

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP**

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO		X		
15	VC/NIC				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
		SUSPENSE	_____	Date	

Remarks	
---------	--

Executive Secretary
29 July 1985
Date

3637 (10-81)

A-310

STAT

Page Denied

ARNOLD BEICHMAN

I recently read a review, published in a certain magazine to be identified later, of a book, *Dezinformatia*, by two respected academics, Professor Richard H. Shultz Jr. of Tufts University's Fletcher School of Diplomacy and Roy Godson of Georgetown University. The review made the following serious charges against this book:

- The book was said to use "specious arguments to prove the obvious."
- It misrepresents reality to prove

Arnold Beichman, a founding member of the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, of which Professor Godson is coordinator, frequently writes about intelligence matters.

Misinformation on disinformation

a simplistic point.

- It is "misguided," exhibits a "total lack of understanding" about Clausewitz, shows "a superficial understanding of current history and the Soviet Union."

- It didn't "fairly report" the content of Soviet journals, it has treated the subject "irresponsibly," it suffers from "extraordinarily naive assumptions" and "erroneous history."

- And the book was said "ultimately" to serve "neither scholarship nor the national interest."

Such harsh language about the published work of academics can be

defined as a form of character assassination, since it questions their honor as teachers and researchers. For my part, to be even harsher, I would say that this review could, with little editing, have appeared in

a Soviet publication.

Now, then, would you like to guess in what left-wing, pro-Soviet, progressive journal this book review appeared? If you're very smart and sophisticated, you might try and

guess, but you'd be wrong. I'll have to tell you:

This book review appeared in an official magazine of the government

see BEICHMAN, page 2D

...demand for equality. A widespread appeal because it is simple and reflects the egalitarian principle of American society," writes Jean Yarbrough, a political science professor at Loyola University in Chicago, in the summer issue of *Policy Review*. "But when applied to military affairs, it is wrong and dangerous."

Her arguments are simple, if not obvious. Physical and psychological differences that are important in combat, such as strength and aggression, give men the advantage. Nurturing and conciliation are gifts that have no currency on the battlefield. What seems absurd is that such arguments still have to be made.

One of the most touching scenes in the movie "An Officer and a Gentleman," is the moment during basic training when Richard Gere sacrifices a record-making run to help a young woman overcome an obstacle she is too weak to climb. In real life running, women keep up only with men who slow down.

world organizes its army by treating women as if they are the same as men. To do so would leave the motherland vulnerable.

Physical requirements have actually been lowered for women at West Point. They do not take part in hand-to-hand combat with men, only with women, even though it's unlikely they'll ever encounter other women in a war. When only 14 percent of the women at West Point achieved a passing time on the two-mile run compared with 96 percent of the men, West Point changed the rules to let women "pace themselves" against the times of women.

...design for a policy that to enable women to answer nature's call as easily (well, almost) as men without excusing themselves from battle, and without taking off their fighting clothes.

The Army's approach to equal opportunity, while pleasing some aging radical feminists, is out-of-step with recent feminist thinking. Jean Baker Miller, a psychiatrist, calls in *Ms.* magazine for women to become leaders in international relations so that men don't use "brute force."

This goes to the heart of the problem. A "brute force" is exactly what every successful army must be. Women generally don't make good brutes. Wars are won, in George S. Patton's celebrated formulation, not by "poor sons of bitches dying for their country," but by "men who make other poor sons of bitches die for their country." The battlefield — which every army must regard as its ultimate destination — is no place to conduct daring social experiments.

Reagan's lower tax rates and doubled exemption.

That's why the Greater Washington (D.C.) Research Center's July 1 report said lower-income taxpayers would receive the largest proportional benefits under Mr. Reagan's proposal.

The reason? Of the 58 percent of all federal tax return filers with incomes below \$20,000, only 11.6 percent (less than 6.7 percent of all taxpayers) claimed deductions for state and local taxes, and they only got \$7.6 billion, or 7.8 percent of the total.

This means the huge lower-income 58 percent of all taxpayers paid at least \$65 billion in state and local taxes that they could not or did not deduct from their federal tax. Only lower tax rates could offset that harsh inequity.

Of the 21 percent of all the taxpayers in the \$20,000-30,000 group, only 44.4 percent itemized, and this group got only 18 percent of the

gans tax plan will save individual California taxpayers a net of \$3.2 billion. And what they lose in the state and local deduction (\$4 billion) is more than offset by what they gain in rate reduction (\$6 billion) and the doubled exemptions (\$4.8 billion) which also help offset other lost deductions.

The prestigious accounting firm of Arthur Andersen did a study for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and found that even high-income, itemizing taxpayers in every state with taxable incomes of \$50,000 and varying values of homes came out ahead with the president's plan. Even in New York City, Mr. Cuomo's home, taxpayers with a median home (\$97,000 value) were \$600 better off than under current law. And in the great "heartland" states of Ohio and Illinois, the savings were \$1,200 to \$1,700.

This is why Mr. Cuomo is blowing smoke on this issue. Just don't let that smoke blind you to the value of tax reform.

BEICHMAN

From page 1D

of the United States, a magazine published by the Central Intelligence Agency — yes, by the CIA under the supervision of the Deputy Directorate for Intelligence that is responsible for all CIA analyses of world affairs.

The publication, a quarterly called *Studies in Intelligence*, is an "in-house" publication. It is not distributed publicly since some articles are classified; others, such as the book review I am discussing, are unclassified. The essay-review, in the magazine's winter 1984 issue, was written by Avis Boutell, a CIA analyst, who works for the Foreign Broadcast Information Service.

When I read the Shultz-Godson book some months ago to prepare my own favorable review, I found it a cool, scholarly examination of Soviet propaganda and disinformation strategies. So did a number of other distinguished Sovietologists and publicists, such as Professors Adam Ulam and Uri Ra'anana, Dr. Robert Conquest, and Professor Sidney Hook, who wrote the laudatory introduction.

The book, now in its third edition, included what I regarded as highly informative interviews with defectors who had specialized, while in the service of the KGB in the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, in "active measures." The Soviet strategy of "active measures" involves, for the most part, covert disinformation as "a non-attributed or falsely attributed communication, written or oral, containing intentionally false, incomplete, or misleading information [frequently combined with true information], which seeks to deceive, misinform, and/or mislead the target," according to the Shultz-Godson definition.

In other words, the book describes a panoply of Soviet tactics to manipulate the media in the democracies, the use of "agents of influence," sponsorship of clandestine radio broadcasts, and use of international front organizations. These strategies and tactics are excellently described in this important book.

Not only is *Studies in Intelligence* an official government magazine, but it also is published by a U.S. secret service. It therefore must be assumed that whatever is published therein represents the official view of the CIA or, at the very least, the point of view of CIA analysts. As an analogy, a Voice of America editorial, for example, must be approved by responsible State Department officials before it can be read on the air.

If the CIA book review reflects the political culture of the CIA and the world in which its analysts live, then some of the egregious errors about Soviet intentions made by the CIA over the past 15 or more years, errors which have been publicly discussed in the press and by the two congressional committees on intelligence oversight, become understandable.

One could take apart, paragraph by paragraph, this CIA book review to demonstrate its use of the rhetoric of overkill.

Here I want merely to deal with the political approach of a CIA analyst whose views, no matter what the CIA might say, seem to harmonize with the agency's ethos, which I pray is not that of William J. Casey, CIA director. That this review got past Mr. Casey, I can understand; he has more important problems to deal with. But isn't there somebody in his organization who has the wit, understanding, and common decency to realize that the language used to discuss the Shultz-Godson book might be better suited to a review of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*?

Take this sneering, reductive sen-

tence in the review: "They [the authors] seem less concerned to prove that the Soviet Union than to West totally it is irrational and the benign."

Now anyone who has read this book knows that the authors do not seek to prove that the U.S.S.R. is irrational. On the contrary, what they demonstrate is that the Soviet KGB is performing what the Politburo's foreign-policy operative phrase is "to prove . . . the West totally is benign."

Of course, the authors do not try to show that the West is totally benign. Such a thesis is irrelevant to the book since it is merely attempting to discuss Soviet "active measures," not the good intentions of the West.

But let's face it: couldn't a victim of Soviet totalitarianism, rotting in one of its prison camps — or an Andrei Sakharov or Anatoly Shcharansky — say that, in comparison to the wholly rational tyranny of the U.S.S.R., the West is "totally benign?"

What the author (and in this, I am sure, the reviewer reflects the views of the CIA establishment) clearly rejects (and the targets of the review do not) is the meaning of Marxism-Leninism as a permanent constituent of Soviet foreign policy. What that doctrine means is that Mikhail Gorbachev cannot regard as legitimate any system of rule other than communism. Marxism-Leninism sees other political systems as doomed to fall because of the "contradictions of capitalism."

Since Marxism-Leninism carries the banner of history and the future, the U.S.S.R. alone has the right to judge who shall live and who shall die. That is why negotiation with the Soviet Union, except on its own terms, is doomed to fail until the Soviet Union accepts — in practice, not in joint communiqués — an amendment to the eschatology of Marxism-Leninism.

The CIA reviewer demonstrates — let's call it naive — a surprising naivete in assuming that the Soviet media, during the Nixon-Kissinger-Ford detente period, out of conviction sincerely ascribed to the West "realistic, positive qualities."

And she attacks the authors for not giving due credit to this thawing of the eternal Soviet winter. Of course, the Soviet media were willing to be kinder and less strident because it was during detente that the U.S.S.R. engaged without Western opposition in the greatest arms-building program of any country in history. The Soviets continue that program to this very day.

But then there came a time when the kissing had to stop. The Soviet media changed the lovey-dovey, bear-hugging music. What in heaven's name did the West do that forced upon a doting Soviet Union a change of tune, from detente mellowness to cold war harshness? Was the error to accept sadly the destruction of 269 lives on KAL 007? Sadly accept the killing of Major Nicholson? Sadly accept the attempt on the pope's life? Sadly accept martial law for Poland? Sadly accept the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan?

But let us assume that the reviewer is correct in some of her criticisms. Does that call for a savage rhetorical barrage which borders on high-level billingsgate? Does it call for a cannonade of unprovable charges such as the claims that the book "hurts" the profession of intelligence, and the efforts to develop "a rational foreign policy" and that the book serves "neither scholarship nor the national interest?" If anybody has "hurt" the profession of intelligence, it would be Avis Boutell and whoever edits the CIA magazine.

What kind of behavior is that, William Casey? Is someone down there trying to get even with somebody else?

TUESDAY, JULY 16, 1985

CLASSIFIED
STARTS ON PAGE 5D

CO

STEPHEN CHAPMAN

Burger throw

Justice loses his cool over

Judges are notoriously fallible, but it isn't too much to ask that their mistakes be confined to the courtroom. Unfortunately, Warren Burger, who has done enough damage in his daytime job as chief justice of the United States of America, insists on, occasionally moonlighting as the village crank.

His latest tirade was contained in a talk to about 30 delegates to the national convention of the American Bar Association, in which Mr. Burger portrayed advertising by lawyers as a certain sign of the collapse of civilization as we know it.

"I will say never — my advice to the public is — never, never, never, under any circumstances, engage the services of a lawyer who advertises," he spluttered, as if he were talking about convicted shoplifters.

The chief justice went on to denounce much legal advertising as "sheer shysterism" which is "pulling down" the image of the entire legal profession.

Pulling down its image? Well, as Dorothy Parker said when informed that Calvin Coolidge had died, how can anyone tell? Outside the chambers of the Supreme Court, it may surprise Mr. Burger to learn, people don't genuflect whenever a blue suit walks into the room.

It's also an open question whether the profession's image suffers more from lawyers' TV commercials or from the continual example of Warren Burger. And scholars can attest that the term "shyster" was habitually applied to attorneys long before television was invented.

Stephen Chapman is a nationally syndicated columnist.

But Mr. Burger is not a thinker of dazzling clarity. How else do we explain his assumption that an address to 30 lawyers, at a meeting open to any of 15,000 delegates, at the convention of a group renowned for its love of publicity, was strictly private? "I am not ready to say that [his opinion of lawyers' ads] publicly yet," he demurred, as a working reporter from *The Washington Post* dutifully recorded every word.

The chief justice's comments should be taken not as a detached analysis of the public interest, but as special-interest pleading. But it isn't likely to change anything...When Warren Burger rants, we have the luxury of ignoring him.

He also managed to insult a perfectly honorable trade when he insisted that if he were in private practice, he would "go out and dig ditches before" he'd advertise. This is the sort of vow that can come only from someone who has never dug ditches. A couple of hours at the business end of a shovel would give Mr. Burger a new respect for ambulance-chasing.

GWYNNE DYER

"I do not wish to be branded as a pessimist," said Derek Winstanley, a British meteorologist now working for the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Service in Washington, "but events over the past two decades testify to the harsh realities that have to be faced." Most of the Sahel may be doomed, he believes: people simply cannot live there any more. It is not just a question of drought — the climate is changing.

It is bad enough that people are starving in the millions this year all along the southern edge of the Sahara, and it is hard enough to get food to them even on an emergency basis. But nobody wants to contemplate the prospect that the region never will recover.

If the rains do not eventually return to this vast, semi-desert area, some 20 million to 30 million people will have to move or die. Moving them, however, would be the equivalent of evacuating all of Canada and resettling its population somewhere else (with the added complication that some entire countries, such as Chad and Mali, might have to be virtually abandoned even

Is Africa

There are ominous

DESERT REGION SOUTH 7½ MIL SEVEN NATIONS IN DANGER

If the rains do not eventually return to this vast, semi-desert area, some 20 million to 30 million people will have to move or die. Moving them, however, would be the equivalent of evacuating all of Canada and resettling its population somewhere else — with the added complication that some entire countries, such as Chad and Mali, might have to be virtually abandoned.

