum and the video presentation.

2. TOPIC TO BE ADDRESSED: a. public policy issue

Public television was created in 1967 to educate, entertain and enlighten the American public. It was intended to enhance our lives and our citizenship by providing an informational context that increased our understanding of the diversity of the American culture. Local stations were set up to feed into and receive programming from the system, and to serve the unique needs of their local communities. Programming of the PBS network was to come from the local stations to the national network in order to bring about meaningful communication between the many different communities across the country. Additionally, public television was to encourage creative and innovative programming, would encourage freedom of expression, diverse opinions and views, community interests, needs, and participation in programming.

Public funding made this possible. Federal subsidies supported the Public Broadcasting System and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and federal arts and humanities endowments provided seed money to independent video and film producers, whose productions were offered to PBS.
B. 2. a. (continued)

When President Reagan took office, he announced an "economic recovery" plan which included heavy budget cuts for "social" programs, including nearly 50% cuts for public television, the arts and humanities, while increasing the defense budget. PBS will feel the effects of its own budget cuts as well as those of the NEA and NEH. Local public tv stations will be particularly affected by the federal cuts, and the entire system is now at a juncture requiring an assessment of its priorities.

We can expect changes to take place in public television now that budgets have been reduced. What kinds of changes will take place in the philosophy of programming policy, antionally and locally? Which parts of the community will be catered to, if public tv stations must seek large corporate/private donations to underwrite programming? How will public television programming be affected by having to compete in the marketplace for alternate sources of funding? How will the First Amendment's freedom of speech guarantee be affected by removing public television's advanced funding, which has insulated it in the past from political pressures? These questions lead to more basic ones---what is public television, what does it mean to the community, whom does it serve?

The examination of the public policy issue of federal budget cuts to public television (including the effects public tv will feel from arts and humanities budget cuts) is the topic of this HCH project proposal. What are to be the effects nationally and locally? What values influenced this policy? What values will influence our reactions to and decisions about this policy?

There will be several specific areas of this topic which we will focus on:

A. Government's role/responsibility in providing funding for the education, entertainment and enlightenment of the public through public television, the arts and humanities. Which values underly government's decision to cut and in some cases phase out funding for public television? Which values and philosophies underly the thinking that government should be involved in public tv, arts and humanities? Is public broadcasting a luxury, a frill to be funded only in prosperous times, or is it a necessity that deserves substantial public support? Is public television included in the "educational process" that is believed to be an essential ingredient of our democratic society, or does that not extend to the educational and informational functions of public television? How will budget cuts affect the fundamental American value of "access of citizens to the full range of information available for an uncensored marketplace of ideas"? Is access to information a key element of a democratic society? Can citizenship be enhanced through a wider understanding of issues facing us, or will citizenship and the individual's role in society be enhanced by reducing these programs?

President Reagan has said that government should not be involved in the business of social change. What is social change? If in the larger sense, social change is a "given" aspect of modern life, is it beneficial to the functioning of a democratic society to have an understanding of these social changes, including an appreciation for the many diverse elements of our society? What is the role of government in developing this kind of understanding of social change?
B. 2. a. (continued)

B. What is to be the direction of public television, given the reality of substantial federal budget cuts? How will the philosophy and direction of public television, both nationally and locally, change, given the need to increase dependence on corporate/private donations to continue the present level of services and programming?

Can substantial givers be catered to and still respond to the diversity in our population, including poor and smaller groups in the community? Will "subscription" television affect accessibility of public television to the "average" citizen? If funding is expected to come from individual citizen donations, how will public input to station policy and programming decisions change? How will a reduction in federal funding affect the individual stations' abilities to serve the diverse elements of the community, both nationally and locally?

To what extent, in a democratic capitalist society, can we expect the free enterprise system, i.e., commercial television, to fulfill the needs of the community for information, education and illumination of issues affecting the public? Which values are transmitted through public tv which are not transmitted through commercial television? Which as a community do we find desirable?

Trends in corporate underwriting and national distribution and production for public tv shows, as corporate underwriting increases, show a decline in local input and influence. A great majority of the average public tv station programming now comes from PBS, whose production budget is heavily underwritten by corporations (mainly oil companies) who prefer "high" or "serious" cultural programming. What impact will increased corporate underwriting have on program content and reflection of the diversity of American culture?

C. Will the next wave of communications systems that are becoming increasingly central to our lives leave a place for creative inspiration and unique learning that we have come to associate with the best of public tv?

Does the emergence of a new technology context for public broadcasting radically alter the institution's mission? How can public tv survive the stresses of a well-funded commercial alternative? Will cable, subscription tv, satellite-to-home tv, videocassettes, videodiscs, result in creating a competitive situation which could, rather than crowding public tv out, result in making it more responsive to the public and the community it serves, by more carefully reflecting the interests, values and unique characteristics of its local population?

D. Given federal budget cuts, what kinds of programming should public tv use its funding for? Which values guide programming policy in an "ideal" situation, and which values guide it in a period of fiscal "crisis"?

Will public tv gravitate toward "safe, comfortable and appealing" broadcasting, or will it continue to attempt to broaden our understanding of diverse elements of the entire society, including dissenting views, independent views. Will it continue to celebrate and illuminate the diversity of American culture, or will it have to "play it safe"? Will it be guided by the policies which created the public tv system, or will it have to abide by fiscal restraint and the values which underly that?

How are the various values of the local community being reflected by local public television? How will fiscal constraint affect the ability of the station to reflect these values? In a financially starved system, does money speak more authoritatively than principle?
B. 3. Contributions of specific disciplines of the humanities to the content of
the program.

History: We would expect that a scholar could examine the history of public
television, nationally and locally, to review trends of public and private
policy towards public television, and to raise questions about recent trends
in public television programming, policies and philosophies.

An historian would also link economic policies toward "cultural" activities
of government with other eras of our society and other societies—what attitudes have
existed toward the arts and humanities during times of economic stress or change?
What can we learn from those past attitudes and the consequences thereof? What,
historically, has been the role of government in education, in transmittal of values
of a democratic society?

Philosophy: At values underly the policies which now affect public television, arts
and humanities, and which values have affected and directed public television in
the past? Which values underly programming decisions made by individual stations?
Which values does the community use when expressing a need or desire for a certain
type of programming? Which values and philosophies have been predominant in government
and the community when the economy faces stress, when money is scarce? Do our values
change? Which values are being transmitted by government when it supports programs
designed to educate, entertain, and delight the public? Which values are being
upheld by adding to the defense budget?

Ethics: Given a smaller budget and more limited resources, is it better to use that
money to buy programming which is known, which is safe, which is inexpensive, or that
which is more controversial, more experimental, perhaps a dissenting view, and less
likely to attract local corporate underwriting? Is it ethical, considering the
public purpose of public television, to cater a station's programming to those
segments of the public who contribute substantial numbers/amounts of donations,
rather than to those segments of the public who may not be able to afford a contribution?
Are the arts and humanities, including public television, less worthy of public support
than other aspects of our society? Just how important to the quality of life, to
freedom of expression, to open communication and exchange of ideas, do we consider
public television to be? What are our responsibilities as citizens to support public
 television to be? What are our responsibilities as citizens to support public
 television, and what are the responsibilities of public television to the community?

Linguistics: To what extent can public television enhance the education and citizenship
of the foreign-language speaker by producing programming about various cultures of
America in the tongue of that culture?

B. 4. ROLE OF THE SCHOLARS

The humanities scholars will be involved in the project by:

a. participating in the drafting of the final application to the HCH, so that
humanities concerns can be developed with them;
b. planning the video documentary, and the humanities concerns which will be developed
in the tape, planning ways to achieve a variety of responses to the humanities and
public policy questions;
c. participating in planning an editing script, after having screened footage of
interviews and other videotaped material. Discuss results of taping with scholars
before deciding on an editing script, focus on most important humanities issues,
decide how best to develop them in the tape.
d.
B. 4. (continued)

d. Reviewing and evaluating the "rough edit" of the documentary. At this point, suggestions for changes, different emphasis, deletions, etc., can be made.
e. Reviewing the final edited version of the tape.
f. Planning the public forum planning session. After reviewing finished product, humanists will participate in developing key concerns and questions to be discussed at the public forum.
g. Review session participation; the tape and the public forum, as well as other project activities (planning and implementation) will be evaluated by humanists at this time.

B. 5. Names, disciplines and institutional affiliation of humanities scholars involved in the proposed project activities:

Donald M. Topping, Linguistics, University of Hawaii
Jim Dator, Political Science, University of Hawaii
Alice Chai, Anthropology and Women's Studies, University of Hawaii
Frank Tillman, Philosophy, University of Hawaii
Dennis Ellsworth, Classics, University of Hawaii
Ralph Steuber, Education History, University of Hawaii
John Van Dyke, Jurisprudence, University of Hawaii

B. 6. Names, area of expertise of the resource persons involved and their role in proposed project activities:

Haunani Kay Trask, Hawaiian community issues, community contact
Steve Mobley, Media specialist, Chaminade University
Ron Pahk, Community Advisory Board Member, Hawaii Public Television
Mabel deCambra, Waianae Women's Support Group, community contact
Penelope Canaan, Women's Studies, University of Hawaii, women's concerns
Franklin Odo, chairman, Ethnic Studies Dept., U.H., ethnic community concerns
Dee Dee Halleck, American Institute for Video and Film, media contact, New York City
Kim Spencer, Public Interest Video Network, Washington, D.C., media contact
Greg Elliott, Service Employees International Union, Honolulu, labor contact
Sandy Galazin, Pacific Concerns Resource Center, Honolulu, Pacific concerns

B. 7. Identification of number and background of target audience:

We hope to reach all ethnic, economic, cultural, and age groups in Hawaii through a televised showing of the videotape. We intend to advertise in a way that should attract people who don't ordinarily watch public tv. We would hope for an audience of approximately 5,000 locally, including residents of the neighbor islands as well as Oahu.

Additionally, we plan to present the tape to public television nationally for broadcast, since the approach and topic are to be relevant to both local and national audiences, and if we are able to have it nationally broadcast, the audience, in both numbers and type of person, will be much broader.
8. Description of project activities:

a. We propose to begin the project on May 15, 1981, and end the project on Oct. 15, 1981.

b. Preparation activities: We intend to hold one "public forum", to be televised in KHET’s studio, following the local broadcast. We have already spoken to KHET Gen. Manager Jim Young about this, and details will have to be worked out after the rough edit is complete and can be shown to station personnel. The forum will consist of resource people, humanities scholars, KHET program director and general manager. They will discuss the issues and humanities concerns raised in the video, and they will respond to viewers' questions through a phone-in system. A discussion leader will facilitate the discussion; it will be someone other than station personnel.

We have budgeted $2,000 for publicity, which will be: ads in the two major daily papers, in weekly community papers, in the TV Guide. Our project director will prepare press kits, with photographs, for media purposes, as will KHET (based on past experience.) We will produce p.s.a.'s for radio and television announcements of the project.

We will hold a community screening before the televised discussion, inviting key community groups, media people, academic humanists, resource people, and other interested persons, so that the press will have an opportunity to view the tape for advance reviews, as well as listen to comments about it made by resource and community people. Academic humanists at the meeting can listen to concerns and responses made by the community groups, and will be able to use this response in making a final determination of the issues and concerns to be focused upon at the televised meeting.

c. Implementation activities: We intend to have a discussion session with public input through questions phoned in by the public. Questions will be screened before forwarding to discussion group to prevent duplication of questions. Format: The videotape will be presented first, broadcast on KHET, followed by an informal group discussion led by discussion leader with a list of key questions, and responding to audience questions and concerns. The discussion leader will attempt to summarize, put into perspective, the points being discussed. This will not be simply a Q.-and A. session, but will attempt to pursue in-depth the concerns raised in the discussion.

d. Evaluation activities:

Ongoing: Since this is a media project, we have a time-line set up for resource persons and scholars involved, as well as four stages of progress set up at which HCH staff can monitor progress. The project director will develop a check list of activities on a monthly basis to correspond to our project timeline.

Conclusion: Evaluation forms will be given to those who attend the pre-forum screening--resource people, scholars, media people, community groups, citizens groups, and so on, with questions relating to the video program and its presentation of the public policy issue and humanities oriented issues. In addition, the humanities scholars and resource people will evaluate the project activities upon conclusion of the project, by responding to a set of questions developed for the purpose.
9. Explanation of videotape format:

a. Value/necessity of proposed format: Incorporating ideas into a video presentation makes it possible for any group, any time, to view the presentation and discuss issues outlined within it, makes it possible for the discussion to take place at any location, with few or many people, makes it possible to obtain an audience which might not otherwise be able to attend a public meeting.

By using visual images, voices and scenes to depict an otherwise abstract idea or public policy issue, a videotape makes complex issues understandable on a level that a discussion alone might not be able to. Also, a videotape can incorporate the wide range of concerns that come into play in a humanities project and discussion, and it remains available for months and years to come after the production is complete.

For this particular project, however, perhaps the best rationale for producing a videotape is that the topic of our project is television, and using that medium seems an appropriate way to explore the topic. In addition, we hope to travel outside Hawaii to produce portions of the tape, and video is a good medium for capturing the element of movement.

b. Content and subject matter of videotape:

We are proposing a one-hour documentary style videotape about the current conditions and future prospects of public television, given substantial cuts in federal subsidies, as well as cuts in endowment funds for the arts and humanities, which make possible much of public television's innovative programming.

We are interested in looking at the effects of these sizeable budget cuts on public television at a national as well as local level. It is a dilemma which faces Hawaii as well as the rest of the nation, and using Hawaii as an example of the individual state and station, then stepping into a larger perspective, on a national level, will help to put the situation in a context that we can identify with. We want to ascertain how our local community will be affected by our local public tv station's resultant programming and funding changes, whether it is likely to make public tv more or less responsive to the public it is designed to serve, whether the programming will address community needs and reflect community values to a greater or lesser degree. To do this, we will interview station personnel—dome of the producers, the program director, and the general manager. We will talk to the station's community advisory board members, to citizen groups concerned with the communications media, and to community groups.

We will then put the problem into a larger framework by interviewing various Congressional representatives, particularly the members of the House Telecommunications Subcommittee—Rep. Wirth of Colorado and Rep. Collins of Texas, who have widely differing views about federal subsidies of public tv, the arts and humanities; to retiring CPB President Robben Fleming, to the Program Fund Director of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Louis Freedman; to the Carnegie Commission Report on Public Television Chairman, William McGill (who is also president of Columbia University); to Bill Moyers, PBS journalist; to independent producers' organizations; to representatives of corporations which traditionally underwrite PBS programming; and to representatives of the arts and humanities endowments, and to scholars in the humanities, in an effort to ascertain the policy decisions and the philosophical/political/value considerations underlying the policies, as well as those underlying the views of those who oppose the policies.

In addition to interviews, we plan to include segments of programs which illustrate a certain point being discussed. We plan to include interviews with members of the Carnegie Commission, who are also, in some cases, academic humanists as well. We will also discuss humanist concerns with scholars in Hawaii in preparation for the production.
9. c. Videotape style and approach:

The videotape will be shot in "documentary" style -- that is, a collection of interviews, live footage, location shots, samples of public television programs, and other footage necessary for visual explanation of the topic being addressed. We have in mind for this production a "personal" approach, which establishes the narrator/on-camera commentator as an independent producer from Hawaii, who has an interest in the state of affairs of public television, the arts and humanities, who first confronts these issues on a local level, then taking those findings/impressions to Washington, D.C. and New York City to examine them on a larger scale. Locally, we will first talk to the station personnel at KHET, with Community Advisory Board members, with community groups, to determine the impact of these budget cuts, competing technologies and increasing corporate underwriting will have on local public television. We will examine the decisions made by the station in terms of how to deal with these problems and the values of the station and of the community in terms of programming needs.

To understand the background, philosophy and values of these policy makers who support/oppose the budget cuts, the on-camera narrator then travels to Washington and New York to talk to Congressmen and Public Broadcasting System representatives, federal arts and humanities endowments, independent producers' organizations, corporations, Carnegie Commission members, PBS journalists/producers. The narrator will develop a story line, starting in Hawaii, and will lead the viewer through the logical chain of events and people which leads to Washington D.C. and New York City, to talk to those centrally involved with the policies, and back again to Hawaii, putting all the findings of the past hour's production into perspective. We think the "personal" approach and the development of a story line of one person's "quest" or inquiry, into the policy and the various values which have influenced it, will help the viewer understand more clearly and identify more readily with the topic than if it were treated in a different manner, for instance, an omniscient narrator whom the viewer never sees, so that the production becomes primarily abstract. We think this will be a more involving and personal experience for the viewer.

9. d. Contributions of disciplines/scholars to this component:

We will have a core group of 4-5 Hawaii-based academic humanists who will be involved with the video production from its inception. We will discuss essential humanities concerns and questions in preparation for the shooting script, so that questions for the interviews can be structured to get responses to the humanists' concerns. Each scholar will be asked to present some thoughts and questions stemming from his or her discipline, and these thoughts then will be incorporated into the shooting outline.

After the shooting outline has been developed, one or more of the humanists might be interviewed for the videotape. After all shooting is completed, we will meet with scholars to review footage, to see whether additional interviews need to be conducted, or whether narration should be written in such a way to set the stage for consideration of certain humanist concerns.

We then will complete a "rough edit", after which the scholars and resource people will view it for possible additions or other changes. Then, after the final edit has been completed, scholars will meet again to review the final product, and from it develop a definite idea of the kinds of questions and concerns to discuss at the public forum.
SENATOR:

Dr. Ronaele Whittington conducts a daily, two-hour radio show on health matters, on K-108 in Hawaii. She has asked for a taped message from you on any health matter of interest to you. Attached is a draft message for your OK. When you have free time, we can tape it here.

--gregg/roberta

feb 1
This is Senator Dan Inouye, speaking to you from Washington.

I appreciate your invitation to discuss with you and with your listeners matters relating to health programs. Let me begin by congratulating K-108 Radio for having a community service program such as TOTAL HEALTH, and to you, Dr. Whittington, for your contributions as the director of this program.

Public discussions of health problems and concerns is very important if they are to be solved in our community. This program, TOTAL HEALTH, seems to give you that opportunity to air the many issues regarding health and community needs.

A particular concern of mine in the United States Senate has been to obtain federal assistance for the new and increasing immigrant population in our state. Without federal assistance, our local public health, education and social service programs would have been overloaded by the heavy influx of these immigrants, from Indochina and the Pacific Islands.

It has taken the Department of Health, Education and Welfare considerable time to recognize the development of the problems in Hawaii stemming from our high percentage of immigrants—-who suffer special health, language and social adjustment problems.

-more-
Following discussions with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, we were able to bring this to their attention and, in November last year, community health clinics in Hawaii became eligible to receive $325,000 through the federal Urban and Rural Initiative Health Program.

Please be assured that my concern and work in this area will continue in the months ahead.

This is

--30--
January 9, 1980

Dr. Ronaele Whittington
P.O. Box 850
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

Dear Ronaele:

I received your letter regarding the call-in health radio program and I appreciate your invitation to participate.

The timing, twelve noon to two o'clock, does not seem too difficult to meet. I will check with the Senator and Patrick DeLenny about participating. It does sound exciting, especially that you included "spiritual".

Pat is in Hawaii right now and will be back at the end of the month. There are many things that could be shared about health legislation but not necessarily on a weekly basis.

As for ads, I will be on the alert about them. I understand your concern about appropriate ads.

I look forward to your visit here in March. I have scheduled you for a visit with the Senator. Thank you for writing and congratulations on your program.

Aloha,

ROBERTA CHANG

RC: rwd
Dear Roberta,

Thanks for all the info on the new bill. Will write to the Senator. Appreciate hearing from you.

Tomorrow, January 7, I start a daily show on K108 from 12 noon to 2:00 p.m. I will be a live, call-in format about health, same as my pretape except that the listeners will have the say.

Now then, would you be willing to call? The station tells me they have no budget for my calling long distance to do programming. Could I make a formal request that the Senator himself and you call me over the air when you have items of interest to Hawaii - essentially items about mental, physical and spiritual health. For example, I think the information about the new bill would be interesting. Maybe when you get some results in hearing, you could call and we would go straight on the air with a short chat 2 or 3 minutes about the latest from Washington.

If you can call during those hours (it would be late there for you), call the regular station number (808) 524 5430 and tell them who you are and that I am expecting your call. Then they will bring me a note and I will put you on the air immediately. Otherwise your call would get into the lineup of callers listening.

The other way to handle it is to just make a regular time each week when I know you are going to call with health news from Washington. The noon news last almost until 12:15 so somewhere right around 12" 15 would be good, or right after our 1:00 p.m. hour or any half hour slot would also be good. Whatever you can work out would be just terrific.

If you hear of any health items related to Hawaii other than Senator Inouye's, I would like to have a chat or written info about those two. My basic approach will be about very personal health matters with a one to one dialogue with listeners. However, I do wish to cover the larger issues as well. At least two days I will have listeners phone about their personal problems.

Also if you have any ideas about ads, let me know. The station says if I get my own ads that I can vouch for, then I cannot complain about theirs that I do not like. Give me ideas (in your spare time of course).

Happy 1980. Will be in touch with you. Hope it will become a regular communication over K108 to get news from Washington in direct conversation with Roberta Chang and Senator Inouye.

Devoted to your mental, physical and spiritual health.
March 30, 1981

Ms. Charlotte R. Dryden
Officer Manager
Saudi Research & Marketing Company
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1030
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Ms. Dryden:

On behalf of Senator Inouye, I wish to thank you for informing us of your change of address.

Your assistance is most appreciated.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA
Press Assistant

GT: #3 cb
March 26, 1981

Senator Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

RE: Address Change

Dear Sir or Madam:

As of April 10, 1981, our office will be moving to a new location.

Please change the address on your mailing list to read:

Saudi Research & Marketing Company
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1030
Washington, D.C. 20005

Below is a mailing label from your recent correspondence for your reference.

Thank you,

Charlotte R. Dryden
Office Manager
November 20, 1980

Senator Daniel K. Inouye
Room 105 Russell Senate Bldg.
Washington D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

Regarding the one-minute radio spot you did for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, would you be kind enough to send us a photograph of yourself for use in their bulletin for their alumni.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ani Coherian
September 17, 1980

Senator Daniel K. Inouye
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

ATTENTION: Mr. Gregg Takayama

Dear Gregg:

Frank Braynard told me of his phone conversation with you today. Enclosed find copy with corresponding timing for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy public service announcement.

We'll need a reel to reel, 7½" tape for the radio stations. Would you be kind enough to mail the material to my attention and bill us for whatever recording expense you might incur.

Suffice to say all of us appreciate Senator Inouye's and your fine cooperation.

Cordially,

Norman Gladney

NG:ak
Enc.
cc: Mr. Frank Braynard

"The sea is a world of entertainment"
Television Programming • Motion Pictures • Books and Publications • Sea Pageants
LOWELL THOMAS

Hello everybody. This is Lowell Thomas. I'm just one among many Americans who feel there is a great career opportunity for young men and women fortunate enough to attend the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. It's one of the 5 federally funded service academies. Here's another booster, Senator Daniel Inouye, Chairman of the Senate Merchant Marine Subcommittee.

SENATOR INOUYE

Thank you Lowell. The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy is, indeed, the training ground for young men and women. If you're college bound, a wide variety of marvelous opportunities exist at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy - to take command, not only of the merchant fleet at sea, but also the port-side facilities, the design and development of tankers and other vessels.

One of your four accredited college years is spent at sea, aboard a U.S. merchant vessel, studying and visiting many foreign ports. Go to college. See the world...and help the nation!

ANNCR.

Find out if you qualify. Write to U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Admissions, Kings Point, NY 11024. An equal opportunity college.

Timing for Senator Inouye: 30 seconds
THANK YOU, LOVELL. THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY IS

indeed, the training ground for young men and women. If

you're college bound, a wide variety of marvelous opportunities

exist at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy - to take command,

not only of the merchant fleet at sea, but also the portside

facilities, the design and development of tankers and other

vessels.

One of your four accredited college years is spent at sea,

aboard a U.S. merchant vessel, studying and visiting many foreign

ports. Go to college, see the world...and help the nation!
September 11, 1980

Mr. Frank Braynard, Chairman
Ship Limited
919 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mr. Braynard:

This will acknowledge your recent letter requesting that I participate in a public service radio campaign in behalf of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. I shall be pleased to do so. Please contact my press aide, Gregg Takayama (202/224-6051) to make the appropriate arrangements.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUIE, Chairman
Subcommittee on Merchant
Marine and Tourism

OKI:jhr
Senator Daniel K. Inouye
105 Russell Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inouye:

As you well know, my proudest moment was organizing our nation's bicentennial Tall Ships celebration - OP SAIL.

Another deep concern of mine is helping restore our merchant marine to the greatness it knew in the 40s and 50s.

I've been asked by the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy to assemble an impressive array of supporters for a public service radio campaign in behalf of the Academy.

I've gotten Lowell Thomas, Cliff Robertson, Wally Schirra, among others, to help us.

What I would like to do is have Lowell Thomas introduce you in a radio announcement. The copy you'd transcribe would be something like the attached.

It would take only a few moments of your time.

Please drop me a line - and many thanks for your assistance.

Cordially,

Frank Braynard

FB: ak
Enc.
P.S. Thought the attached would interest you.

"The sea is a world of entertainment"

Television Programming · Motion Pictures · Books and Publications · Sea Pageants
U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

ONE-MINUTE PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT

This is Senator Daniel K. Inouye with a career idea that's great for you and your country.

The United States Merchant Marine Academy is the training ground for young men and women who augment the importance of our merchant fleet, our ports, our shipbuilding industry - the expansion of our foreign trade - vital in peacetime and times of crisis.

If you're college bound, what a wide variety of marvelous opportunities exist for men and women trained at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: to take command - not only of the merchant fleet at sea, but also the port-side facilities, the design and development of tankers and other vessels - and many other land and sea careers associated with foreign and domestic trade.

One of your four accredited college years is spent at sea, aboard a U.S. merchant vessel, studying, and visiting many foreign ports. Go to college and see the world... not bad!

Find out if you qualify. Write to U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Admissions, Kings Point, N.Y. 11024.
Old Ship May Lie Beneath the Dunes

By Patrick Brasley

Fire Island—Maritime expert Frank O. Braynard of Sea Cliff is convinced that the dunes near the old Bellport Life Saving Station hold, intact, the wreck of the SS Savannah, the first steamship to cross the Atlantic.

Braynard, curator of the U.S. Merchant Marine Museum at Kings Point and the man who organized Op Sail during the Bicentennial celebration, is planning an expedition this fall to try to uncover the historic vessel, which foundered off Fire Island in 1821. He will work with Prof. John Loret, a Queens College oceanographer, and a score of graduate students and other volunteers.

Similar expeditions have failed to find a trace of the Savannah, but Braynard and his colleagues are undeterred. "I believe the ship is buried right there on the beach beneath the dunes and that there is a good chance that she is still in excellent shape," Braynard said. "We're not discouraged by the naysayers who claim the vessel was broken up years ago."

The 300-ton, ship-rigged packet was equipped with an 85-horsepower engine and mid-ship paddle wheels that could be dismantled while under sail. In 1819, she became the first steam-powered ship to cross the Atlantic when it sailed from Savannah, Ga., to England, and then to Sweden and Russia. Almost the entire crossing was by steam power, although sails were used for short stretches in bad weather.

On a voyage from Savannah to New York City on Nov. 5, 1821, the Savannah encountered storms and ran aground off Fire Island, its master, Capt. Moses Rogers, the crew and passengers and most of the cargo were taken safely off the stranded vessel. The tide, waves and shifting dunes buried the vessel.

Rogers returned to Savannah, where he died of yellow fever less than two weeks after the wreck. Rogers' great-great-grandson, Furseman R. Rogers of Levittown, worked with Braynard in the successful campaign to have the first U.S. nuclear merchant ship, the Savannah, named after his ancestor's old command.

Braynard said the U.S. Explorers Club, a geographic group that frequently sponsors scientific expeditions, has made a preliminary contribution to the operation's $50,000 budget and is considering an application for an additional $44,000. Application also has been made for a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Braynard said.

Braynard's study of old maps, logs, documents, dune topography and the shorelines has convinced him that the Savannah is buried in up to 35 feet of sand beneath three unusually large dunes about eight miles west of the Smith Point Bridge. He said there was once an inlet at the site, and he believes the vessel was seeking shelter in Great South Bay when it ran aground.

Braynard, Loret and their team plan to mark a grid pattern on about 400 square yards of beach beneath which they believe the vessel is buried. A coffer dam will be constructed to keep the sea and sand out, and the team will use electronic probes to detect wood and metal from the Savannah. The expedition has received permission from the National Sea Shore Institute to set up a camp at the site.
January 6, 1980

Dear Roberta,

Thanks for all the info on the new bill. Will write to the Senator.

Appreciate hearing from you.

Tomorrow, January 7, I start a daily show on K108 from 12 noon to 2:00 p.m. It will be a live, call-in format about health, same as my pretape except that the listeners will have the say.

Now then, would you be willing to call? The station tells me they have no budget for my calling long distance to do programming. Could I make a formal request that the Senator himself and you call me over the air when you have items of interest to Hawaii - essentially items about mental, physical and spiritual health. For example, I think the information about the new bill would be interesting. Maybe when you get some results in hearing, you could call and we would go straight on the air with a short chat 2 or 3 minutes about the latest from Washington.

If you can call during those hours (it would be late there for you), call the regular station number (808) 524 5430 and tell them who you are and that I am expecting your call. Then they will bring me a note and I will put you on the air immediately. Otherwise your call would get into the lineup of callers listening.

The other way to handle it is to just make a regular time each week when I know you are going to call with health news from Washington. The noon news last almost until 12:15 so somewhere right around 12" 15 would be good, or right after our 1:00 p.m. hour or any half hour slot would also be good. Whatever you can work out would be just terrific.

If you hear of any health items related to Hawaii other than Senator Inouye's, I would like to have a chat or written info about those two. My basic approach will be about very personal health matters with a one to one dialogue with listeners. However, I do wish to cover the larger issues as well. At least two days I will have listeners phone about their personal problems.

Also if you have any ideas about ads, let me know. The station says if I get my own ads that I can vouch for, then I cannot complain about theirs that I do not like. Give me ideas (in your spare time of course).

Happy 1980. Will be in touch with you. Hope it will become a regular communication over K108 to get news from Washington in direct conversation with Roberta Chang and Senator Inouye.

Devoted to your mental, physical and spiritual health
June 15, 1981

Ms. Ann Director  
Media Coordinator  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Dear Ann:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Senator's participation in your program. I know that he appreciates the opportunity to be of assistance.

Please do not hesitate to call on us if we can be of further help.

Aloha,

GREGG TAKAYAMA  
Press Assistant

GT: mcb
June 10, 1981

Mr. Gregg Takayama  
Press Secretary  
Senator Daniel Inouye  
105 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Takayama:

I want to thank you for your assistance in arranging Senator Daniel Inouye's participation in our public service announcement program. Distribution of the spots is planned for July 24.

I am enclosing a copy of the news release which will be sent to all of the daily and weekly newspapers in Hawaii.

Once again, thank you.

Sincerely,

Ann Director  
Media Coordinator

Enclosure
For release: Upon Receipt
For information contact: Ann Director

10% OF HAWAII RESIDENTS SUFFER COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS

One out of every ten persons in Hawaii suffers from a speech, language or hearing impairment, making communicative disorders the state's number one handicap.

Senator Daniel Inouye is lending his public support to a campaign sponsored by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) to increase public awareness of communicative disorders and of the professional help available in Hawaii.

"Most people with speech, language or hearing disorders can be helped," said Senator Inouye, "if the problem is recognized and treated promptly."

According to ASHA, the 35,000-member non-profit society of speech-language pathologists and audiologists, many people with communicative disorders suffer needlessly because they don't know where to turn for help. Nationally, over $1.75 billion in earnings are lost each year due to communicative disorders.

Professional help is available. For information write Hawaii Speech-Language and Hearing Association, P.O. Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.
Mr. Gregg Takayama
Press Secretary
Senator Daniel Inouye
105 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
April 15, 1981

Ms. Ann Director
Media Coordinator
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
10801 Rockville Pike
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Dear Ms. Director:

I wish to thank you for your thoughtful invitation to assist your organization in increasing public awareness of communicative disorders, and the availability of professional help.

I would be most happy to cooperate in any way I can.

My staff will be in touch with you to make the necessary arrangements for the two television tapes and photography scheduling.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI: mcb
United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

6/4/81

FILE MEMO

Two public service TV spots taped at Recording Studio today. (30 and 60-seconds).

Ann Director has videotapes, will make copies and handle distribution thru media mailing list I gave her.

Hawaii assoc. will contact DKI to present him with plaque for his assistance.

--gregg
MEMORANDUM

Monday, May 18

SENATOR:

You had been asked to do a public service videotape for Hawaii TV stations, by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Assn.

Attached are the drafts of 2 TV spots.

If they are OK, I can arrange taping date at Recording Studio.

--gregg

thurs. 6/4 - 2:30 pm x 4977
One out of every 10 persons in Hawaii has a speech, language or hearing disorder.

Those affected should receive expert help and community support. In some cases, disorders can be treated or prevented.

Have a checkup,

For more information, write to the Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, PO Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.
One out of every 10 persons in Hawaii suffers from a speech, language or hearing disorder.

Prompt, professional treatment is available.

If your child is not responding to sounds, or talking at normal levels;

or if your spouse has failed to regain his or her speech after a stroke;

or if you think you have a hearing loss from constant loud noises at your job;

you should arrange a hearing and speech checkup.

With early recognition and proper treatment, many problems can be helped. Adequate speech, language and hearing levels can be restored.

For more information, write to the Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, P.O. Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.

Do it today.
One out of every 10 persons in Hawaii has a speech, language or hearing disorder.

Those affected should receive expert help and community support. In some cases, disorders can be treated or prevented.

Have a checkup.

For more information, write to the Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, PO Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.

- 30 -
(60-second spot)

One out of every 10 persons in Hawaii suffers from a speech, language or hearing disorder.

Prompt, professional treatment is available.

If your child is not responding to sounds, or talking at normal levels;

or if your spouse has failed to regain his or her speech after a stroke;

or if you think you have a hearing loss from constant loud noises at your job;

you should arrange a hearing and speech checkup.

With early recognition and proper treatment, many problems can be helped. Adequate speech, language and hearing levels can be restored.

For more information, write to the Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, P.O. Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734. Do it today.
April 9, 1981

Hon. Daniel Inouye
U. S. Senate
105 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Attn: Gregg Takayama

Dear Senator Inouye:

One out of every ten citizens in Hawaii is affected by speech, language, and/or hearing disorders. With more than 22 million Americans suffering from communicative disorders, it is the nation's number one disability.

We would like to call on you to help us bring to the attention of the people in your state the prevalence of communicative disorders and the availability of professional help through a thirty and sixty second television public service announcement we have prepared (copy enclosed). The announcements can be changed as you wish, within the general framework of the message. You are the only official we will be contacting to do the PSAs in your state.

We hope you can find time in your busy schedule to film these announcements and then permit us to reproduce and distribute them to television stations in Hawaii. We will be happy to reimburse you for all taping charges and, of course, reproduction and distribution will be completed through our office.

In addition, we request permission for our photographer to take photos of you during or after the taping session to accompany news releases distributed to the daily and weekly newspapers throughout the state.

Upon distribution, your state speech-language-hearing association will contact you to arrange for the presentation of a plaque thanking you for your participation in this project.

I will contact your press secretary to discuss this in further detail and make the appropriate arrangements. Thank you for your time, and I hope you will be available to assist us in reaching the millions affected by communicative disorders.

Sincerely,

Ann Director
Media Coordinator
April 9, 1981

Hon. Daniel Inouye
U. S. Senate
105 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Attn: Gregg Takayama

Dear Senator Inouye:

One out of every ten citizens in Hawaii is affected by speech, language, and/or hearing disorders. With more than 22 million Americans suffering from communicative disorders, it is the nation's number one disability.

We would like to call on you to help us bring to the attention of the people in your state the prevalence of communicative disorders and the availability of professional help through a thirty and sixty second television public service announcement we have prepared (copy enclosed). The announcements can be changed as you wish, within the general framework of the message. You are the only official we will be contacting to do the PSAs in your state.

We hope you can find time in your busy schedule to film these announcements and then permit us to reproduce and distribute them to television stations in Hawaii. We will be happy to reimburse you for all taping charges and, of course, reproduction and distribution will be completed through our office.

In addition, we request permission for our photographer to take photos of you during or after the taping session to accompany news releases distributed to the daily and weekly newspapers throughout the state.

Upon distribution, your state speech-language-hearing association will contact you to arrange for the presentation of a plaque thanking you for your participation in this project.

I will contact your press secretary to discuss this in further detail and make the appropriate arrangements. Thank you for your time, and I hope you will be available to assist us in reaching the millions affected by communicative disorders.

Sincerely,

Ann Director
Media Coordinator
This is Senator Daniel Inouye and I'm concerned about the one person out of every ten in Hawaii who has a speech, language, and/or hearing disorder.

For those affected, expert professional help and community support is vital; for those whose problem may be preventable, accurate information is essential.

For your family and yourself, have a speech and hearing checkup. For information write Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, P. O. Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.
This is Senator Daniel Inouye and I'm concerned about the one out of every ten persons in Hawaii who has a speech, language, and/or hearing disorder.

To those affected, expert professional help and community support is vital, and for those whose problem may be preventable, accurate information is essential.

Prompt, professional treatment is available. So if you're concerned because your child isn't responding to sounds and talking at levels that are right for his or her age, your spouse hasn't talked normally since his or her stroke, you feel you have a hearing loss, you are exposed to constant loud noises at your job - you should have a hearing and speech checkup.

With early recognition and proper treatment many problems can be helped and adequate speech, language, and hearing levels can often be restored. For more information write the Hawaii Speech, Language and Hearing Association, P. O. Box 1303, Kailua, Hawaii 96734.