

HARD TIMES

SPOOKING THE SPOOKS: the victor marchetti story by james otis

"I'm a scoutmaster" says Victor Marchetti. He is, in fact, more than a scoutmaster.

Until 1969 he was executive assistant to the deputy director of Central Intelligence, Admiral Rufus Taylor. More recently, he has been the subject of a legal case which could crack open the darkest recesses of America's clandestine government. "I am the kind of a guy who manages Little League teams," he goes on. "Well, my scouts and ball players began to grow up on me and they became draft age. They let their hair grow; they changed. Now I know these were good boys, and they started to get to me. They began saying, 'I'm not going to go and get shot in Vietnam, because it's an unjust war.'" Doubts, gnawing doubts about Vietnam and the CIA's role in foreign affairs. He says that he saw himself becoming a lifer, an intelligence bureaucrat, and he "didn't want to play the game any longer." After 14 years as a spy for America, Marchetti quit.

That was 1969. Now, in August, 1972, in Washington, D. C., he sat in a Chinese restaurant known as a place frequented by CIA agents. Far from the taciturn and glamorous killer, Marchetti looked stolidly middle class, of conservative mien and talkative manner. As he spoke, he furtively sized up the occupants of the other tables and mentally chronicled the comings and going of all patrons, presumably out of habit. Did he think the interview was being bugged? "It's not beyond them," he replied, his face a mixture of edginess and resignation.

It had not always been like this. He had left the agency on the best of terms, his boss assuring him that he "had a home to come back to." "In the first year I was away, it was just as

if I was at the Agency. I was going to dinner parties . . . we'd sit around and talk. In fact, I saw as much of Agency people as I did when I was working."

But somewhere along the line he got the notion that he wanted to blow the whistle on the CIA: "I would go down to a shopping center and walk around. For the first time in 15 years, I began to look at a check-out clerk as a human being, instead of a check-out clerk. I got interested in people and my ideas about the Agency became firmer and sharper, and I began to



Marchetti: Blowing the whistle

focus on precisely what was bothering me."

Victor Marchetti decided to write a book. While the process of writing can be a solitary and private experience, he could scarcely expect to scribble away, merrily exposing his former employers, without it coming to their horrified attention. True, the CIA's record has been afflicted with tragicomic vicissitudes, but it can presumably keep tabs on its own.

Within weeks of his book outline being shown to various New York publishers, the CIA obtained a copy through a source within the industry. It immediately sought, and received, a court injunction against any further revelation of the book's contents. The order additionally restrains Marchetti from even discussing the as yet un-

written book with his literary agent, publishers, or wife. It is an injunction of unprecedented scope—never before has the government gone to court to prevent former employees from speaking or writing. At the heart of the case lies a basic conflict between the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and the government's interest in keeping a lid on its various clandestine—and often illegal—activities. Provoked by the wave of "whistle-blowing" attendant on Daniel Ellsberg's release of the Pentagon Papers, the conflict arises because of official activity which offends the moral sensibilities of rather ordinary, and very loyal, public servants like Victor Marchetti. If the Supreme Court backs Marchetti's right to talk, it could open a floodgate for a torrent of revelations about the nefarious activities of American spy agencies. If it upholds the CIA, it could cut down on the trickle of information which currently keeps the Invisible Government on its guard.

Aside from the broader implications of the case, the CIA has good reason to fear what Marchetti himself might reveal about his erstwhile employers. He is unquestionably the highest-ranking intelligence official to threaten exposure of the Agency's more questionable endeavors. He knows where the skeletons are hidden. Indeed, Marchetti is given credit for developing the surveillance techniques which led the CIA to discover Russian missiles in Cuba and thereby provoked the 1962 Missile Crisis.

As Marchetti tells the story, "After I was with the Agency for five or six years, I was assigned to the Cuban problem. This was exciting and personally very satisfying because another fellow and I evolved a strange analytical working tool which we called crateology. With it we were able to identify the merchant ships that were arms carriers. Over a period of time, since the Soviets were very methodical, we began to learn which crate contained a SAM 2 and which crate

V.S. Naipaul: *The Return of Eva Perón*
The New York Review
of Books

**Gore Vidal:
Dirty Politics**

**I. F. Stone
Heat on
McGovern**

**Sick Freud
by Charles Rycroft**

**Paul Goodman:
The Conservatism**

W. H. Auden: *German Twenties*
Virgil Thomson: *Modern Music*

The New York Review
of Books

**Who Are the Chicanos?
by John Womack, Jr.**

**NEW MIDDLE EAST
I. F. Stone: Egypt's Move**

**Y. Arieli:
Israel Hurts Herself**

**Ellen Willis:
Considering
Psychotherapists**

Let us send you the current issue FREE so that you can see what all the fuss is about.

What makes *The New York Review of Books* so different from any other publication? Why has it been called, "The premier literary-intellectual journal in the English language," (*Esquire Magazine*) and "... the best general review of books and of human affairs to appear in this country in at least a generation." (Henry David Aiken)? And why has it become the most discussed intellectual journal published in this country?*

Since it began publishing nine years ago, *The New York Review* has reshaped the standards and thinking of American intellectual life. It has, for one thing, re-defined what good book reviews should be — probing essays on the real issues raised by the most important books being published.

Every two weeks *The New York Review of Books* publishes the world's best writers and scholars — Isaiah Berlin, Robert Lowell, Erik Erikson, Lewis Mumford, Elizabeth Hardwick, W. H. Auden, Alfred Kazin, Mary McCarthy, Hannah Arendt, and many others. Their work differs from the glib opinion-mongering of most current journalism by its integrity and depth of thought. "Reading *The New York Review*,"

*Columbia University's Public Opinion Quarterly published a recent survey of authors, editors, and professors, which showed that over 50% selected *The New York Review* as the journal they discussed most often. The next journal was mentioned by only 20%.

one professor writes, "is my idea of what going to a brilliant, small university should be." In *The New York Review*, art, politics, literature, science, history, psychology, music, and education are discussed clearly, honestly, and in an exciting way, without pedantry or pretense.

See for yourself what all the shouting is about. We'll be glad to send you the current issue free of charge. Won't you, too, be fascinated by reviews and features like these which have appeared in the last few months:

NOAM CHOMSKY's devastating review of B. F. Skinner's widely discussed book, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*.

RALPH NADER's eye-opening *Citizen's Guide to the American Economy*.

GORE VIDAL's hilarious demolition of Howard Hughes.

JEAN STAFFORD on the lives of Edith Piaf and Chanel.

WILFRID SHEED's skeptical and original essay on the Mafia that separates it from its myths, including "The Godfather."

HANNAH ARENDT's illuminating essay, *Lying in Politics: Reflections on The Pentagon Papers*.

VIRGIL THOMSON, ROBERT CRAFT, and National Book Award winner CHARLES ROSEN writing on music.

ROBERT COLES's controversial essay on *The Psychology of White Racism*.

FRANÇINE GRAY on radical religion.

LEWIS MUMFORD reviewing new books on the relation between photography and art.

FRANCES FITZGERALD's review of several books on the history, culture and politics of Vietnam.

ROGER SHATTUCK's fresh examination of the literature and painting of Surrealism in a review of more than 20 recent books.

GEORGE MCGOVERN's controversial plan for tax reform and income redistribution which was published for the first time in *The New York Review*.

Is it any wonder that even *Esquire* writes, "As intellectual review: *The New York Review of Books* is tops — the Colosseum and the Louvre Museum"?

A Free Copy and a Firm No-Risk Invitation

This is not the usual subscription offer. We feel you will enjoy reading *The New York Review of Books* — but we think you should decide at our risk, not yours. Therefore, we will send you the current issue entirely free of charge — and reserve for you a Trial Subscription for a full year (24 issues) at only \$10 (a saving of \$2 from the newsstand price) with this guarantee: that you can receive full refund (not partial) of the entire subscription fee at any time during the year. Why not mail the coupon below to take advantage of this unusual invitation?

"The Best Fog-Cutter in Washington"

— THE NEW YORK TIMES



After 19 years of independent reporting and publishing, of his own Washington newsletter, I. F. Stone has joined *The New York Review of Books* as Contributing Editor. He writes, "I am looking forward to carrying on the work I've done for the last 19 years in *The New York Review of Books*. I consider it the finest review of its kind in the English language."

In recent issues, *New York Review* readers have enjoyed I. F. Stone's articles on the concealed strategy behind Nixon's moves in Moscow, China, and the Middle East; the failures of all the political party platforms; and his exposure of Washington corruption. As Stone puts it, he's "as full of pep and vinegar as ever."

You are invited to enjoy I. F. Stone regularly, along with the many other features of this extraordinary *Review*, by taking advantage of this unusual no-risk invitation today.

**The Current Issue FREE — And
A Year's Subscription — at Our Risk**

The New York Review of Books

- Subscriber Service
- P. O. Box 1162, Ansonia Station, N.Y. 10023
- Please send me the current issue without charge and enter my subscription for a year (24 issues) at \$10.00 — a savings of \$2.00 from the single-copy price. I understand that I can cancel at any time — even after a full year — and receive a full (not partial) refund of the entire fee, with no charge for issues received.
- _____
- Name
- _____
- Address
- _____
- City State Zip
- Send bill \$10.00 enclosed. Please add an extra month to my subscription for saving bookkeeping costs. Same refund guarantee.
- R-2

contained a Mortor torpedo. We could even tell whether a ship was out of the Baltic or the Black Sea.

"In 1962 we saw in Cuba a build-up the likes of which we'd never seen before in the world. At the same time, the Soviets were doing other things as diversionary tactics. In Indonesia and Yemen, for instance, they were using Soviet pilots and submarine crews for the first time. I don't think that stuff ever came out. Meanwhile the Pentagon was writing rebuttals to our reports, saying the Russian ships were just part of big agricultural and economic aid programs. But because of our work, the U-2 flights were sent. They came back and the first photographs showed all the SAM sites being put in. We have always taken great pride in this."

Later, Marchetti was assigned to keep tabs on Soviet efforts to develop an anti-ballistic missile system. "The point we kept hammering away at was this: Try as they might, the Soviets could not produce ABM's. All the fears they had around Washington were not founded. The anti-ballistic missile system is a dream. By the very nature of the game, it cannot work. You cannot develop a gun which will shoot a bullet from a gun already fired at you. Only Tom Mix could do that."

By this point, Marchetti's star was rapidly rising within the Agency. He was moved to the "executive suite," and there, ironically, his doubts began to develop. Vietnam was the issue. "It started off with me being hot and saying, 'We're gonna fight these gooks. Let's beat their asses, we can do it. Don't let them nickel and dime you to death. Whump 'em a couple of good ones.'" But the Johnson Administration chose another, more expensive course, and Marchetti grew frustrated. "They had money going down the drain like crazy. At the same time I was becoming more and more aware of the social problems in this country. It started out as a simple financial concern. We have ghettos. We have all kinds of other problems that have to be taken care of. Why spend money out there?"

Marchetti was never "radicalized" and he is certainly no radical today. But his frustration deepened, and he grew more and more disillusioned. "Vietnam was just one issue. I became disenchanted with a lot of the clandestine

activities. I thought they were useless. Actually counter-productive. Upholding a dictator somewhere in a country which . . . if we had any brains . . . we would have nothing to do with."

At first, he simply said his piece and avoided the Vietnam "account"—as it is called in CIA jargon. But he saw himself becoming a bureaucrat in an institution whose basic activities he questioned: "For example, so much money is spent on research and development, and I couldn't think of anything to research or develop. So I spoke with the guy who ran R & D and concluded that—out of 1200 people working for us—we had 300 to 600 too many. He wanted to keep them! He was a real bureaucrat. I was thinking what he had become and I could see myself that way. So my decision, in the end, was highly personal, emotional as well as logical. I just typed up my resignation and fired it in one day."

Though he confesses to missing "certain things about the Agency," Marchetti is today more critical than ever of its operations. "I am convinced that the U.S. intelligence, the CIA, are drifting toward, if they are not already involved in, domestic operations. It's only logical. I mean you can't spy against the Soviet Union and China. Those targets are almost impenetrable. Really the only place they can operate with any kind of success is in the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, Africa, certain parts of Asia. In any case, intelligence should be collecting information and analyzing it, but Agency people are most interested in influencing events. They're more interested in covert action operations that put certain people into office, in a coup d'état if necessary."

And so Marchetti fights his legal battle and jots down in private his recollections of life in the CIA. He does it, he says, because the only way to reform American intelligence is to open it up for public review. If he wins his case and publishes these memoirs (now scheduled for release in 1973, by Alfred Knopf and Co.), his story, we are assured, will present the American people with a view of the CIA which has heretofore appeared only in the nightmares of its most severe critics. If he loses, the dangers of which he warns are certain to multiply. ○

WOMEN

The sex of a psychologist may interfere with his or her clinical judgment, according to Norma Haan and Dr. Norman Livson, two psychologists at the University of California's Institute of Human Development in Berkeley.

After studying 30 experienced, professional psychologists, Haan and Livson found that male psychologists quickly pick up such deviations from the "male" norms as passivity and dependency, while females are more apt to notice "male" tendencies such as condescension and excessive concern with power and self-control. "It is as though men keep a sharper eye out for defections from the male stereotype, while women are more alert to excesses of males in the service of that stereotype," they report.

Male psychologists also tend to be more critical of *both* sexes, while females are supportive, the study shows. Female psychologists evaluate women more favorably, giving them credit for intellectual competence and self-acceptance, while males frequently accuse women of irritability and rebelliousness.

"We are left with a big question," add Haan and Livson, "Which psychologist—man or woman—can best tell us what people are really like?"

A mother today spends only one-seventh of her lifespan raising children, compared to one-half of her life in 1911, according to Colin Bell in the British publication *New Society*. Due to earlier and fewer pregnancies and a lengthened life expectancy, Bell reports that most marriages can now anticipate two decades of "child-free existence," whereas 60 years ago there were only five such years.

After a months-long strike, the all-women Cleaners Action Group of London has won union recognition and an increase in basic pay (see RAM-

The work of the Women's News Collective has grown out of a weekly radio program of women's news at KPFA in Berkeley. We welcome contributions.