

organizations.

Many deletions caused little problem. In some cases, where an ex-CIA official's affiliation with the Agency was well known, I had used that person's true name. The Agency objected. I felt the point was unimportant and agreed to substitute titles or aliases.

At one point I really became worried. Bob said that I must produce the document from which I had taken a direct quote. If I could not produce it, he warned that I would be accused of stealing secret documents. I had not deigned to steal any of the Agency's classified fantasy, but I was not sure that I could relocate that precise quote. Luck was with me that day, and a short scan of the research materials I had brought with me produced that quoted passage.

We referred the question of joint operations with the Thai police to the general counsel's office, which conceded that such information was probably not deletable. We continued our review based on the premise that I could discuss joint intelligence and counterinsurgency programs with the Thais. Even so, I could not mention my participation in programs with specifically named Thai organizations although I could substitute phrases to describe them. Also I was allowed, via footnoting, to replace a deleted item with information from a source document. By juxtaposition I hoped my meaning would be clear.

The next day I objected to the deletion of my very negative assessment of the Agency's long-term operations against mainland China. I produced a book, *Sub Rosa*, in which a former Hong Kong station chief, Peer de Silva, set forth his own lengthy, negative evaluation of those operations. I said Peer's book had been approved by the PRB and it had permitted him to state his opinion; therefore, I should be given the same privilege. Bob agreed and my critical comments, in modified version, were reinstated. From that point on I searched through books written by former Agency officials and cleared by the CIA, to locate items similar to deletions made in my book. By this tactic I was successful in reinstating numerous deletions.

We had a problem over naming specific CIA stations and bases — other than those already acknowledged — even though those installations were well known. The Agency's objection had nothing to do with secrecy. It instead applied to administering the Freedom of Information Act. Whenever the Agency acknowledged the existence of a station or base, the public could, under the act, demand documents relating to the facility. Although it seldom releases documents in response to such appeals, the Agency must by law physically check all such documents. By not allowing anyone to admit that a station or base exists, it avoids those requests.

Bob and I agreed to a modified version of my book. That weekend I made all the changes. On Monday morning I reviewed those changes with Mark Lynch and submitted the book to the deputy general counsel, Mayerfeld. In the interim Mayerfeld's office had reversed itself. He said *The New York Times' Pentagon Papers* had not been officially released, that the Supreme Court only ruled that it could not enjoin publication of those documents. Therefore, my discussion of liaison programs with Thai organizations might again encounter opposition.

That night I searched through the edition of the *Pentagon Papers* that Senator Mike Gravel of Alaska had entered in the official records of the Senate. I found that it included the Lansdale memorandum and therefore supposed that that constituted official disclosure. The next morning I happily relayed the news to Bob. He said members of Congress could say anything, so the Gravel edition did not count.

Official disclosure only occurs when a member performs that function. But how finely I was yet to find out.

I immediately went to the Reston Room made by members of the executive branch organizations. I spent the day going through all entries under Thailand from the present to well-publicized incident, allegedly caused by land. Because of the furor, numerous American CIA operations in Thailand. Some press CIA officials in Langley and the United States constituted executive branch disclosure of CIA. He asked if the articles named specific American CIA official in Langley did not count. I said made a statement. He asked if the statements write anything, and if the statement was no disclosure. (Later after completing the review level CIA official making a direct statement land.) I called Bob and asked if that did disclosure. He said no. That person had prosecuted for violating his secrecy agreement public evidence of the CIA's relationship and concede that I might retain relevant items in

On Tuesday, April 8, I went to the Agency resubmitted version. I was not surprised that it had reversed itself in several key areas. It merely changed its objections and

China desk had changed its objections. The desk now claimed that the technique, recruiting persons from the other side known than prostitution. Of course if I could ation would be meaningless. That night I cleaned out its shelf of books written by me undoubtedly written at the behest of the desk in detail. By adding footnotes to the discussion of that technique.

The Thai desk had also changed its position for deletion — namely, the rural village surveillance officials. The desk's original objection pertained to liaison with Thais. When it became apparent the desk then claimed the technique itself was ridiculous. Over the years I had lectured describing the method. When documents were located, the Thai desk had to drop its objections.

Forty-six days after I submitted the script with a letter saying that it had no secret that version. Throughout the review one came to CIA operations with Thai organizations