



**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY**

**2430 E STREET, N. W.**

**WASHINGTON 25, D. C.**

**TO: Mr. Samuel W. Crosby**  
**Committee on Appropriations**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington 25, D. C.**

**FROM: John S. Warner**  
**Legislative Counsel**

STAT

**Forwarded herewith are seven copies of  
C. L. Sulzberger's article in the New York Times,  
13 May 1961, which Mr. Dulles promised to make  
available to the Committee.**

UNCLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
 OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP**

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
STAT	OGC/LC <input type="text"/>		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DIRECT REPLY</b>	<b>PREPARE REPLY</b>
<b>APPROVAL</b>	<b>DISPATCH</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>FILE</b>	<b>RETURN</b>
<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>INFORMATION</b>	<b>SIGNATURE</b>

**Remarks:**

George:

Attached are copies of Cy Sulzberger's article in the New York Times of 13 May which the Director promised to make available to the members of the Cannon Committee.

JSE

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.

DATE

EO/DCI/JSEarman:blp

17 STAT61

UNCLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

MAY 1

# Foreign Affairs

## A Problem First Posed by Pericles

By C. L. SULZBERGER

PARIS, May 12.—Events have once again forced us to reconsider all the implications, in terms of ultimate survival, of what we so proudly call our open society. The advantages of an open society to the persons fortunate enough to inhabit it, are incomparably great when compared to a closed society like that of the Soviet Union. It is needless to discuss these advantages which are the very essence of our political theory. The question posed, however, is: At what point does an open society become a naked society? And the debate on this point is still imprecise.

We protect ourselves against misused liberties by laws forbidding libel, slander or other forms of vilification; laws nevertheless do not inhibit freedom of our press or speech. We recognize that for the sake of decency, a society, just like the individuals who comprise it, requires some degree of vestment. The argument comes when we argue what vestment is needed in security's name. Is it entirely safe, in cold war, for democracy to wear only a bikini?

This, in essence, is the question raised by President Kennedy and which has become a topic of sharp dispute. The President points out obvious advantages of closed societies that conduct cold war with "war-time discipline no democracy would ever hope—or wish—to match."

By contrast, he repeats that the dangers of excessive and unwarranted concealment of pertinent facts far outweigh the dangers which are cited to justify it; that there is little value in insuring the survival of our nation if our traditions do not survive with it. Yet he mentions the evident fact that American newspapers unintentionally provide our adversaries with valuable information.

This observation has been greeted with hostility. It has been pointed out that our press performs a valid watchdog role, and that the Government itself errs in leaking wrong information. All this is true but, in my opinion, the broad problem presented by Mr. Kennedy merits profound consideration.

We have never attempted anything similar to London's Official Secrets Act, which seems over-restrictive. Nor does the informal British system whereunder editors are enjoined from printing certain things seem always conducive to public interest. Whether in the ridiculous ban on information concerning King Edward VIII's trans-Atlantic romance or in the recent George Blake spy case, no logic can be adduced that self-censorship favored Britain's interests.

Nevertheless, if the English go too far, one is forced to wonder if we go far enough. The President's concern is valid. If he did not point out a precise way of rectifying obvious weaknesses, neither do those who dispute him. Our system depends on an informed public opinion; but it is not necessary for this opinion to know the innermost secrets on which our security relies. Surely a national commission should study the subject and make recommendations, a commission representing both Government and press and dealing with aspects of a cold war, not a hot one.

No doubt our so called world image benefited immensely from the publicized rocketing of Commander Shepard. The Government took a great risk in permitting this; but the gamble paid off handsomely. One wonders, nevertheless, if it is similarly advisable to test so many Cape Canaveral missile launchings in everybody's full view.

The issues involved are both acute and old: the effort to practice freedom and yet survive a deadly contest. It was first and best set out by Pericles some twenty-five centuries ago. He said:

"Ours is a free state both in politics and daily life. . . . We are superior to our enemies, too, in our preparations for war. Our city is open to the world. We are not always expelling foreigners for fear of their learning or seeing something of military importance. . . . We live freely, and yet we face the same dangers quite as readily as they. . . . Those men surely should be deemed bravest who know most clearly what danger is and what pleasure is and are not made thereby to flinch."

These noble words state the problem we face today. But in considering the messages of both Pericles and Kennedy, let us remember something else. The "free state" of which the Athenian leader boasted lost its war with regimented Sparta. Its traditions, indeed, survived and we still cherish many of them. But free society, died.