JACK ANDERSON

1401 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

July 14, 1980

Dear Herb:

Thank you for your letter of June 12, responding to my two columns about Jack McGehee and his disenchantment with the agency.

I appreciated that the Agency had reviewed McGehee's work and did not require "him to delete information criticizing the Agency." But the Agency should not be applauded for the most minimal bow to the First Amendment rights of its agents, when it has been given broad powers by the Supreme Court to abridge those rights.

I agree with you that, in general, Admiral Turner has given no real "cause to question (your) honesty or integrity." And I respect you for that. But I must add that the Agency has been less than candid, and not as helpful as I feel it could be in responding to questions from my associate Dale Van Atta. In fact, he has mentioned to me that the Agency has refused him a briefing on any subject. Since this privilege has been granted other major news outlets, I can only conclude it is punitive action for writing critically about the Agency. Instances like these further elevate the importance of conscientious CIA objectors like McGehee and the things they say, which can be more reliable than those sometimes coming from persons more worried about political than security remifications.

I continue to seek favorable CIA stories, because I believe it is in the national interest to restore public confidence in all government agencies, including the CIA. I will continue to report unfavorable stories, because the public is entitled to know what their public servants are doing. But you can help me present the other side.

Sincerely,

Jack Anderson

Mr. Herbert E. Hetu Director of Public Affairs Central Intelligence Agency Washington, D.C. 20505

C141.04 Wa Gelee, Calph (orgunder Anserson)

12 June 1980

Mr. Jack Anderson 1401 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Second Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Jack:

This concerns your columns about former CIA employee Ralph McGehee. Perhaps in fairness you might emphasize that in reviewing Mr. McGehee's book and assisting him to delete classified information we did not, as is often charged, ask him to delete information criticizing the Agency. Subsequently, we have also reviewed two additional submissions by Mr. McGehee; one a review of Mr. Colby's book, "Honorable Men," and another article describing the Agency's review of his book which is highly critical of that process. Both were reviewed with no changes requested.

I will not debate Mr. McGehee's charges. However, I would hope that you would attest to the fact that during the past 3+ years your relations with this Agency, Admiral Turner and myself would give you no cause to question our honesty ar integrity. We may not always be able to answer your questions fully but we never lie or contrive to deceive, as McGehee charges.

Sincerely,

Herbert E. Hetu Director of Public Affairs ARTICLE APPEARED

THE WASHINGTON POST 11 June 1980

BACK ANDERSON

Book Charges Lying by CIA Brass

A veteran CIA agent has just written an explosive book, charging that the agency's top brass has repeatedly lied about secret operations to the public, the Congress and even the president. The revelations could stymie the congressional campaign to loosen the leash on the CIA.

The agent, Ralph McGehee, spent 25 years with the CIA in a variety of assignments. He has produced an unpublished manuscript that debunks many of the CIA's arguments for greater secrecy. My associate Dale Van Atta interviewed McGehee, and was allowed to examine the book-length manuscript.

McGehee is no Philip Agee, out to destroy the CIA by identifying former colleagues and endangering their lives. But his disillusionment runs deep, and he lays out the reasons for it articulately on moral grounds.

"I did not reach my apostasy easily," he explains, noting that he chose the CIA for a career in 1952, fresh out of Notre Dame, where he played four years on undefeated football teams.

Essentially, McGehee charges that the CIA uses secrecy to cover up incompetence, bureaucratic bungling and illegal activities. "Other than identity of sources and any unique technological collection processes," he writes, the CIA "does not have any secrets to protect."

Here are some of McGehee's charges:

• "It has been my observation that most everything an agency official says about the agency is either false or so misleading as to convey a greatly false impression."

· Every word in public announce-

ments by CIA officials should be examined for deception. For instance, the word "currently," as in, "we currently no longer employ American journalists as CIA operatives," may mean nothing more than that they were fired in time for the announcement and then rehired.

- Articles on the CIA in Time and Newsweek two years ago "drew upon official CIA sources who continued their policy of undeviating dishonesty." For example, one of the stories reported that a human agent provided the first solid evidence that China was about to set off an atom bomb, "thereby scooping the spy satellites." McGehee had been assigned to check that claim and found it to be untrue—but it suited the purposes of CIA brass who wanted to justify use of human agents.
- President Ford was given a glowing account of a superspy with supposed access to critical inside information. "Not mentioned was the fact that the agent had been completely unproductive, and . . . his meager salary of less than \$100 a month had been suspended."

Footnote: McGehee dutifully submitted his manuscript to the CIA, and made the deletions ordered. The agency has refused to comment to us.

Informing Ivan — The chill in Soviet-American relations hasn't interrupted the flow of U.S. government publications that are shipped regularly to the Soviet Union, courtesy of the American taxpayers.

The U.S. government exchanges publications with several countries. The Soviet Union, as you might guess, gets the best of the swap — six times

more pamphlets packed with 100 times more information.

This annoys Sen. James Sasser (D-Tenn.), who has conducted his own private investigation. Here are some of his findings:

- It cost \$12,000 in fiscal year 1979 to send the Kremlin some 23,000 documents, including the Defense Intelligence Agency's "Review of Soviet Ground Forces" and CIA maps and atlases of Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Angola, Pakistan, Israel and South Korea.
- It cost just about as much in the same period to see that Fidel Castro received government publications, including copies of the U.S. Army's field manual, technical manual and a guide to the Lance missile.
- Even the Iranian government is on Uncle Sam's free mailing list. The hostage holders get some 3,100 publications at a cost of \$1,800 that year.

The cost figures, incidentally, don't include mailing, which is also paid by the American taxpayers.