

DRAFT
OGC/LC:JSW:mks
11 April 1966

The Honorable J. W. Fulbright

Dear Senator Fulbright:

I have received your letter of March 31, 1966 concerning the article on the Vietcong by George A. Carver, Jr. in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs. It is correct that there was no indication in the magazine of his employment by the Central Intelligence Agency, and an assumption by the reader that Mr. Carver was writing for himself and not for the Administration would also be correct.

Mr. Carver has known the editor of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, for some time. In the fall of 1964, Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Carver to write an article on the general social and political dynamics of the South Vietnamese situation which, after Agency security review, was published in the April 1965 issue of Foreign Affairs under the title "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam." In December 1965, Mr. Armstrong again contacted Mr. Carver, said that he wanted to run an objective, historical analysis of the Vietcong movement in his April 1966 issue and personally asked Mr. Carver to write it for him.

Agency regulations do not prohibit publication by employees of matters within their professional competence, provided there is no violation of security. Mr. Carver submitted his article for the required security review and security approval was given, but the Agency did not encourage or discourage Mr. Carver in connection

with writing an article. Likewise, the Agency neither approved nor disapproved of the article.

As to whether Mr. Carver used the information available to him only by reason of his employment, it should be noted that Mr. Carver has specialized in Vietnamese affairs for a number of years during which time he was an employee of the United States Government. He also spent a great deal of his own time studying the situation in Vietnam, the Far East, and Southeast Asia generally. How much of the information in the article was acquired through his own efforts and how much by virtue of his employment, no one can say. In any event, however, there is no classified information in the article.

As to your question whether the Agency would have approved the article if it had been critical of the Administration's policy, I repeat that the Agency neither approves nor disapproves of such articles. But, in fact, the article in question does not comment on U. S. policy. It is a historical treatise by a careful student of the problem. The Agency would certainly not encourage any of its employees to write articles discussing foreign policy as such whether it be supporting a particular policy or whether it was critical of a certain policy.

Since Mr. Carver did the article on his own time as a personal matter, he saw no reason to put in his official connection with the Government, although no attempt was made to conceal his employment when an inquiry was made by the newspapers. We do not believe it appropriate that our employees advertise their association with the Agency in connection with published articles since we do not wish them in effect to trade on the Agency's reputation. A number of other Agency employees have written for publication in their fields of technical competence subject only to the security clearance by the Agency. These have ranged from articles on technical and scientific matters to economics and history.

You ask how this kind of activity is related to the role of the Agency as an information-gathering institution. While the Agency does have collection responsibilities, its primary statutory duty is to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government. I find nothing inconsistent in this responsibility with publication by individual employees of articles, even though at least a portion of the information is acquired by virtue

of his employment. If we are to continue to attract able, intelligent employees in the essential work of this Agency, we cannot stifle their desire to express themselves so long as the national security is not involved.

Sincerely,

APPROVED FOR RELEASE - CIA-RDP75-00149R000200910017-5 UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET			
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Assistant to the DCI	12 APR 1966	JM
2	Commander Moran 1 F 08		
3			
4			
5			
6			
<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE
Remarks: Proposed reply to Fulbright on Carver article.			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
OGC/LC 7 D 01			12 Apr 66
APPROVED FOR RELEASE - CIA-RDP75-00149R000200910017-5 UNCLASSIFIED CONFIDENTIAL SECRET			