

DRAFT
OGC:LRH:jeb
8 Apr 66

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 for a long time and had in fact written an article for that magazine about a year ago on the subject of

He was asked by the editor if he would do another article on the historical development of the Vietcong because the editor was aware of Mr. Carver's long interest in and knowledge of the area.

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 the Vietnamese area over a ^{long} period, 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, but subject only to security requirements this would not appear to make much difference.

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. Therefore, whether Mr. Carver would have been free to write a critical article for publication is not at issue. In this connection, the Agency's reaction to an article by an employee which is critical of the Administration would depend entirely on the circumstances of any one case. If an employee were to write for publication on a theme which supported your own ideas critical of

the Administration, I believe he would be free to do so although I also believe we would be inclined to review his objectivity as an intelligence analyst. Obviously, an article by an employee in the vein of a Birchite or Daily Worker smear of the Administration would raise a definite question as to his suitability for continued employment.

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. 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. In some instances articles have been written in response to requests from congressional committees and are published by these committees as their own with full knowledge of the fact that the author is employed by the Agency but without attribution to the Agency.

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 some 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 ^Rable, 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. In fact, I am not aware under what authority we could attempt to prevent such publication except as noted above in those cases where the nature of a publication might question the employee's fitness for further employment.

Sincerely,

Executive Registry

66-1525

J. W. FULBRIGHT, ARK., CHAIRMAN
JOHN SPARKMAN, ALA.
MIKE MANFIELD, MONT.
WAYNE MORSE, OREG.
RUSSELL B. LONG, LA.
ALBERT GORE, TENN.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE, OHIO
FRANK CHURCH, IDAHO
STUART SYMINGTON, MO.
THOMAS J. DODD, CONN.
JOSEPH B. CLARK, PA.
CLAIBORNE FELL, R.I.
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, MINN.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, IOWA
GEORGE D. AIKEN, VT.
FRANK CARLSON, KANS.
JOHN J. WILLIAMS, DEL.
KARL E. MUNDT, S. DAK.
CLIFFORD P. CASE, N.J.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

March 31, 1966

CARL MARCY, CHIEF OF STAFF
ARTHUR M. KUHL, CHIEF CLERK

The Honorable William F. Raborn
Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Admiral Raborn:

I have seen press reports to the effect that George A. Carver, Jr., the author of a recent article in Foreign Affairs on the Vietcong, is an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency. There was no indication of that fact in the magazine and it would be logical for the reader to assume, therefore, that Mr. Carver was writing for himself and not for the Administration.

This raises questions in my mind as to the role of Agency employees in engaging in activities designed to influence foreign policy attitudes in the United States. For example, was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article? Did Mr. Carver use information available to him only by reason of his employment? Did the Agency approve the article? Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of Administration policy? Would Mr. Carver have been free to write a critical article for publication? Why was Mr. Carver's official connection with the Government not made public?

How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the

-2-

United States without attribution? How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?

I would appreciate very much having your comments on these questions and a statement of Agency policy on this matter.

Sincerely yours,


J. W. Fulbright
Chairman

Enclosures

15K-1

Approved For Release 2004/08/30 : CIA-RDP80R01720R000500030049-7

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM

CONFIDENTIAL SECRET

**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP**

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Mr. George A. Carver, Jr. 6 F 19		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

<input type="checkbox"/> ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/> DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/> PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/> DISPATCH	<input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/> COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> FILE	<input type="checkbox"/> RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE

Remarks:
George:
Attached you will find a draft letter to Fulbright done by Larry Houston. In addition, I have made some modifications. I will be in touch with you this afternoon to go over this.

John S. Warner

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.		DATE
OGC/LC	7 D 01	11 Apr 66

Approved For Release 2004/08/30 : CIA-RDP80R01720R000500030049-7

STAT

STAT