

C  
O  
P  
Y

28 June 1954

Hanson Baldwin, Esquire  
THE NEW YORK TIMES  
New York, New York

Dear Hanson:

As you know, I welcome constructive criticism, particularly from one like yourself, who has a deep and abiding interest in intelligence and is sincerely working to see that the government gets better intelligence. And it is in this light that I have studied your article in THE TIMES of 3 June 1954. These/ comments, which I would like to supplement when we next get together, are intended merely as friendly comments.

As regards the Mansfield Bill, I have not adopted an attitude of opposition and the only statement I have made on the subject is in the attached interview in U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT (March 19, 1954). I am convinced that Senator Mansfield, whom I know well and respect, has at heart the desire to improve our intelligence and to protect it from destructive attack. It does not seem to me, however, that the analogy with the Atomic Energy Commission is particularly apt. The Commission has to deal with a somewhat unusual situation where a government Agency is directly involved in a major business enterprise involving large scale operations in the United States and the expenditure here of many, many times the funds allocated to CIA. Also, the AEC, as the present situation discloses, has frequent and complicated legislative problems whereas we have relatively few questions of this nature. In fact in the three years and more that I have been here, we have only sought one very minor and uncontested piece of legislation to establish the position of Deputy Director. I have also felt that it was wise to build up the existing relations between this Agency and the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Their roles are more than "cursory." Here we have established secure and satisfactory relationships. Naturally I recognize the great importance of having sponsors in the Congress to protect us from unwarranted attack.

The reference to our intelligence estimates on Indo-China in your article are not substantially accurate. While there was no formal estimate when Dien Bien Phu would fall, our current appraisals as to that situation, viewed now from hindsight, were reasonably accurate. While the first estimate made sometime before the fall of Dien Bien Phu as to the time required for redeployment to the Delta, may have been

-2-

off by a couple of weeks, the estimates made immediately after the fall and when the matter became an important problem, were "right on the nose." Since the attack on the Delta has probably been held up for political reasons, we may never know with complete accuracy the exact date when that redeployment was completed.

The most serious and frankly damaging misstatement in your article relates to our annual budget. The figure of approximately a billion ~~for~~ dollars for CIA expenditure which you have implied has been widely repeated in THE NEW YORK TIMES and elsewhere. We do not propose to disclose this figure; but the total you have given is so many times out of line as to be thoroughly damaging. I realize that you did not intend this and that as long as our figures are secret we will continue to be the victims of guesswork in an age when millions too easily become billions.

It is only because I respect your judgment and enjoy and profit by your writings that I have felt justified in commenting on your article in this detail. Naturally, it is purely personal, as I do not wish to get into public print on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ALLEN W. DULLES

Allen W. Dulles  
Director

AWD:hea

Distribution:

Addressee - Orig

DCI file - 1 cc

ER - 1 cc