

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

15 APR 86

| TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post) | | Initials | Date |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | EXO/DDA | <i>[Handwritten initials]</i> | <i>[Handwritten date]</i> |
| 2. | ADDA | <i>[Handwritten initials]</i> | 15 APR 1986 |
| 3. | DDA | <i>[Handwritten initials]</i> | 15 APR 1986 |
| 4. | DA/PLANS | <i>[Handwritten initials]</i> | <i>[Handwritten date]</i> |
| 5. | DDA REGISTRY | <i>[Handwritten initials]</i> | <i>[Handwritten date]</i> |

| Action | File | Note and Return |
|--------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Approval | For Clearance | For Conversation |
| As Requested | For Correction | Prepare Reply |
| Circulate | For Your Information | See Me |
| Comment | Investigate | Signature |
| Coordination | Justify | |

REMARKS

D/PAO HAS ACTION; D/OS RECEIVED A COPY.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

| | |
|---|----------------|
| FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post) | Room No.—Bldg. |
| | Phone No. |

5041-102

U.S.G.P.O.: 1983 -421-529/320

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
 Prescribed by GSA
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.806

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP**

| TO: | | ACTION | INFO | DATE | INITIAL |
|-----|------------|----------|------|--------------------------|---------|
| 1 | DCI | | X | | |
| 2 | DDCI-D | | X | | |
| 3 | EXDIR | | X | | |
| 4 | D/ICS | | | | |
| 5 | DDI | | | | |
| 6 | DDA | | X | | |
| 7 | DDO | | | | |
| 8 | DDS&T | | | | |
| 9 | Chm/NIC | | | | |
| 10 | GC | | | | |
| 11 | IG | | | | |
| 12 | Compt | | | | |
| 13 | D/OLL | | | | |
| 14 | D/PAO | X | | | |
| 15 | D/PERS | | | | |
| 16 | VC/NIC | | | | |
| 17 | C/SECOM | | X | | |
| 18 | D/Security | | X | | |
| 19 | ES | | X | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| | | SUSPENSE | | <u>17 Apr 86</u> Date | |

Remarks
To 14: Please have requested draft statement prepared for DCI review.

Executive Secretary

14 April 86
Date

3637 (10-81)

STAT

~~SECRET~~

| | |
|--------------------|------|
| Executive Registry | |
| 86- | 1575 |

12 April 1986



[Faint handwritten notes and scribbles]
 10-5

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Public Affairs
 FROM: Director of Central Intelligence
 SUBJECT: Leaks

1. I ran into Kay Graham at dinner last night. She thought our presentation on leaks went very well with the editors. She pointed out that Simons and I were really talking about different things, he about tearing down secrecy which covers up corruption and mismanagement and I about secrecy to protect lives and vital interests. In the discussion, that wasn't brought out as clearly as it might have been. The two of us talked past each other.

2. In this editorial in USA TODAY they decry overclassification in which there is probably room for improvement. They also again try to turn the whole issue on being entitled "to know what our federal government is doing just as we deserve to know how much the school board will pay teachers or whether the city council will raise taxes." That's true, but has nothing to do with protecting lives and national interests.

3. It seems to me we should get a coherent response drafted and use it to respond to editorial comment like this.

William J. Casey

Attachment:
 Page 10A, 11 April 1986 USA TODAY



~~SECRET~~



USA TODAY hopes to serve as a forum for better understanding and unity to the USA today, the USA of the future, the USA of the past, the USA of the future, the USA of the past, the USA of the future...

John C. Quinn Editor

John Saperhan Editor

OPINION

The Debate: THE USA'S SECRETS

Today's debate includes our opinion that too many secrets and spies, not less or aggressive reporting, are the real threat to our national security, an opposing view from "Hush" based on news from Hiro, Wisconsin, and the Desert of Columbia, and voices from across the USA.

Too many secrets are real security risk

"The White House," President Reagan says, "is the least-kept place I've ever been in." The president wasn't talking about the White House roof in his speech to newspaper editors this week, he deplored a leak, most editors love — the disclosure of information He said it's such a serious problem that planning for U.S. operations of Libya was limited to "a few people."

Today, it's no secret that our government keeps far too many secrets. There are approximately 10 million government records that are classified, and 4 million government employees have clearance to see classified information.

Consider some of the "secrets" the media have reported throughout the years:

A report that the space shuttle carried a spy satellite. The Pentagon complained about the leak, but an Air Force official said later little was reported that was not already public information.

The Watergate scandal. Without leaks, the public would never have known the extent of White House involvement in the burglary and the subsequent cover-up.

The publication of the Pentagon Papers. The government claimed printing the leaked details of how we got into the Vietnam War would endanger U.S. lives. Courts disagreed, and the knowledge we gained may have saved lives later.

Instead of harming us, most disclosures help us better understand what government is doing. Just as we deserve to know how much the school board will pay teachers or whether the city council will raise taxes.

There are those who cry that journalists are unpatriotic. They claim reporters would sacrifice national security for a hot story. That's nonsense. Journalists frequently withhold sensitive information if it would be dangerous or irresponsible to reveal it. Even CIA Director Casey admits that.

The real disclosures that have damaged our national security have not come from reporters but from spies who came from quillings and traitors — the Johnny Walkers and the other spies — who sold secrets to the Soviets. Sure, sometimes leaks embarrass public servants. And they've caused a bit of embarrassment here and there. But in freedom, not under the thumb of a totalitarian state, our democracy is messy. And to a great degree, our freedom depends on how much we know about our government.

Yes, the White House leaks. But it would be a mistake to fix it.

QUOTELINES

"The First Amendment was not intended to make it impossible for the executive to function or to protect the security of the United States." — Erwin Griswold, former U.S. Solicitor General

"Many secrecy laws are put on documents not to protect a true secret, but to avoid true embarrassment or to cover up a cost overrun, or an abuse of power, or to stifle criticism, or to avoid public scrutiny, or out of habit." — Howard Simons, former editor, The Washington Post

"Loose lips sink ships." — World War II slogan

"Without enlightenment about politics and information about government, democracy simply would not work." — Henry Steele Commager, historian

THE LINE ON THE NEWS

Many news organizations have established "redaction" lines that prevent the publication of certain information. Some of these lines are based on budget cuts, the need to protect sources, or the desire to avoid controversy.



By David Seavey, USA TODAY

JUDY MARKEY

Guest columnist Remember, you read it here first!

WILMETTE, Ill. — The press may be occasionally guilty of jeopardizing national security, but I tell you that is nothing — nothing — compared to what children can do when it comes to jeopardizing family security.

No secret, no piece of information is sacrosanct when the little people with the big mouths reside in your household.

Generally, there are two main topics we do not want our kids discussing with anyone outside of the family — money and sex. Conversation about either of these is considered by me to be a bad thing.

Just like the press, children make these sorts of inquiries partly out of curiosity and partly because they actually feel they have a right to know.

WILLIAM J. CASEY

Guest columnist Help keep the USA's vital secrets

WASHINGTON — Our country has spent billions of dollars to develop methods of collecting information required to assess missiles and other weapons aimed at us, to develop effectively to protect our citizens and installations around the world from terrorists, and to assist our diplomats.

Good intelligence sources are critical to our security. Secrecy and confidentiality are essential. For that reason, we must restrict the circulation of information about how and where we collect intelligence — and also the reports and assessments based on that intelligence if they might reveal or compromise our sources and methods.

The NSA and other hostile intelligence services spend billions each year in their efforts to acquire this information. Publication of this restricted information hands our adversaries on a silver platter information they spy, research, and satellites are working 24 hours a day to uncover.

In recent years, publication of classified information by the media has destroyed or seriously damaged some of our most important intelligence sources of the highest value.

Our agents, our relationships with friendly intelligence and security services around the world, our photographic and electronic capabilities, the information we get from communications — and also the reports and assessments based on that intelligence — if they might reveal or compromise our sources and methods.

This, time and time again, has enabled those hostile to us to avoid huge investments in conceal and observe deny information critical to our defense, and to deprive us of the ability to protect our citizens from terrorist attacks.

We do not wish to limit the press from getting information the public needs and should have. I believe we're all work-

PETER B. GEMMA JR.

An opposing view Unpatriotic media risk national security

PROVIDENCE, R.I. — I know, I know. It's almost predictable — even boring — to read of a conservative's yearning for the good old days. Sure, however, when it comes to media handling of national security issues, journalistic standards used to be higher.

I'm only 35, but I can't remember a precedent — nor think of a rationalization — for ABC's inviting that Soviet communist commentator to rebut the role of neutral observers. Have they no patriotic instincts?

Sure, the public has come to expect that a free press will deliver accurate, reliable news without undue influence from left or right, good or bad. But we also want our news delivered by real people who hurt, feel angry, and who can appreciate the pride and patriotism of the great middle class.

That's why the gangsters who hold our innocents as hostages don't deserve a "fair" hearing, and why Mao-Dog Khadafi needs to be needed, and why those who leak information to fuel the fire of speculation should be discounted as sources for legitimate news.

And I'm real tired of Imelda Marcos' shoe-count, of Louis Farrakhan's sermons, and of the voter analyses of Mayor-elect Clint Eastwood's supporters. That's cheap and nasty "news." Poor Lowell Thomas must be turning in his grave.

Cynical, superficial, and insensitive to national security interests are charges the media must take seriously.

Remember the scandalous coverage of the Pentagon Papers? The unnecessary expose that one of the space shuttles was carrying a military satellite? Or the endless discussion of the caliber and range of ammunition we might provide to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua? Of course, I don't believe The New York Times needed to detail our Mediterranean military presence.

ERWIN KNOLL

Guest columnist What's already public cannot be a secret

MADISON, Wis. — A scholar who specializes in modern Chinese history tells me that many of the official Chinese publications he uses as source materials are more readily available in this country than in the People's Republic.

Here, those Chinese documents circulate freely in public universities. But in Peking they are denied to foreigners — and to Chinese citizens who don't hold high rank in the Communist Party.

Such obsessive and irrational secrecy is what we expect of regimes we call authoritarian or totalitarian. Our government wouldn't practice such foolish censorship, would it?

In 1971, when the Nixon administration tried to prevent the Washington Post, The New York Times, and other newspapers from publishing the Pentagon Papers, Justice Department lawyers argued behind closed courtroom doors that publication would have devastating consequences for "national security."

The government cited 10 "reasons" which, if brought to light, would result in the death of men still fighting in Vietnam, disrupt relations with our allies, and strengthen the enemies of freedom throughout the world. The courts were unpersuaded and allowed the papers to be published.

It turned out that every one of the reasons cited previously had been published — in some cases months or even years before the Pentagon Papers were completed.

In 1975, when the Carter administration tried to prevent The Progressive from publishing an article about the H-

Erwin Knoll is editor of The Progressive magazine.

Erwin Knoll is editor of The Progressive magazine.

Erwin Knoll is editor of The Progressive magazine.

Erwin Knoll is editor of The Progressive magazine.

Erwin Knoll is editor of The Progressive magazine.

VOICES FROM ACROSS THE USA

Do you think media disclosures compromise national security?



ERNEST GIBSON, 50 Welder, Depue, Pa.

There are lots of things that get printed that shouldn't be printed — classified information should not be in the hands of an ex-military man. I know that media disclosures can do us compromise our national security. The media should show more restraint. They shouldn't publish everything that the public doesn't want to see. They should get their hands on...



CINDY ZELL, 22 Student, Venice, Calif.

If anything, newspapers do enough to inform the public. They tell us what they know and we hear and read probably true, but there are many exceptions. I'd like to see the media take more responsibility in getting the entire story to the public — not just what they feel should be printed.



JIM SWIHACK, 38 Company manager, Houston, Texas

On the whole, I think reporters and editors do a good job reporting the news. Sure, there is an occasional slip where an editor could have used more discretion or better judgment, but I'm generally very satisfied with the news. I think the newspapers do a good job of providing it.



JOAN KATSARACOS, 63 Writer, Essex Junction, Vt.

What concerns me is the need to obtain material in classified form. It's not that I'm a conspiracy theorist, but I'm concerned about the possibility of a "national security" leak. I think the media should be more careful in what they report.



WALTER KERR, 57 Attorney, Shaker Heights, Ohio

As long as it's not strictly classified information, it should be fully disclosed to the public and put in open competition. Let the people — the voters — decide for themselves. I think the media should be more careful in what they report.

CLIFFORD CHAPMAN, 58 Engraver, Hyattsville, Md.

I'm a retired military man, and I strongly believe that certain classified matters should not be in the hands of a newspaper. I think the media should be more careful in what they report.

SANDY DAVISON, 48 Secretary, Milwaukee, Wis.

Generally, I'm satisfied with the media. In many cases, they do a good job of reporting the news. I think the media should be more careful in what they report.