

The case of State Department security official Otto Otepka bids fair to break all previous New Frontier records for manhandling the national interest. Otepka is the official who blew the whistle on William Wieland, ex-president of the Fidel Castro fan club in the U.S. diplomatic corps, and exposed the methods by which Wieland was given important assignments even after his peculiar performance in the Cuban matter.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in a

since he had produced proof of their own untruthfulness —so they charged him with revealing classified documents. The act of refuting their own misrepresentations with documentary evidence, and of nailing down security laxness in the State Department, was alleged as a violation of security! Otepka was put on notice that, for conduct unbecoming a State Department official, he would be dismissed from his position. He is now contesting that order, and the Senate Subcommittee is having a further extended look at State Department security practices.

At Home

report published last October, described Wieland as having been "an active apologist for Fidel Castro," who had "falsified his job application by omission," and who had failed to pass along to his superiors information proving the pro-Communist nature of Castro's movement.

Otto Otepka was a key figure in the inquiry leading to these conclusions. As Chief of the Evaluations Division of the State Department's security office, Otepka had delivered an adverse report on Wieland's "suitability and integrity." Otepka told the senators: "I felt and I specified each instance, that I thought there were questions, serious questions of the man's integrity, and I felt that such questions, since they . . . did not relate to the issue as to whether or not he was disloyal . . . should be reviewed and adjudicated under the Foreign Service regulations of the Department of State."

Despite these recommendations, nothing in particular was done about Wieland's security clearance until the subject was raised at President Kennedy's press conference, January 24, 1962. Kennedy stammered an indistinct approbation of Wieland's continued employment, and the following day a State Department memo was dispatched indicating Wieland was to be regarded as free and clear of security shortcomings. Otepka commented: "I don't think I can defend the Department in its course."

Otepka also alleged that men of "questionable background" occupied other important positions in the State Department, and that "emergency clearances" were being used to keep personnel in sensitive positions. Department higher-ups, appearing to challenge Otepka's testimony, accused him of falsehood. The New Frontiersmen claimed not to know anything about specific cases mentioned in Otepka's presentation to the Subcommittee.

Otepka was subsequently recalled and asked to substantiate his statements. He did so, producing documents corroborating his previous testimony, chapter and verse. These papers carried notes and initials by the same New Frontiersmen who claimed never to have laid eyes on them. Otepka's rebuttal, according to Subcommittee members, was "iron-clad."

Caught dead to rights, the Kennedy officials assumed a new tack. They could not now charge Otepka with lying—

The episode as a whole presents a rather unhappy picture of operating procedure in Foggy Bottom. We have, in order:

1. State Department official William Wieland covering up the true nature of Fidel Castro's 26 July movement, helping steer the U.S. into diplomatic catastrophe in Cuba.
2. State Department higher-ups covering up for Wieland, overriding sensible security practices to do so.
3. State Department denial of the true facts of the security situation, in order to cover up for their previous coverup of Wieland.
4. State Department reprisals against a man courageous enough to tell the truth about security procedures, in order to cover up for their general coverup in the security picture as a whole.

In an interview with Willard Edwards of the *Chicago Tribune*, Otepka commented concerning Coverup #3: "This put their testimony in conflict with mine and with my official knowledge. Their testimony was untrue. Since they had used the Subcommittee forum to make their statements, I felt entitled to rebut their statements and present the true facts . . . I'm charged with violation of orders when all I did was defend myself."

Considering the Department's over-all record in this field, it seems unlikely its campaign against Otepka is inspired by zeal for security. The Kennedy officials are obviously concerned to prevent Congress from knowing of their misfeasances—merely the latest flowering of executive arrogance toward the legislature. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee means to assert the rightful prerogatives of the lawmaking branch, and it is to be hoped the result will puncture the hubris of the foreign policy bureaucracy.

There are yet other ramifications of the Otepka case, embracing Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland. According to testimony before the Subcommittee, Cleveland has been bringing people of dubious security status into the State Department. Simultaneously, evidence has accumulated suggesting a sustained effort to dismantle the security office of the Department—a move described by former Security Chief John W. Hanes as either "incompetence or a deliberate attempt to render the State Department's security section ineffective." It was Otepka's difference with the New Frontier on these matters, that allegedly brought on the vendetta against him. The Subcommittee has also been examining this aspect of the controversy.

M. STANTON EVANS

Two days later, September 25, they took off from Cozumel, bound for Tegucigalpa, Honduras, and they have not been heard from since.

Alex Rorke's wife has tried to get U.S. authorities to search for the aircraft, but their response has been, it is said, perfunctory. Perhaps she and the three young children should not have expected more, for Rorke has been in trouble with the U.S. Government.

One D. F. Cardoza, a customs supervisor, has threatened Rorke with a \$5,000 fine and two years in jail. As reported by columnist Robert S. Allen, Cardoza explained to Rorke that the order came "directly from the Great White Father in Washington—President Kennedy." The State Department had previously grounded two other planes Rorke had used, by canceling the certificates permitting flights to the Caribbean. Still earlier, customs officials had threatened to shoot the tires of his plane if a takeoff was attempted.

Rorke, of course, had invited this trouble by making a series of incredible air raids on Castro's Cuba in the last

two years, culminating in a bombing raid on an oil refinery outside Havana last April. Some said he had the help of the CIA in these activities. Rorke's anti-Castroism is personal: in August 1959 he was jailed by Castro while covering Cuba on assignment from NBC-TV; he has claimed to be the first U.S. citizen Castro jailed. And Rorke's anti-Communism is professional and traditional: his earlier career includes work with the FBI, and military intelligence in Germany, and he was in on the first postwar dragnet of Communists in the Allied Zone of Germany. Back in 1919 his father, then Assistant District Attorney in New York, prosecuted the founders of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

At one time or another the U.S. Government has sent military or other search teams after vacationers in Mexico, or Nelson Rockefeller's boy lost off New Guinea; even cattle stranded in blizzards on the western plains have had bales of hay dropped to them from Air Force C-119s. But Alex Rorke apparently will have to go it alone. Unless somebody nudges Great White Father.

Pasted separately

regrets over Mr. Baker's forced resignation. And the GOP, under that rocking, socking fighter, Everett McKinley Dirksen, complacently agreed to a secret investigation of the Baker case. Were the circumstances reversed, Senator Mike Mansfield, the Democratic leader, would be clamoring loudly—backed by the press—for open hearings and shouting "unclean" from the rooftops.

● The second scandal involves Otto Otepka, the State Department security officer who has been semi-cashiered for supplying information, to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which showed that some of his superiors had been more than a little cavalier with fact in their sworn testimony. For cooperating with the committee, Mr. Otepka has been disciplined and removed from his job. At present, while the case wends its way through the bureaucratic jungles, he has been given the task of preparing a guide book. Obviously, it was felt by Secretary Rusk that to demote Mr. Otepka to leaf-raking or floor-scrubbing might cause too much comment.

The Otepka case has led to some comments from Republican legislators, but the outcry one would have expected has not materialized. Neither has there been any concerted effort to link the breakdown in security disclosed by Mr. Otepka to the horrors of the Dunlap case. Sergeant Edward Dunlap turned over highly important information to the Soviets. The Federal Bureau of Investigation was, as usual, not called in until much too late. The Sergeant made one attempt to commit suicide and informed his superiors of it—yet nothing was done to prevent the second and successful effort.

In fact, his demise before he had been forced to name his confederates and to show the determined laxness of the National Security Agency was met by a sigh of relief in certain quarters. With Sergeant Dunlap dead, a number

of people can sleep better these nights. This is such an obvious proposition that the question arises: Was it really a suicide—or was he helped along the way? The Whittaker Chambers report of a conversation with an *apparatchik* is recalled. It's easy to murder but to suicide someone takes skill.

The Dunlap case, however, is but one more indication that the Liberal view of security is robbing this country of its most vital secrets. If one listens to the Administration clique, security measures are old-fashioned and no longer needed. Yet at a time when President Kennedy's Defense Department, according to Assistant Secretary Arthur Sylvester, was lying to the people in order presumably to maneuver against the Soviets, Sergeant Dunlap was slipping his espionage colleagues facts that were too touchy to give the American public.

● The Otepka case and the Dunlap fiasco—not to mention the recent haste of the State Department to trade two Soviet spies before trial—can be the basis for some searching questions in the House and the Senate. But the belief that Communism is no longer an issue, that espionage and security should not be talked about, seems to prevail on Capitol Hill. The brainwashing of the post-McCarthy era has convinced many Republicans that to talk about these topics can mean death at the polls. It upsets the Washington press crops and they write nasty things about you.

This fear of adverse comment was responsible in substantial part for the number of Republican votes cast in favor of the Moscow Treaty on nuclear testing. More than one senator admitted that he would have stood up against the treaty—but that he did not want to be "isolated" or pushed into the "radical Right" wing. In instance after instance—starting with the Wieland case—this kind of press and social intimidation has carried the day. QUINCY