

147/77

The CIA's 'Unequivocal' Right to Prior Review

There have been stories in the media in recent weeks concerning a new book—"Decent Interval," by Frank Snepp—that is critical of the CIA's role in the closing days of Vietnam. News stories question whether the CIA had the right to review this book or, by extension, any work before publication and, if so, whether it had the right to excise portions it reasonably considered damaging to national security.

The answer to the first question is unequivocally yes. The CIA had the right to review because the author had signed a specific agreement to that effect as part of the terms of his employment with the agency. At no time prior to publication did he challenge the validity of that agreement. Rather, he claims there is some higher right that gives him the privilege of breaking that oath.

Yet, all of the evidence upon which Snepp bases that rationale was available to him when he met with me on May 17 of this year. In that meeting he explicitly promised me that he would fulfill his written obligation to provide us his manuscript for review. More than that, he reaffirmed this obligation a few days later in writing.

The Central Intelligence Agency, and I as its Director, accepted this man at his word. We made no effort to monitor the progress of his activities. He simply violated both his own oath and our trust. Moreover, his publisher, Random House, and his initial TV interviewer, "60 Minutes," have also acknowledged that they were party to this deliberate evasion of written and spoken promises.

Why do people and organizations feel that duplicity is justified in circumstances like these? Because, I suspect, of an erroneous premise, clearly expressed in some of the newspaper articles on this case, that government employees inevitably place covering their and their agencies' reputations above their duties and even above the law. This is a common anti-establishment reaction that has become so familiar in recent years. Its fallacy lies in the absence of any evidence that the CIA, over the past year and a half when Snepp was writing his book, deliberately used secrecy to protect its reputation. To the contrary, the public record attests unequivocally to the agency's willingness to face the past squarely whatever the effect on its public reputation. The self-revelations last July of the MKULTRA drug-abuse activities of the 1950s and the 1960s are only the most recent examples of this forthright policy. What is at stake, however, is a fundamental issue for our society. If the society cannot trust the judgment of its public servants regarding what should or should not be withheld from the public, then the society can in fact have no secrets at all.




Photo by Ellsworth Davis — The Washington Post

is build into our system, as we have in the past few years, a series of bureaucratic checks and balances that will control secrets and secret activities, yet at the same time protect the public from any abuses that excessive secrecy can encourage. Beyond that,

intelligence apparatus, as well as many other organs of our government. It is remarkable today, and I say this with no self-pride because I am a newcomer, that the Central Intelligence Agency can operate as effectively as it does despite these cir-

1448

5

... should not be withheld from the public, then the society can in fact have no secrets at all. The logical extension of the Ellsberg-Snepp syndrome is that any of our 210 million citizens is entitled to decide what should or should not be classified information.

Secrecy is, of course, dangerous. It can be abused. Yet, some things must be secret. Clearly there must be checks and balances on those who decide. But because these judgments are difficult does not mean that the chaos of no regulation at all is to be preferred. I believe that the public recognizes the necessity for some secrecy in our modern society. There is no question that we each recognize it in our individual lives. Nor is there a question that we recognize it in the extension to government. None of us is so naive as to believe that we live in a totally open and benign world. Many of our efforts, like those directed toward strategic-arms limitations, which could move us closer to the open and peaceful world that we all desire, would be impossible if we tried to negotiate from a position of total openness. Nonetheless, how much secrecy is necessary and who should decide what will remain secret are vexing issues.

How much must always be a matter of the subjective judgment of human beings. The best we can do

... and secret activities, yet at the same time protect the public from any abuses that excessive secrecy can encourage. Beyond that, another check is the ballot box, where the public exercises ultimate control over the quality of individuals in public office. And, also, the free media in our society can assist the public in ensuring against

The writer is Director of the CIA.

excesses of secrecy. However, such vigilance does not best proceed from the unsubstantiated assumption of evil motives on the part of all public servants. Investigative reporting does imply some measure of investigation. No one from Random House or CBS, for instance, contacted me or anyone else in the CIA to investigate the other side of this story. It would appear that they feared that we might have obtained an injunction against publication. Yet, an injunction is a legal mechanism of our judicial process. It, too, is a means of protecting the public. Should corporations be encouraged to skirt the legal mechanisms of our country by subterfuge?

This case in itself is not worthy of this much discussion. It is only of interest as an example of our dwindling capacity to maintain the minimal level of secrecy essential to the effective operation of our

I say this with no self-pride because I am a newcomer, that the Central Intelligence Agency can operate as effectively as it does despite these circumstances. President Carter has said, "One of the greatest surprises to me in coming to office is how effective the CIA is." The concomitant of this fine performance is the fundamentally healthy and patriotic attitude within the agency despite its being a frequent whipping boy. There is no question in my mind that the people of the United States recognize the need for good intelligence and can appreciate the destructive effect the carping of a Snepp can have. It is time, instead, to concentrate on the constructive role of oversight of the CIA and other agencies of the government.

I hope that the public will join us in the CIA in seeking constructively to understand and build our role for the future. We need less encumbrance from national self-flagellation over the past and more interest in how we can achieve a workable balance between necessary secrecy on the one hand and oversight on the other. Perhaps that venerable statesman Averell Harriman is overly generous when he often says, "The CIA is our first line of defense." But he is not far enough off that we can afford less than a constructive approach to what the CIA should be providing for the defense of our country and its institutions.

CIA Director Defends Staff Cutbacks

CIA Director Stansfield Turner yesterday defended his controversial cutbacks in the Central Intelligence Agency's clandestine service while acknowledging that they have shaken morale.

"Clearly there is a morale problem when you ask 212 persons to leave," Turner told reporters on Capitol Hill yesterday following a secret briefing for the Senate Intelligence Committee. "I feel like a football coach with too many good players on the team."

At the same time, Turner said he was "very disappointed" in former CIA for-censorship and clearance authorized account of the final period of the Vietnam war, a book called "Decent Interval" just published by Random House.

In the book, Snepp charges that the American evacuation of South Vietnam in April, 1975, was a chaotic disaster brought on by major U.S. intelli-

gence failures in Saigon and Washington. Snepp, 34, said that he decided not to submit his manuscript to the CIA for censorship and clearance because the CIA had made selective leaks to the press in order to "whitewash his role" in the evacuation.

Turner said Snepp had violated his written oath of secrecy as a CIA officer and also broken a personal promise to Turner to submit his manuscript for review. "He let me down," the CIA director said, adding that he

was searching for ways to tighten security and to emphasize to CIA employees that they must heed their oath.

As for the substance of Snepp's allegations, Turner said that "in my view, Mr. Snepp was not in a position of sufficient authority to be a good judge of decisions made by the State Department, the Defense Department and the CIA in Washington and in Saigon." Snepp, who spent five years in the CIA's Saigon station, had been the agency's principal analyst of North Vietnamese political affairs.

There has been speculation that some of the 816 CIA officials cut or about to be cut from the agency's roster might be embittered enough to make public some of their inside knowledge, but Turner said he had "deep confidence in the loyalty and patriotism of the persons who have worked for us." He said the only problems of public disaffection have come from employees "who have left us on their own," such as Snepp and former CIA officers Philip Agee and John Stockwell.