

STAT



16 February 1985

Washington Bureau
The Philadelphia Inquirer
1319 F Street
Washington, D C
20044

Sirs:

I have before me a clipping of a story by Alfonso Chardy that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer for 13 February 1985. A version of what is clearly the same story appears in the Washington Post for the same day. The story is alleged to be based on a piece I wrote for the Foreign Service Journal. The story misrepresents that piece and my opinions. It invents opinions and statements and attributes them to me. Not only have I never said things that Chardy attributes to me, I have never even thought them. Mr Chardy has called me more than once asking for an interview. I told him, as I have told others, that I want to speak for myself rather than to depend on others to speak for me. This seems to be fruitless. Here words appearing in print have been distorted.

Where I quote I am quoting from your story.

I did not say in the Journal article that "... Casey and Pentagon officers consistently reject analyses for political reasons." Furthermore, it is not true.

I did not say that "Casey dismissed his estimate of the number of Cuban soldiers on Grenada etc." I don't know what Chardy means by "dismissed" and I doubt that your readers will.

I did not accuse "a senior Pentagon official of rewriting a military analyst's report on weaknesses in the Salvadoran armed forces." He did not.

I did not contend "that the administration was involved in a series of intelligence failures -- including the Grenada invasion and the mining of the Nicaraguan harbors" nor did I say that "the intelligence community would have advised against (sic) had it been asked." That is a complete fabrication.

In one paragraph the story talks of 1,000 Cubans and elsewhere of 786 Cubans. I mentioned no numbers at all in my article and I do not remember what they were. This was not my statement nor did it "agree with Havana's." The story then says that it "contradicted U.S. assertions that the discrepancy was due to many Cubans hiding in the hills." That thought is out of

context as can be seen by reading the story. Further, it is absurd: what does "U. S." mean? Those of us preparing that assessment -- it was not an "estimate" -- are part of the "U.S."

In the final paragraph the canard about the Pentagon official is repeated.


This is not my "first written comment on the CIA since I resigned last year," as your story says. The Washington Post published an OpEd piece that I wrote. I mention that only because the editor was scrupulous about checking with me about dropping a redundant statement or two: quite a contrast .

Now this is not a case of my word against a reporter's. You should read the story and the article to understand the misrepresentations of which I speak. I can assure you unequivocally that he no way represents my opinions and that I have never said anything to him in his several telephone calls asking for an interview that would allow him to attribute such views to me.

I request you to print a retraction of the story in your paper and that you circulate the retraction to others who saw or carried the story, asking that they also print a retraction. My own motives are obvious. You owe it also to the Central Intelligence Agency and to the intelligence community and, I suppose, to your own reputation.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Central Intelligence Agency and I am authorizing the agency to use this letter as it wishes. I am sending a copy to the Washington Post for their information as well as to Knight-Ridder and the Foreign Service Journal.

As I shall be out of the country until 4 March you can reach my son, in case you have questions about my request.

 John Horton

STAT

STAT

STAT

16 February 1985

Mr George Lauder
Director, Public Affairs
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D C
20005

Dear George,

I have your note of 13 February attaching the article from the Philadelphia Inquirer by Alfonso Chardy. Also, I have in the mail today from the Foreign Service Journal a clipping of a story in the Washington Post for 13 February. (It did not appear in the edition we get here.) You have probably realized by now that the "magazine article" from which Chardy drew his misrepresentations is the article which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal for February.

The draft of that article was submitted to the Publications Review Board on 9 November 1984 and a letter of 19 November said the board had found no security objection to the publication of the article. In a letter of 31 December to the board I stated that the article had been so heavily edited by the Journal that I was not sure that I would let it appear. I rewrote and resubmitted the article and, while I again complained to the editors of the Journal of final editing -- changing my language as well as dropping sentences -- in the page proofs without consulting me, none of those changes are connected with Chardy's inventions.

I have written the bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer, rather than Chardy, and sent a copy to Knight-Ridder, to the

Post, as well as to the Foreign Service Journal. See the enclosed copy of the letter. I authorize you to use this letter in full or to quote from it if you want in any statement you decide to make on the matter. As I am leaving on the 18th and will be away until the 3rd of March I consider that authorization to be necessary.

Have your "angry analysts" read the article in the Journal.

Yours,


John Horton