

# 'Disinformation' on CIA, or the Unintentional

Reviewed by  
Thomas B. Ross

The reviewer is Washington bureau chief of The Chicago Sun-Times and the co-author of "The U-2 Affair," "The Invisible Government" and "The Espionage Establishment."

Miles Copeland, an old CIA hand, has E. Howard Hunt's penchant for adventure, intrigue, conservative geopolitics and the games grown boys play. But Hunt, when not living out his fantasies at the Watergate or Dr. Fielding's office, was turning them into fiction, so labeled. Copeland, on the other hand, has submitted his second book "The Truth About the New Espionage."

more subtle level, when the old CIA operative is practicing the fine, professional art of "disinformation" to deceive the "opposition" and, incidentally, the reader.

The problem is compounded by the fact that Copeland assertedly did not submit his manuscript to the CIA for clearance, yet the agency has not challenged its publication. By contrast, the agency took another important CIA man, Victor Marchetti, on a long ride through the courts to stop or censor his recent book, "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence."

Why such permissiveness toward Copeland when he purports to be dealing with the innermost secrets of the CIA? Perhaps it is because he is loyal and uncritical and Marchetti is not. Copeland takes the orthodox line that those who run the CIA are "incorruptible," that much of what they do should be taken on faith, and that there is more than enough control of the

agency by Congress and the White House.

But there is an inner contradiction in the argument. Copeland contends, on the one hand, that the House and Senate subcommittees on the CIA are kept fully informed of the agency's activities. On the other hand, he concedes that no one in the CIA hierarchy will "tell even those Congressmen on the 'watchdog' committee more than they 'need to know.'"

It's like President Nixon judging what evidence the House Judiciary Committee needed to pass judgment on him.

Copeland takes an insider's pleasure in the cute practices of John M. Maury, until recently the CIA officer in charge of congressional relations. "Maury, a Southern gentleman of great charm, has a simple formula," Copeland writes. "When appearing before committees, he provides a carefully worked-out story that contains no untruths, yet reveals no information

## Book World

WITHOUT CLOAK OR DAGGER: The Truth About the New Espionage. By Miles Copeland (Simon & Schuster, 351 pp., \$8.95)

that would damage the Agency should it leak out to the public. With demagogues, he takes them aside and tells them 'nothing, and lots of it, and with an air of great secrecy.' Finally, with the most respected Congressmen, he tells them the whole truth, thereby passing on to them the responsibility for deciding whether or

not what he confides should go any further."

But even when "the most respected Congressmen"—I assume he means respected by the CIA for their unway-ering support—take exception, Copeland concedes they do not necessarily prevail. He complains bitterly, at one point, about "some smart-ass kid in Support"

who complied with a congressional demand that the CIA obey official policy on chemical warfare by destroying the agency's supply of chemical agents. The proper procedure, Copeland explains, is to "lose the papers" or "concoct an excuse plausible enough" for not carrying out a "stupid order" from Congress or the White House.

Copeland suggests that in a similar way the "old boy net" dealt with a new boy, James R. Schlesinger, during his brief tenure as director of the CIA. Schlesinger sought to make the CIA "re-

## Indictment

sponsive to the needs of the White House," Copeland explains, but "The only result of his firings and attempts at reorganization was to force most of the espionage branch to go underground where he couldn't find it, thus crippling his ability to govern."

Copeland speculates that the CIA took even more drastic action against the former President's men when they repeatedly sought to use the CIA for political purposes. He theorizes that James McCord was a double agent for the CIA and that he purposefully botched the Watergate job to

expose the illegal activities of the White House plumbbers.

It does not appear to have crossed Copeland's mind—or Richard Helms' for that matter—that it might have been simpler and more efficient, not to mention more democratic, for the agency to have gone to one of its "respected Congressmen" and exposed the dirty tricks. Copeland's blind spot on Watergate is reflective of a general myopia about the problem of running a secret intelligence organization in a free society. He tried to write an apologia but produced an indictment.