



CPYRGHT

FOIAb3b

Written by Otepka

CPYRGHT

Secret Loyalty Reports Aired

By Richard Harwood
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate Internal Security subcommittee, over the bitter objections of the State Department, made public yesterday "secret" loyalty reports on ten prominent Americans.

The reports were written by Otto Otepka, a State Department security officer who was fired in 1963 (but is still on the payroll). Otepka, in violation of a Presidential order issued by Harry S. Truman in 1952, gave the reports to the subcommittee to demonstrate "laxity" in the Department's security operation. That was the main reason for his dismissal.

He produced no evidence of disloyalty on the part of any of the men involved—other than gossip—and all ten ultimately were given a clean bill of health by Otepka himself.

They came under investigation by Otepka's office in 1962 when they were appointed to an Advisory Committee on International Organizations.

Granted Waivers

Because of their eminence, and to avoid time-consuming delays, they were granted security waivers and began work before they were checked out.

Otepka, in a secret memorandum to a superior, objected to seven of the waivers for a variety of reasons.

The Committee chairman, Sol Linowitz, board chairman of the Xerox Corporation, had a blank file and was not entitled to clearance, Otepka argued, until he could be investigated.

Ernest Gross, a former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, required investiga-

tion, said Otepka, because of rumors that he had been "friendly with Alger Hiss."

The same point was made by Otepka in his report on Andrew Cordier, a former U.N. official who is now a graduate dean at Columbia University.

Lawrence Finkelstein, a vice president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, had once done research at the Institute of Pacific Relations and deserved investigation on that account, Otepka reported.

Reasons Not Given

He recommended that Marshal D. Shulman, now a John Hopkins University dean, be "thoroughly investigated" for reasons not specified.

The same recommendation was made in the case of Harding Bancroft, executive vice president of the New York Times, who is now serving as an alternate U.S. delegate to the United Nations.

Bancroft, Otepka said in another report, had been described as "pro-Soviet" by Loy Henderson, a former State Department official, and had "long defended Alger Hiss and . . . relented (but not fully) only after Hiss had been sent to jail."

Never Any Doubt

Henderson said on Friday he would not comment on any conversation he might have had with Otepka but said of Bancroft:

"I have complete confidence in the loyalty and patriotism of Bancroft and never had any doubt about it."

Otepka came to roughly the same conclusion about Ban-



OTTO F. OTEPKA

... secret testimony bared

croft and other members of the Advisory Committee. They got security clearances from his office.

But he insisted that the "waiver" procedure nevertheless was wrong.

His "secret" reports were published, in part, said Subcommittee Chairman Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.), to "underscore Otepka's impressive record of fairness and objectivity in assessing allegations bearing on personnel security."

The State Department pleaded with the subcommittee not to violate the Truman order of 1952 which states that "it would be a great mistake to release the names of State Department and other Federal personnel who have been subjected to loyalty investigations . . . To divulge the names of these loyal employes and the specific steps taken in adjudi-

cating their cases would serve no useful purpose."

Release Voted

But the Subcommittee, against Dodd's wishes, voted to release the material as part of its campaign to have Otepka restored to his job.

One of those supporting that decision was Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.) who is currently fighting for legislation to protect the privacy of government employes and the privacy of their personnel files.

Otepka has been complaining to the Subcommittee for five years about State Department security practices, and 20 volumes of testimony dealing with his frustrations and disagreements with superiors have been published by the subcommittee. Yesterday's was the final volume.

Otepka finally was fired by the Department in 1963. At that time he was making \$16,000 a year. His salary has automatically risen to more than \$20,000 since then. Assigned make-work chores, he has continued to report for duty pending a hearing on his appeal.

He has also been the beneficiary of an Otto Otepka Defense Fund that raises money through newspaper advertisements in the Middle West and California.