

This one of January 4, for example—well, I say that the May 4 thing doesn't say anything as far as I can see, the fact that reporters are taken to the field. That doesn't give them access to classified information.

I don't think that was necessary to tell anybody intelligent enough to hold any position of responsibility for the United States in Vietnam.

The second one about shooting down aircraft, of that isn't true the reporter shouldn't say it. That is hardly necessary to say in a guideline, I would think.

But this third one of January 4, 1963,

in commenting on the actions of South Vietnam, the reporters should not criticize them unless it is clearly warranted.

Now, obviously to me, when you say "clearly warranted," who is going to decide whether it is clearly warranted? And when you do that, you are telling the people in Saigon "You get the newspaper reporters to write this kind of a story." That is the philosophy of the cable.

Mr. HILSMAN. I agree that this, too, is badly drafted, and with the chairman's permission, what I would like to do is take up with our Ambassador, to take up with General Harkins the insertion after "should not criticize them unless" the words "the reporters believe."

Mr. REUSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. Yes.

Mr. REUSS. I share his view, but what makes the January 4, 1963, directive that he is talking about particularly unsatisfactory is when it is taken in conjunction with the cable that Mr. Griffin has referred to, because that in effect seems to say that somebody who doesn't play ball doesn't get on the helicopter, and that I am sure is what the gentleman from Michigan does not want to have happen.

Now I don't think the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Meader, feels that there is anything wrong with instilling in the minds of our military and diplomatic people in Vietnam the idea that it does not help us to have frivolous and unwarranted criticism of the actions of the South Vietnamese. I think we all would agree with that.

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will yield, I think I should make it clear, as we attempted to do at the top of this memorandum you have before you, these are paraphrases of the three guidances. We will have the opportunity to study the precise language. The import seems to be as indicated here.

Mr. HILSMAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Heavner has the belief that since we got this over the telephone, there may have been an error and that the word "reporters" should read "advisers." That would change the whole thing, if the word "reporters" is "advisers." It will change the whole thing. Mr. Heavner says he would be surprised if it was really the word "reporters" there.

Mr. REUSS. If it is "advisers" then of course it is in accordance with the principle we discussed before. You become persona non grata if you criticize.

Mr. HILSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Are there further questions?

Mr. HILSMAN. The context, you see, of the January 4 guideline was after a rash of stories saying "U.S. military advisers criticized the