

31479

~~SECRET~~/EYES ONLY/IMMEDIATE

TO: DIRECTOR ☐

RYBAT

FOR DIRECTOR BUSH FROM HELMS

170700Z

(Please deliver at OOB
on 17 February)

1. Noted Tuesday morning in AP story by David Martin that you are scheduled to meet today with Senator Huddleston "to discuss the Committee's request for the names of journalists and news organizations who have been on the CIA payroll." In addition the story says, "a top intelligence official insisted that Bush would not RPT not turn over the names to the Committee under any circumstances".
2. Delighted to ~~note~~ ^{see} that this will be your ~~stand~~ ^{position} and that you are avoiding that slippery slope on which your predecessor seemed to enjoy skiing so much. Every sensible alumnus would back you to the hilt on this stand. Congressional committees have no RPT no right to agent names. ^{during past year} Revelations of modus operandi peculiar to clandestine intelligence ~~during past year~~ ^{have} been extremely harmful, ^(are no doubt discovering) as you ~~will gradually discover~~ I do not have to be familiar with what is going on at the Agency to be able to divine that.
3. At the risk of sounding gratuitous, which I have no intention of being, I become increasingly bemused by the double standard practiced by the Congress and the press on this issue of the confidentiality of sources used by investigative reporters and other media news collectors. The press contends that "the public has a right to know" about anything under the sun except RPT except the source who leaked the information to the journalist. If "the public has a right to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-2-

(governmental actions)
know" about ~~news events~~ why does it not have "a right to know" about where the information originated? If you are offered a glass of water, you not only have a right to know that it is water but you should also have a right to know that it came from a poisoned well. The Church Committee has not called one single newspaperman to attempt to ascertain where various leaks originated. All this Committee has done is ^{to} say "there have been no leaks from our Committee". Nonsense. But what is more, in the long investigation which Church has undertaken, his Committee and its staff have made no RPT no efforts to find out the sources of patently phony allegations *(in newspapers and magazines)* about the Agency and its operations. Huddleston has struck me as a fairly sensible fellow. Perhaps he would like to chew on this red herring: make-weight argument ^{it may be} but useful debating point. (Hope you do not mind mixed metaphors!)

4. Referring to preceding paragraph, you will have undoubtedly noticed that the Columbia Broadcasting System is prepared to back Daniel Schorr in protecting the confidentiality of the source from whom he acquired the House Intelligence Report. I am no lawyer, but I have never heard it alleged that there is any constitutional protection for the identify of news sources. The ~~assertion~~ about confidentiality is entirely a piece of media sophistry. But so far they have been pretty successful in making it stick.

5. Good luck and warm regards.

mt
~~SECRET~~