

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-4

WASHINGTON TIMES
30 August 1984

Five being considered for Casey's CIA job

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Reagan White House has begun assembling a list of possible successors for Central Intelligence Agency director William J. Casey who reportedly has made known his intention to leave government service in January.

Well-placed administration officials said there are at least five names on the informal list of individuals who will be considered for the cabinet-rank CIA post if Mr. Casey makes a final decision to return to private life.

Three of those being considered to take over the CIA are White House chief of staff James A. Baker III; national security advisor to the president, Robert C. McFarlane; and Laurence Silberman, former Justice Department official who also served as former ambassador to Yugoslavia and a senior transition official for President Reagan after his 1980 election victory.

All this, of course, is contingent on President Reagan being re-elected in November. Mr. Casey, now 71, would be replaced as a matter of course in event of a victory by Democratic candidate Walter F. Mondale, but White House insiders say he is ready to return to private life no matter what the election outcome.

The scenario of potential successors to the CIA directorship sets up a fascinating array of domino effects within a second Reagan term. If Mr. Baker is nominated to replace Mr. Casey, or to some other cabinet post such as Treasury secretary or attorney general, Mr. Reagan would be faced with finding a new chief of staff. Insiders at the White House are quietly speculating that the president might elevate deputy chief of staff Michael K. Deaver to replace Mr. Baker, but they also say that dedicated conservatives would prefer Secretary

of the Interior William P. Clark for the second most powerful job in the inner circle.

There is plenty of reason to suppose that Nancy Reagan, who likes both Mr. Deaver and Mr. Clark, might have the prevailing influence on whoever is chosen as staff chief. Mr. Deaver, who is not expected to remain in a second administration for any longer than a year, and Mr. Clark have been at odds for more than a year and at one stage were not even speaking.

If Bud McFarlane is tapped for the CIA job, the possibility arises that President Reagan might ask United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick to take over direction of the National Security Council. Mr. McFarlane's deputy, Rear Adm. John Poindexter, has been assigned to the security council for most of the past four years. If Mr. McFarlane remains at the NSC, it is speculated that

he would replace Admiral Poindexter with Donald Fortier, now in charge of political and military affairs there.

Mr. Silberman, 48, is now an executive of the Crocker National Bank in San Francisco and has had wide experience in Washington law firms, at the Justice Department and as under secretary of labor. He is a no-nonsense, tough-talking individual who was an influential factor in the Reagan transition team.

Mr. Casey has been repeatedly involved in controversy since he managed Mr. Reagan's 1980 campaign and took over the CIA with a determination to keep both himself and the agency out of the news. The former World War II Office of Strategic Services (predecessor to the CIA) operative got into trouble with Congress for failing to disclose all his financial holdings.

— Walter Andrews
and Jeremiah O'Leary

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 20

Maneuvering Manila Isn't So Easy

By PAUL GIGOT

MANILA—This tropical city is 10,000 miles from Washington, but judging by the U.S. visitors it could be Capitol Hill.

Rep. Jack Kemp dropped by for a chat with President Ferdinand Marcos last week, joining a troupe that has included CIA boss William Casey; former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick; Adm. William Crowe, chairman-designate of the Joint Chiefs; Sens. John Kerry and John Melcher; Rep. Stephen Solarz, plus assorted State Department big shots. They've all come to assess the troubles in the Philippines firsthand, and, more important, to continue a two-year effort to urge Mr. Marcos to "reform" his struggling 20-year-old rule.

They have all mostly been whispering into the wind. Despite nearly two years of prodding, Mr. Marcos still stubbornly resists most of the changes that both the U.S. and many Filipinos believe are needed to ensure a democratic transition from the Marcos era.

U.S. Influence Limited

As this fact sinks in, you can be sure that some Americans will begin to call this a "failure" of U.S. policy. They will then demand that the Reagan administration take more drastic action, such as withdrawing all support from the Philippines. The New York Times is already taking this line. Americans on the left claim to favor "nonintervention," except for authoritarians who have long been U.S. allies; then they hunt for "leverage" that can produce miracles of political change.

If only it were so easy. Events over the past two years in Manila suggest that U.S. influence with Mr. Marcos and in the Philippines generally is very limited. Most of the reforms that have taken place have resulted from Filipino, not American, pressure on Mr. Marcos. The lesson is that, unless the U.S. is willing to commit troops or support a coup, the fate of authoritarians and their countries is beyond much U.S. influence.

This isn't the first case of such stymied U.S. influence. Washington won't sell arms and seems to have quit backing multinational-agency loans to Chile, but the Pinochet dictatorship appears undeterred. South African Premier P.W. Botha has just demonstrated that he, too, can ignore the threat of U.S. sanctions. Yet this lack of leverage is all the more striking in Manila, because ties with the Philippines are among America's strongest anywhere. The U.S. has two big military bases north of Manila and has long been generous with aid. Filipinos and Americans fought to-

gether in World War II, and even today Filipinos visit or emigrate to the U.S. by the tens of thousands each year. One local parody of the Philippine left goes like this: "Yankee, go home (and take me with you)."

Yet even here, a determined dictator can deflect American pressure. Take military reform, a high U.S. priority. Most people agree that the Philippine military needs better discipline and morale to prevail against the growing communist insurgency. To do that, most people also agree, it needs to replace top officers corrupted by Mr. Marcos's patronage.

The symbol of this effort is Gen. Fabian Ver, who rose under Mr. Marcos from chauffeur to chief of staff. Gen. Ver is among those charged with conspiring to kill Benigno Aquino two years ago. Mr. Marcos has put him on "temporary leave" during the trial. The U.S. doesn't want Gen. Ver reinstated, in part because his successor, Fidel Ramos, is a well-regarded West Point graduate who has started to clean up the military. American emissaries have told Mr. Marcos this to his face and Sen. Melcher even said it publicly.

Yet Mr. Marcos insists that if Gen. Ver is acquitted, he'll get his old job back despite U.S. wishes. Philippine cabinet members say the best the U.S. can hope for is a compromise in which Gens. Ver and Ramos both resign. Yet this would merely open the chief-of-staff post to another Marcos protege, Gen. Josephus Ramas. Two other top Filipino generals who would also have influence after Gen. Ver's departure happen to be relatives of First Lady Imelda Marcos. The net effect on the military would be zero.

Similar obstacles have prevented economic reform. Mr. Marcos is a champion economic meddler, and the U.S. wants changes that let the market work. Mr. Marcos has at least bowed to a standard International Monetary Fund austerity package. But on major issues he stonewalls. Two of his favorite cronies or their surrogates continue to dominate the sugar and coconut industries, for example, and the reason goes to the heart of Mr. Marcos's power. If Mr. Marcos abandons his top cronies, he loses major sources of political funding. He also sends a signal to every other client.

"It's the *padrone* mentality. He has to take care of his own," says someone who knows Mr. Marcos well. "If he cuts off one, then every rat will leave the sinking ship."

It's also instructive to look at where Mr. Marcos has agreed to reform, because Americans have had little to do with it. Mr. Marcos agreed last year to scrap a succession plan that would have made it

easy for his ambitious wife to grab power. He was responding, though, to pressure from businessmen and voices in his own political party. "The U.S. was irrelevant," says Arturo Tolentino, an architect of the compromise.

A reform movement independent of Mr. Marcos has also developed this year among junior officers in the military. Yet U.S. diplomats admit the movement caught them by surprise, while the Filipino reformers say they'll do anything to avoid being associated with the U.S. "We remember Diem in Vietnam," says one.

Similar fear of American taint makes it difficult for the U.S. even to help ensure a fair election. An independent citizens group known as Namfrel did yeoman work making 1984's assembly elections the fairest in decades. It needs both more money and more manpower to make the next election truly honest, however, and the CIA conceivably could help. But Jose Conception, Namfrel's chief, considers any such funding the kiss of death, because it would damage the group's reputation for independence. "[That rumor] causes me all kinds of trouble," he says.

Faced with these realities, Filipino oppositionists and American moralists will surely demand that the Reagan administration press Mr. Marcos further. One idea is the "carrot-and-stick" proposal of Rep. Solarz, threatening aid cuts unless Mr. Marcos makes specific reforms.

A hint of how well this works occurred earlier this year when Mr. Solarz pushed aid cuts through the U.S. House. (Most aid was later restored in a House-Senate conference.) Mr. Marcos's defense minister quickly proposed that the U.S.-Philippine bases treaty be abrogated, while Mr. Marcos took the unobvious step of having a medal (left over from World War II) pinned on his chest by the Soviet ambassador. Some of this was surely bluff, but it is always possible that Mr. Marcos could start playing ultranationalist and snub the U.S. altogether.

Dealt Out of the Game

Another idea is a show of U.S. moral indignation—a complete withdrawal of aid and a retreat from the bases. This would surely damage Mr. Marcos's domestic standing, but to an uncertain end. In the happiest scenario, the democratic opposition triumphs. But what if it doesn't? Mr. Marcos, his back to the wall, might himself crack down, or elements in the military assert themselves, or the growing force of the hard left play its hand. Whatever happens, America wouldn't be a player because it already will have dealt itself out of the game.

Continued

Will Jeane Kirkpatrick move up — or out?

By ROWLAND EVANS and ROBERT NOVAK

JEANE Kirkpatrick intends irrevocably to deliver her post-election resignation as ambassador to the United Nations after the fall General Assembly session, setting up a battle royal inside the administration over whether she will move up in a Reagan second term — or out.

Michael K. Deaver, President Reagan's deputy chief of staff, and other White House aides want her out (perhaps to

a prestigious exile as ambassador in Paris). But Reaganite Republicans regard her as the special protector of Ronald Reagan's ideological purity in international policy and, especially since her triumphant convention speech in Dallas, a possible vice-presidential candidate.

Because the result of that battle will set the national security mold for Reagan's second term, conservative

hard-liners have put Kirkpatrick's retention at the top of their second-term list, preferably as the first female secretary of state.

Reagan's well-known distaste for easing out George Shultz or any Cabinet member is thoroughly appreciated by Kirkpatrick's admirers. Their fallback post is Robert McFarlane's national security job in the White House, a natural launching pad for the

secretary's office if Shultz bows out as expected sometime in 1985.

When she has chosen to exercise it, Kirkpatrick's influence with the President can be profound — and that makes important enemies for her in high places. His intellectual affinity with her strong views on Israel, the Third World and especially the Soviet Union is resented both in the State Dept. and White House.

Such resentment has surfaced regularly over the past three years. Insiders confirmed to us that one senior White House aide politely warned her in person early last year that the President would make "peace" with the Soviets

before he left office; in that case, Jeane Kirkpatrick would have to be out of the administration before it happened. Why? Because her views on the Soviet Union were too unfriendly to accept any U.S.-Soviet deal.

Intimates say that although Mrs. Kirkpatrick was stunned and deeply upset by that conversation, she chose to ignore rather than pursue it. But the warning came back to haunt her last October when William P. Clark was eased out as national security adviser and dispatched to the Interior Dept. in hopes Reagan would replace him with chief of staff James Baker. Although Baker's

bid was blocked by hard-liners in the administration (Clark, CIA Director William Casey and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger), they hit a brick wall in pushing for Kirkpatrick. Deaver and other critics vetoed her.

Since then, the administration's leading intellectual has expanded her political base among Reaganite conservatives without hardly trying and while remaining the Cabinet's only registered Democrat.

Dramatic evidence of that base was the reception accorded her opening-night speech at the Dallas convention. Her performance generated confidence that, if she becomes a Republican after

the election as key conservatives expect, she is equipped to be the 1988 vice presidential nominee.

She thrilled hard-liners by attacking her own party for "hiding its head in the sand" about the Soviet reality and "always blaming America first" — the best-received speech at the convention other than Reagan's own. That was a valedictory for four years at the UN, during which she has not masked frustration over the impotence of both the world organization and her own role as chief U.S. delegate.

But talks with delegates on the convention

floor made clear that despite her self-image of impotence, the Republican Party's dominant conservative wing places a high value on keeping her in the administration.

That value is confirmed to them by her attitude toward the continuing effort by Shultz and Deaver to finally bestow a peacemaker's image on Ronald Reagan by setting up talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko during the UN General Assembly session before Election Day.

Those talks are viewed by Shultz and some political aides as giving Reagan the long-sought image of peace Deaver wants to adorn him with. Most administration officials who are skeptical keep their doubts to themselves, fearful of intruding on this high-level stratagem.

But not Jeane Kirkpatrick. She is too blunt to be silent inside the administration about her concern that a pre-election Reagan-Gromyko talk, however well-intentioned, could end up embarrassing both the President and the U.S. Similarly, she does not hide her opinion that the State Dept.'s well-advanced plan to cut a deal with Nicaragua's Marxist-Leninist dictatorship is scandalous.

It is just this quality that has galvanized those ideologically-committed Reaganites remaining in the administration to fight to keep her in at their side. Indeed, she has become the principal bearer of the torch picked up by Reagan in New Hampshire eight years ago when he challenged and defeated the Republican's foreign policy in 1980.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 1

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
29 August 1984

There's a man giving away military secrets from a quiet warren at National Archives

By Peter Grier

Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

JOHN Taylor has spent 40 years revealing United States military secrets. He does this with enthusiasm. His best tidbits are written on small squares of paper, as if they were grocery lists.

"Here's a good one," he says, holding up a note. "In World War II, in Europe, US secret agents were often named after plants. Basil. Nutmeg. Goldenrod."

Mr. Taylor is not an antiwar activist. He presides over the National Archives Modern Military branch, a warren of rooms where casual chat can center on

which SS regiment was commanded by Hitler's girlfriend's sister's husband.

He has worked at the Archives since 1946, becoming the man behind numerous famous books on World War II (such as Barbara Tuchman's "Stillwell and the American Experience in China"), and even serving as the model for a character in a best-selling spy thriller.

"There are a thousand and one untold stories here," says Taylor, with once-top-secret documents strewn about his desk like so many old newspapers.

In the last several months, Taylor and his fellow archivists have been gleefully

examining rich material. This summer the CIA, after much prodding, shipped to the National Archives 450 boxes of memos, reports, and war diaries dealing with the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the spy arm of US forces in World War II.

These old boxes, says Taylor, hold thousands of previously unknown details. The OSS used agents called "chief whisperers" to spread rumors in foreign lands. Saul Steinberg, famous for drawing New Yorker magazine cartoons, was an agency propaganda artist.

The OSS received intelligence reports on Japan from contacts in the Vatican. It helped the British run a "black" radio station that broadcast propaganda into Germany. This lavish station had a fountain in the control room and illuminated plastic furniture. The station transmitter was so powerful (with an effective power of 900,000 watts) that when it was turned on, light bulbs in nearby homes blew up.

"You never know what's going to pop up in these boxes," says Taylor, chortling as he moves off in search of more papers.

The newly released documents name the real names of many OSS agents and contain personal accounts of the war behind the lines — secrets that archivists say they have rarely seen before.

Take, for example, the story of Lt. Comdr. J. B. Roberts. Near the end of the war, Commander Roberts was parachuted behind Japanese lines, in China, to accomplish sabotage with Chinese Nationalist guerrillas. The battery of Roberts's radio was dead on arrival. He received only half the 500 pounds of TNT

he had been promised. The explosives were wet when delivered, and of an inferior type used for blasting tree stumps.

Still, Roberts and his Chinese aide, Chiu Wing, whose nickname was "the Madman," managed to blow up numerous enemy trains.

"The Madman is turning into a legend," Roberts wrote in one of the weekly reports he somehow found time to file. "Men beg to go with him."

In the months preceding D-Day, the OSS divided German-occupied France into spy "circuits," much as a manufacturing company splits countries into salesmen's territories. The circuits were named by someone with a feel for lilting words: "Sacristan," "Satirist," "Wheelwright," "Gondolier." Agents were dropped into each circuit, their job to work with the French Resistance in that particular area.

The newly released OSS material includes a green folio, titled "W. Europe, Vol. 3, Bk. 1, Secret War Diary," in which these agents describe what life was like in occupied France. Claude Arnault, a civilian who worked for the OSS, was dropped into the "Wheelwright" circuit in late summer, 1944, and promptly captured.

"... they had found a German flag, German medals, grenades, a midget receiver in my suitcase," Arnault recounted, "and they decided to shoot me at eight PM. However, I was lucky because the officer commanding the castle was called away, and he told the guards to keep me until he returned. I decided it would be safer to escape."

Several days later, the castle where Arnault was imprisoned was bombed by the Allies. "During the confusion," he said in his report, "I managed to escape

and ran to the river, which was about two miles from there, and crossed it. Then I walked about 50 miles through the woods so as not to be seen by the German soldiers searching the country."

Another report tells of an agent who worked out of a Polish farmhouse. Some weeks after he arrived, the barn was commandeered by German troops. Unsuspecting, the soldiers slept on a pile of hay that covered a secret radio. "The whole period was a serious strain on the agent's nerve," says the report.

It is for historical detail such as this that writers and scholars flock to the Modern Military reading room, a small space with the atmosphere of an underground lunch counter. On an average day, says John Taylor, there are between 10 and 15 people riffling through military records at the archives, researching everything from PhD theses to screenplays.

German POW camps, the proposed US invasion of Japan, and the Nuremberg war crimes trials are popular subjects, Taylor says. So is anything dealing with the OSS.

William Casey, before President Reagan made him chief of the CIA, used to drop by and browse. Once a man who was a German spy in Latin America during World War II came in to read his file.

"I not only found his report, I found his photo," says Taylor.

John Taylor came to the National Archives as a freshly minted graduate of the University of Arkansas. He found himself wheeling around Army documents dating back to the 1800s and was quickly hooked. "I liked it, from Day 1. I was fascinated by those records," he says.

He has been dealing with military documents ever since. Along the way he has

acquired a top-secret security clearance (archivists in his department must have one) and worked with many well-known authors and historians.

He helped David Kahn with his ground-breaking tome on US cryptography, "The Codebreakers." James

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE B-3

WASHINGTON TIMES
28 August 1984

FILE

LUNACY / John Podhoretz

Good evening, this is 'Nightline' (sort of)

SAM DONALDSON: Good evening, this is "Nightline." I'm Sam Donaldson, filling in for Ted Koppel. Tonight we are dealing with a conservative political thriller called "I, Martha Adams," from St. Martin's Press, 336 pages, \$12.95 — and neither the Soviets nor the American intellectual establishment are too happy about it. For more on the story, we go to Anne Garrels in Moscow.

MS. GARRELS: Sam, the Soviet press agency TASS today took the rare step of issuing a formal denunciation of an American novel. "TASS is authorized to state," said the press agency, "that we condemn in the harshest possible terms the Reagan-Kirkpatrick-Kristol-inspired publication of the so-called novel 'I, Martha Adams,' by the so-called Pauline Glen Winslow, who is in reality a Zionist-racist CIA operative."

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you, Anne. "I, Martha Adams," for those of you who have not read it, is set sometime in the early 1990s. Both President Reagan and Vice President Bush have been killed by an assassin's bomb, and the presidency has reverted to the Democratic Party, which signs two arms control agreements that are extremely prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. Then, one day, the Soviets strike at American nuclear installations in the West, disabling American counterresponse, and the U.S. capitulates. Martha Adams, the heroine, is the wife of a nuclear-weapons designer who, unlike most of her countrymen, decides to fight the Soviets. She discovers plans for a secret missile that had been deployed by President Reagan without anyone's knowledge, and sets out to find it.

But most interesting about the novel is its portrait of a United States under Soviet domination. There are two Soviet headquarters: the White House, and the United Nations in New York, which is depicted as a nest of Soviet espionage agents. Liberal Americans desperately try to put the best face they can on the new political order. Most Americans become collaborators as expert as the French during the Second World War. The Soviets round up every military leader in the country and shoot them, and send all American politicians off to mental hospitals inside the Soviet Union. Only Martha Adams, along with a legendary Israeli Mossad agent, have the power to end the Soviet domination.

MR. DONALDSON: Now, for a personal Soviet response, we have joining us our old buddy Vladimir Pozner, the American-born commentator for Radio Moscow.

MR. POZNER: Hey, Sam, how's it shakin'?

MR. DONALDSON: Not bad, Vladimir. How about you?

MR. POZNER: Not too shabby, not too shabby. What you say me and you grab a couple brewskies after the show?

MR. DONALDSON: Sounds good to me. Now what do you, as a Soviet citizen, think of "I, Martha Adams"?

MR. POZNER: Well, Sam. I think we all enjoy a trashy novel every now and then. Here in the Soviet Union, for example, we gobble them up, particularly the "Gyorgy's Adventures Inside the Murmansk Hydroelectric Power Dam" series. But we find it troubling, more than troubling, in fact, when we find out that a

novel as clearly anti-Soviet as this one, a novel that portrays us falsely as aggressors and imperialists, is allowed to be published in your country when in fact an investigation by our own internationally respected Institute of USA and Canada has proved that this book was written by a CIA committee.

MR. DONALDSON: I'd really like to know just what proof you have for this charge that "I, Martha Adams" was written by the CIA.

MR. POZNER: Well, Sam, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, certainly, as you know. How are the Dodgers doing?

MR. DONALDSON: Not as well as the Cubs. Joining us now is William Casey, director of the CIA. Mr. Casey, was this novel written by the CIA?

MR. CASEY: No.

MR. DONALDSON: Come on, Mr. Casey. After all, the internationally respected Institute for the USA and Canada insists that it is a CIA plot.

MR. CASEY: For your information, the Institute is a KGB disinformation operation.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, that may be your opinion.

MR. CASEY: You'll take TASS' word over mine?

MR. DONALDSON: Mr. Casey, we are an independent news organization, taking no sides, with neither fear nor favor.

MR. CASEY: That's just great, Sam. I thank you, the captive nations thank you, and the American people thank you.

MR. DONALDSON: You're welcome. For a right-wing view, joining us now is ABC commentator George Will. George, your thoughts.

MR. WILL: Ted, the loose, baggy monster that is this novel is riddled with grammatical, syntactical, and other stylistic errors, and demonstrates few of those qualities that Aristotle, for one, insisted were necessary to the foundation of a work of moral art.

Continued

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 16

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400020004-1
U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT
27 August 1984

Washington WHISPERS

☆☆☆

Five top Reagan administration officials were exempted from political chores at the Republican convention. Left out, either because of their sensitive duties or at their own request: Secretary of State Shultz, Defense Secretary Weinberger, Attorney General Smith, CIA Director Casey, budget chief Stockman.

☆☆☆

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 5A

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400020004-1
WASHINGTON TIMES
23 August 1984

The disappearing Republican liberals

By S.J. Mastay
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

For millions of "A-Team" fans, Mr. T was in rare form. They waited for him to throw someone through a saloon window as he railed at "the wishers, the wasters, the wanters and the weak."

Indeed, he sounded like Mr. T, but looked older, balder and much too pale. Wait a minute, it wasn't Mr. T, it was Jerry Ford! Viewers stared, incredulous. Jerry Ford of "Whip Inflation Now," and the stealth golf-ball? He was flexing his biceps, roaring that Walter Mondale was "just peddling fear." Something fishy was going on.

Mr. Mondale was a chump, pick-pocket, snake-oil vendor, second-story man, thimblerrigger and general dink. Mr. F be tellin' you 'bout it, and if you didn' listen, you were goin' through that saloon window, fool.

Then the former duffer turned muscleman, who could never pay an untarnished compliment to the Gipper, described him in tones usually reserved for a Vatican High Mass. As good as the speech was, one could hardly wait for him to jump in his van and rescue little girls from Sandinista kidnappers.

This was highly disturbing to a few. Sen. Lowell Weicker, ?-Conn., ran from camera to camera complaining. Weirdos had taken over, he howled. They were against tax hikes and free abortions with green stamps.

Sen. Chuck Mathias, R-Md., sounded the same. Why was he in the party? "As long as I can do something useful as a Republican, I'll be a Republican," he explained. It was unsatisfactory, with so much work to do. For example, Mr. Kemp's tires needed rotating and it was branding time at Bunker Hunt's ranch.

At a nearby theater, liberal Republicans rallied their troops with a play where a bumbling Mr. Reagan toys with jelly beans. He laments imminent nuclear war, saying, "Nancy's not going to like this one bit. She had her heart set on a little Santa Barbara jaunt." It wasn't working. Nobody cared. Something was going wrong.

Moderates held their breath as Mr. F finished to numbing applause.

It would be better now. They had a matched set of Doles to damp things down.

Sen. Bob Dole, R-Kan., won liberal hearts on election night 1982, when he said Republican losses crippled the White House. Now, President Reagan would be coming to him to get things done. Disloyalty, as the greeting card says, means never having to say you're soggy.

Suddenly, eyes bulged and throats constricted. President Reagan "restored dignity to his office," said Mr. Dole. "For the first time since President Dwight Eisenhower, the country we love is at peace with itself." They knew it had to be a plot. It looked like Sen. Dole, but it sounded like Jimmy Cagney in "Yankee Doodle Dandy." They gritted their teeth and waited, but there was neither a drop of disloyalty nor a smudge of bitterness, just smiling people and the general miasma of Chanel No. 5.

Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole was no better. Ronald Reagan "backed up his words with deeds," she explained. He "doesn't just praise hard work, he provides it." No harping on ERA, no demanding SBA loans for women's aerobics classes, just Valentines Day.

Somehow, it just didn't seem like Mrs. Dole. Then it dawned on them. They realized precisely what President Reagan, CIA Director Bill Casey and RNC Chief Frank Fahrenkopf were up to, and it was chilling.

In the basement of the Republican National Committee, mad scientists were turning moderates into mindless conservative automatons.

They got the Doles, replacing their loveable, mushy cerebellums with two parts Milton Friedman's "Free to Choose;" three parts 1984 GOP platform; three parts Reagan speeches; one part John Wayne movies; and a dash of Professor Friedrich Hayek. They might never be the same again. They imagined

poor Gerald Ford strapped to a steel table as doctors prepared an injection of Gatorade.

It was just like the 1970s cinema classic, "The Stepford Wives," where housewives were turned into robots by their husbands.

There was only one problem. The wives were more pleasant, less given to whining and abysmal selfishness by the end of the movie. What's more, they seemed happier too.

As the evening concluded, the liberals took a head count. Call the restaurant, one commanded, and book a table for six. oops, make that five, oops, four. Where were they disappearing to? It was eerie.

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400020004-1
ARTICLE APPEARED WASHINGTON POST FILE ONLY
ON PAGE A-18 17 August 1984

"I WAS JUST THINKING ABOUT THE NICARAGUAN HARBORS—OH, NO — IT COULDN'T BE CASEY AGAIN"



Fears for El Salvador's fate said behind Reagan gamble

By Roger Fontaine
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Reagan administration, by making Central American policy a "prime issue" in a battle to win more aid, gambled against the political wisdom that it should avoid controversial policy debate in an election year.

Behind the gamble, according to administration sources, was the widespread fear that the leftist guerrillas in El Salvador would start a Tet-style offensive soon, in an attempt to convince the American public that the war there was unwinnable.

The immediate danger in El Salvador reinforced the broader conviction in the administration that the effort there is vital to American security and must be pursued without letup.

The decision on a high-visibility effort was taken by President Reagan last month, officials said, with overall direction of the effort, particularly as it related to the Congress, given to national security adviser Robert C. McFarlane.

The State Department, according to White House officials, initially opposed a strategy it deemed high-risk and likely to fail.

Administration sources reported that the strategy was worked out in an informal but high-level White House situation room meeting headed by Mr. McFarlane July 20—the day after the closing of the Democratic convention.

NEWS ANALYSIS

Those attending, including Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, CIA Director William Casey and Gen. John Vessey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are all known for their belief that Central America must be a high priority concern of the administration.

The first hint of a new strategy came three days later, when Vice President George Bush announced in a published interview that Central America would be made into a Republican campaign "prime issue."

"The Democrats have been working on an erroneous premise about what has been going on in Central America," Mr. Bush said at the time, indicating the Democrats were oblivious to the nature of the threat.

White House sources now say Mr. Bush's interview was a "trial balloon" which worked and served as the opening salvo of a public campaign to win support for the president's policies in an election year.

Officials have long expressed concern about an autumn guerrilla offensive, and most remain convinced it is coming, most likely next month. "Everybody expects it," said one official.

In light of that immediate threat, the first stage of the administration's go-for-broke strategy targeted additional military aid for El Salvador, and led to the following actions being taken:

- A stepped-up effort at releasing information supporting the administration's case on Central America. Within a period of two weeks, an official Green Book was released giving the most comprehensive details to date of the Nicaraguan military buildup and subversion of its neighbors.

That was followed by the disclosure of information linking the Sandinistas to drug running, which in turn was amplified by orchestrated Senate hearings on the same subject.

At the same time, the administration made available Gen. Paul Gorman, head of the U.S. Southern Command, and Thomas Pickering, U.S. ambassador to El Salvador, for top-secret "Codeword" congressional briefings.

It then released 95 percent of the material to the public — material including films of arms smuggling into El Salvador from Nicaraguan shrimp boats.

According to one White House source, "Gorman did a remarkably good job," a view shared by a number of other administration officials.

- A high-intensity lobbying effort by the administration, led by Mr. McFarlane, resulted in key legislative victories for President Reagan's funding requests for El Salvador for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, even though the current fiscal year ends in less than two months.

That effort has produced a total \$186 million in military assistance for that country this year — a record. This came when a \$70 million supplemental appropriation was added to the \$126 million that had already been appropriated.

According to administration officials, the new money above all buys mobility in the form of more helicopters and trucks, which are expected to keep the guerrillas on the run for the rest of the summer and fall.

It also relieves the concerns of Salvadoran field commanders about ammunition shortages. Such worries, officials point out, resulted in the past in a passive defense.

Now, with the return of Congress after the Republican convention, the administration will turn to winning full funding of the \$8 billion, multi-year economic-development program recommended by the Kissinger Commission — known as the Jackson Plan for the late Sen. Henry Jackson, D-Wash. White House officials have promised another all-out effort.

In Central America, the administration is also conducting high-visibility operations, despite concern that they may spur controversy in an election year.

Recent decisions include:

- Resumption of regular reconnaissance flights over El Salvador in anticipation of the fall offensive. Eleven Mohawk OV-1 aircraft, whose radar can pinpoint troop movements in the dark and relay details to Salvadoran field commanders, will fly for the next six months as they did last February through April.

- Continuation of a policy of pressuring the Sandinista government by naval shows of strength. This month, the recently commissioned USS *Arcton* is heading a five-vessel task force that will patrol 50 miles off the Honduran coast near the Gulf of Fonseca.

MARGIOTTA FINDING OUT WHO HIS FRIENDS ARE

FORMER Nassau Republican leader Joseph Margiotta walked out of the Nassau County Jail yesterday looking more like a conquering hero than a convicted felon.

Wearing a large smile, Margiotta said he was "delighted to be home with my family and my wife and that's all I have to say."

Margiotta, who has lost 30 pounds, said he'd try to keep his weight down to 193.

The ex-political boss walked alone from the cyclone fence at the East Meadow, L.I., facility to his wife, Dorothy, waiting in a gray Cadillac.

Margiotta, 56, was paroled after serving 14 months of a two-year term for running a \$800,000 municipal insurance fee kickback racket.

He has spent the past two months in a work-release cottage — after doing a year in Allentown, Pa., federal prison.

He had commuted to his political office in nearby Uniondale, spending weeknights in the cottage and weekends at his Brookville home on Long Island's Gold Coast.

He'll be welcomed tonight at the luxurious Swan Club in Glenwood Landing by 150 old friends as guests of restaurant owner Stanley Shapiro.

But trying to figure out who is going to the ex-con's bash is tougher than being invited.

The invitation list includes such big names as Richard Nixon, CIA Director William Casey, former Gov. Malcolm Wilson and Reagan Administration strategist Lyn Nofziger.

"No, no. The [former] President is definitely not going," said Nixon spokesman John Taylor. "I don't know what he'll be doing, but he is not going."

By ROBERT WEDDLE
& CHRIS OLIVER

A spokeswoman for the CIA director, who maintains a residence in nearby posh Roslyn Harbor, said she would not reveal whether Casey is going "for policy and security reasons."

And a spokesman for Margiotta successor John Mondello, chairman of the Nassau County Republican Committee, said:

"The chairman is attending, but we don't know anything else about it," said David Levy. "We will neither confirm or deny who else is invited or who is going. If we knew, we wouldn't tell you."

Unfortunately Reagan aide Lyn Nofziger won't be able to attend. He's in Dallas this week, preparing to get the President reelected.

The most positive response came from former Gov. Wilson:

"Of course I plan to attend. That's a stupid question. I would relish the opportunity to see once again my long time friend Joe Margiotta."

Other guests include all top state legislative leaders of both parties.

They'll toast the return of Margiotta — one of the state's most powerful figures for 15 years.

They'll talk about his new consulting career in his former Uniondale law office building.

FILE

MARGIOTTA
BY HENRY G. LOGEMAN
EAST MEADOW, NY

Former Nassau County Republican Chairman Joseph Margiotta will be freed Monday after serving 14 months of a two-year prison term for extortion and mail fraud.

The 57-year-old Margiotta, at one time the most powerful political boss in the state, will be on parole for good behavior for the remaining 10 months of his federal sentence.

It is not clear what time Margiotta will be released Monday but on Tuesday night, he will be guest of honor at a cocktail party to celebrate his release. The party will be held at the exclusive Swan Club, in Glenwood Landing.

Among those invited are former president Richard Nixon, Lyn Nofziger, a political strategist for President Reagan and CIA Director William Casey of Roslyn Harbor.

Not invited, however, is Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, to whom Margiotta served as mentor during the younger senator's rise in politics. Margiotta believed D'Amato gave him only minimal support during his federal trial.

Others sure to attend are County Executive Francis Purcell and Joseph Mondello, Margiotta's hand-picked choice to succeed him as county chairman.

Margiotta served one year in Pennsylvania's Allenwood Federal Prison Camp and was allowed to serve the remaining two months in a work-release program in the Nassau County Jail in East Meadow.

Under the program, Margiotta has established a business as a political and public relations consultant working from his former insurance office in Uniondale.

But Margiotta's political future is clouded. Under state law, as a convicted felon he cannot resume his job as party chairman. And because of the conviction, some party leaders are reluctant to give Margiotta any role in party affairs fearing adverse public reaction.

Throughout Margiotta's personal ordeal he steadfastly maintained his innocence.

Following one mistrial, a second federal court jury found him guilty of forcing a county insurance agent to hand over \$700,000 of his commissions to him.

Margiotta then doled out these funds to party faithful who did little or no insurance work.

Margiotta testified the fee-splitting was accepted and entirely legal political patronage.

Margiotta has been disbarred from the practice of law and is at least temporarily suspended from conducting insurance business because of the conviction.

ARTICLE APPEARED

ON PAGE 4-1

WASHINGTON POST
10 August 1984

U.S. Officials Backed Off Tsakos Plan

By Howard Kurtz
Washington Post Staff Writer

When Sen. Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.) agreed to help Greek financier Basil A. Tsakos with plans to build a trans-African oil pipeline, he joined a long list of former government officials and corporate executives who were involved in the \$12 billion project.

Among those who were associated with Tsakos' pipeline venture were former Navy secretary J. William Middendorf, former Arms Control and Disarmament Agency di-

rector George M. Seignious III, former Republican National Committee member Carl J. Shipley, former intelligence agent Joseph Rosenbaum, former Navy deputy undersecretary Robert Ferneau and former assistant secretary of State Willis Armstrong, as well as senior executives from Rockwell International and Morrison-Knudson Co.

All of them left the venture, however, at least in part because of questions raised about Tsakos' financing sources and business methods. Some of those questions are

now at the heart of investigations by the Justice Department and Senate Ethics Committee into the Oregon senator's relationship with Tsakos.

Tsakos, 70, an excitable man with thick glasses who carries his files around in a suitcase secured with a padlocked chain, was confident that he could sell the plan when he opened an office at the Watergate Hotel three years ago. The 2,200-mile pipeline, he told visitors, would carry 4 million barrels a day

of Saudi Arabian oil to the United States and Europe, cut costs and travel time, create jobs in Africa and bypass the tense shipping routes of the Persian Gulf.

But to make his ambitious plan fly, Tsakos had to have support inside the Reagan administration. In classic Washington fashion, he assembled a group of prominent Republicans who might open the right doors.

His associates met with CIA Director William J. Casey, who, according to a spokesman, was interested in the national security implications of the project; Seignious and Armstrong, two officials from the Nixon and Ford administrations, briefed Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker on the idea. Hatfield, meanwhile, discussed the plan with Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and arranged for Tsakos to sit down with Energy Secretary Donald P. Hodel.

While the pipeline does not need formal government approval, Hatfield and other supporters say the African nations along the route—Sudan, the Central African Republic and Cameroon—were seeking assurances that U.S. authorities would not oppose it.

Former associates also say it was clear that Tsakos eventually would need government financial help, perhaps through the Export-Import Bank, and that U.S. diplomats would have a role in negotiations with Africa.

"Our government agencies were interested in this project and they were willing to lend their help to it," said Shipley, a Washington lawyer who resigned as president of Tsakos' Trans-African Pipeline Corp. "I was just a hired gun . . . to lend an aura of Americanism to it. If it succeeded, I would have received substantial fees."

Once he and the others pulled out, Shipley said, "It was absurd, childish and infantile to think that [Tsakos] could walk this project through the government."

By early this year, all the firm's original American directors had resigned. "These guys all dove for cover," said William Hundley, Ro-

senbaum's attorney. They all bailed out."

Hatfield has remained the most prominent supporter. Hatfield and Tsakos have maintained that there was no connection between the senator's support for the pipeline project and \$40,000 in payments from Tsakos to Hatfield's wife, Antoinette, for what both men describe as real estate services.

To get started, Tsakos paid \$250,000 to Rosenbaum, a friend of Casey, and sought financing from Financial General Bankshares, which Shipley represented.

Consultant Keith Norman, Tsakos' former project director, said a key element with Sudan fell into place last December, when Hatfield sent Tsakos a letter supporting the project. Hatfield also discussed it with Sudanese President Jaafar Nimeri and hosted a dinner for Sudan's energy minister.

"That letter, and the meeting with Nimeri, was the first initiative of a senior member of the U.S. political establishment pleading on behalf of the project," Norman said. "You can imagine the significance of that."

Sudanese Ambassador Omar Eissa said his country studied two years before signing a right-of-way agreement. "We're concerned about creating a lot of commercial activity for Africa," he said. "We're not interested in who's behind the project. The merits of the project can speak for themselves."

Tsakos charged in two lawsuits that Rosenbaum and others tried to defraud him and steal his plan by secretly forming a rival firm with a similar name. One suit was dropped and the other settled.

"We denied every one of his cockamamie allegations," Hundley said. Hundley and Shipley said Tsakos knew that the men were setting up the second firm under an agreement that the venture had to be controlled by Americans. They said they also were troubled by allegations that Tsakos had a criminal record and has been involved in arms sales, both of which Tsakos denies.

Continued

Michael Dobbs

10 August 1984

The Pope and the Bulgarians: A Reply

PARIS—The author of Tuesday's "Taking Exception" column, Claire Sterling, has devoted considerable time and effort to proving that the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II was masterminded by the Bulgarian Secret Service on behalf of the Kremlin. She has elaborated on this thesis in an article for *The Readers' Digest*, in a book entitled "The Time of the Assassins," and as a consultant for NBC News.

Most recently, on June 10, 1984, Sterling published a 5,900-word account in *The New York Times* describing a secret report by Italian state prosecutor Antonio Albano which asked for the indictment and trial of three former Bulgarian officials in Rome accused of involvement in the conspiracy.

During the course of my own inquiries in Rome into Albano's report, I discovered a series of omissions, factual errors and misquotations in the summary provided by Sterling to *The New York Times*. I refrained from pointing out these mistakes—or even mentioning Sterling by name—as I felt no useful purpose was served by being drawn into a public shouting match at a time when the bulk of the evidence about the case is still protected by Italian laws on judicial secrecy.

This effort to avoid a journalistic argument about a still secret report has now been thwarted by Sterling herself, who accuses me

of "numerous omissions or misstatements" in my article in *The Washington Post* on July 22. I have provided my editors with a point-by-point rebuttal of Sterling's criticisms, none of which I accept, and am happy to do the same for any reader who is interested. I will also make available in due course a list of significant errors and omissions in her *New York Times* account. For reasons of space, I will deal here with just a few of the more significant distortions in her attack on me.

First, I would like to draw attention to a literary device used by Sterling: her tendency to conclude that anybody who questions her thesis that the assassination attempt has already been shown to be a Soviet-bloc conspiracy is accepting "Bulgarian arguments." Fortunately, I am in good company here: In her book (page 197 of the hardback edition), she says that CIA chief William Casey and former national security adviser William Clark were taking a stand that "hardly differed from" the Bulgarian press spokesman's.

By failing to acknowledge that the two articles I have written on this subject have gone to some lengths to give readers an idea of both

sides of the case and have given prominence to prosecutor Albano's contention that his case stands up despite some apparent flaws, Sterling sets up a straw man argument. My articles

examined the nature of the evidence without taking a position on whether the prosecutor has proved his case against the accused Bulgarians or not. That is the proper role of a journalist, and it is the role of the Italian courts to decide on the case itself.

The argument that Mehmet Ali Agca, the pope's would-be assassin, could have gotten at least some of the details about his alleged Bulgarian accomplices from the mass media—the "Bulgarian argument"—Sterling calls it—does not derive from Sofia. Among the sources for this assertion is Agca himself, who told Italian magistrates on June 28, 1983, that his description of the apartment of Bulgarian airlines clerk Sergei I. Antonov was based on reports in the Italian press to which he had access while in prison.

Agca's contention was described by Albano in his report as "amazing but in fact probable." In her *Times* article, Sterling does not mention this acknowledgment, and indeed omits any specific reference to the June 28 retraction in which Agca denied earlier statements about visiting Antonov's apartment, meeting his wife or knowing that he was employed in the Bulgarian airline office in Rome.

In her column Tuesday, Sterling accuses me of failing to note Albano's comment that the June 28 retraction was "unconvincing and

indeed a contrast with objective evidence." But the report makes clear that, when he uses this phrase, the prosecutor is referring not to the June 28 testimony at all but to a later occasion on which Agca retracted details about a plot to kill Solidarity leader Lech Walesa. (The portion of the report covering this sequence is in fact available for inspection, since it was published by the Italian Catholic weekly *Il Sabato*.)

More to the point is why Sterling, who claims to be in possession of the full text of the prosecutor's report, should have failed to tell her readers of a retraction by Agca that Albano writes in his report—"modifies in a certainly penetrating manner the basic fabric of the evidence . . . and poses new problems to the investigators." Not only does Sterling take a phrase out of context, she also simply ignores statements by the prosecutor which do not support her argument.

Sterling focuses on some details that would not affect the sweep of my articles even if they were incorrect. In fact, they are not. For example, Sterling challenges my statement that Judge Domenico Sica was the first Italian magistrate to interrogate Agca. But he was, and did so less than six hours after the assassination attempt at 11 p.m. on May 13, 1981. Sica told me this himself, and it is confirmed in

a photocopy of the formal interrogation report in my possession.

She is mistaken when she says that all details provided by Agca about Antonov's and Aivazov's apartments have been "subsequently verified." Neither is it true that "practically everything Agca tried to take back had been substantiated already."

Sterling writes that—apart from a claim about carrying arms and explosives—Agca has not taken back "a word" about plotting with the three main Bulgarian suspects and a fourth Bulgarian, Ivan Tomev Dontchev, to kill Walesa. But according to Prosecutor Albano's report, Agca has denied that he even knew Dontchev. He has also denied visiting the scene of the would-be assassination with the Bulgarians.

In pursuing this story I was paying implicit tribute to Sterling for breaking new ground by revealing details of the prosecutor's report before anyone else. It gives me no pleasure to have to respond to her attack by pointing out that this achievement has been tarnished by a lack of concern for accuracy and balance, and an apparent refusal to accept as legitimate conclusions that may differ from her own.

The writer is The Post's Paris correspondent.

CIA Performs Vital Task, Needs Support

America is confronted with an undeclared war by the forces of international Communism and radical Arab states.

Terrorism has reached a stage where the distinction between war and peace is often obscured. The Soviet Union's KGB is waging constant battle against us, using techniques of propaganda, disinformation and other so-called "active measures," such as stealing or otherwise improperly acquiring our best technology.

The KGB is destabilizing weak governments, undermining trade and international economies and providing weapons and training to insurgents who seek to overthrow non-Communist governments.

At the same time, the Soviets seek to build an overwhelming military power that can be used to intimidate others and force political gains.

Thus we in the Central Intelligence Agency have our work cut out for us. What do we have going in our favor?

First, the benefit of strong support from the administration and Congress for our rebuilding program. We have had considerable increases in budget and other resources. The increases have allowed us to acquire advanced technical systems that have brought us new information-gathering capabilities.

Second, we have been able to employ top systems analysts to handle the flow of new information. In hiring them, we aren't looking for spies. We're after patriots, friends and supporters — people who understand the endless difference between human freedom and totalitarianism and who are willing to put themselves on the line for the things we in America believe in.

Third, we see increasing dissatisfaction among the people of Communist nations. Over the years, the Communists were very successful in supporting guerrilla action and destabilizing and overthrowing governments. They came into control in Ethiopia, Angola, Nicaragua and, of course, Cuba and Vietnam.

More recently, however, they've been encountering substantial unrest. People in those countries are less willing to take Communist oppression lying down. They are more aware of what the Communist bosses are really up to.

The people are progressively more fed up with the rigidity and ineffectiveness of bureaucratic Communist controls and their negative economic and social impact.

All this is overlaid on intense demographic problems. A large and rapidly growing percentage of non-Slavic Soviet peoples does not fully identify with the Soviet state or the ruling elite.

Meanwhile, the CIA is achieving gratifying results in such areas as our campaign to curb industrial espionage.

Through KGB operations, America has often wound up contributing indirectly to the Soviet buildup — the accuracy and precision of Soviet weapons — which, in effect, has us competing with our own technology. This has forced us to make those budget-busting appropriations to come up with more adequate defense forces.

But we now fully recognize the problem, and we in the CIA are doing a much better counter-espionage job. Last year, well over 100 Soviet agents were arrested or kicked out — or defected — around the world. Most of them had been engaged in stealing technology.

The CIA's task of fighting the undeclared war is an unceasing one. For the nation's sake, it is imperative that we have the understanding and support of our fellow Americans.

DISPATCHES.

KAI BIRD AND MAX HOLLAND

■ NICARAGUA: Not-So-Comic Capers

Unusual documentary evidence that belies Director of Central Intelligence William Casey's assurances that the Reagan Administration is not trying to overthrow the Sandinista government has just emerged. Now circulating in Nicaragua is "The Freedom Fighter's Manual," an illustrated pamphlet in the style of a comic book. It encourages citizens to join in the "final battle against the usurpers of the authentic Sandinista revolution. . . . There is an essential economic infrastructure that any government needs to function, which can easily be disabled and even paralyzed without the use of armaments."

The style of the sixteen-page booklet reminds one nostalgically of a 1950s U.S. government handout on civil defense, but this one is filled with suggestions on how to sabotage the Nicaraguan economy. Pouring sand into car engines, spilling tacks on highways and clogging up toilets with sponges are strongly recommended. Not all the techniques are strictly in the realm of sabotage. One series of illustrations shows how to make a Molotov cocktail; another depicts breaking the windows of the local police station with a slingshot. Presumably with the fainthearted in mind, the manual also endorses reporting late for work.

A peasant found the pamphlet stuffed in the door of a house in the town of Ocotal, near the Honduran border, shortly after a June 1 attack by members of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, the *contra* group most heavily dependent on C.I.A. financing. Eventually the pamphlet reached Betsy Cohn, director of the Central American Historical Institute at Georgetown University. She passed it on to Robert Parry of the Associated Press for confirmation of its authorship, aware he had sources within the American intelligence community. Despite the predictable official denial, Parry's sources told him the booklet was indeed prepared by the C.I.A. for distribution by the Nicaraguan *contras*. Although it has received major play in Baltimore, Miami and Minneapolis newspapers, the story has received scant notice in *The New York Times*.

It took a scholar to make the next observation. Cohn says she became curious when she noticed that some of the Spanish used in the pamphlet—for example, the words for faucet and tire—is not typically Nicaraguan.

With the huge increase in the agency's budget, one would think that the least Casey could do is produce a culturally sensitive comic book.

FAIRFAX JOURNAL
2 August 1984

The secrecy obsession, the CIA, and folly

Analysis

By JEREMY CAMPBELL

THE American obsession with secrecy has reached such heights of folly it is now very likely that the CIA will be sued by its own former director for preventing him from publishing excerpts from his own public speeches.

Admiral Stansfield Turner, head of the CIA under President Jimmy Carter, has spent the past year trying to make his new book, "Secrecy in Democracy," innocuous enough to satisfy the CIA Review Board, which must approve works by members or ex-members of the agency before publication.

In spite of heroic acts of self-censorship on his part, the Board is still not satisfied. Turner, no longer bothering to hide his disgust, calls the whole process "absurd."

At one point Turner accepted the judgment of the board that a section of the book, dealing with his experiences at the CIA, divulged classified information. He set to and completely rewrote the section, quoting only from his own publicly given speeches.

To his amazement, permission was still denied, even though other officials have said almost exactly the same, either in speeches or in published writings.

Of two further matters the CIA is trying to make him censor, Turner says: "You would laugh out loud if I told you what they are."

Turner is now considering a lawsuit if he continues to be thwarted. This is richly ironic because Turner, a careful and far from exciting writer on the subject of intelligence and defense affairs, once enthusiastically supported the idea of pre-publication review for books by CIA officials.

He was responsible for the prosecution of Frank Snepp, a former CIA agent who published a book — "Decent Interval," a critical study of the U.S. intelligence role in Vietnam — without prior review.

Snepp was ordered to surrender all his royalties from the book to the government.

The Turner case highlights an aspect of the rising mania for secrecy in Washington. It shows that the Reagan administration is so determined to suppress leaks of information that it does not mind making a fool of itself in the process. This could cause political troubles for the White House.

It is known, for example, that the Pentagon is planning to expand the use of random lie detector tests, in which officials at the Defense Department would periodically be required to "reaffirm their continued loyalty to the government."

At present such tests are voluntary, but refusing to take one can compromise a civil servant's chances of promotion.

Jeremy Campbell is Washington correspondent for the Standard of London. Distributed by the Scripps-Howard News Service.