

by the U.S. Information Agency overseas were kept secret on the grounds that to publicize them would affect our foreign policy. The ACLU at that time failed to see any justification for this position. This particular section might afford a *carte blanche* for Executive decisions of that kind.

Although some of the exemptions set forth in subsection (e) are capable of abuse, nevertheless it is apparent that H.R. 5012 would be a major step forward. Accordingly, we give it our support.

NOVEMBER 26, 1962.

Memorandum for—

The Under Secretary of the Army.

The Under Secretary of the Navy.

The Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Subject: Civil and private rights.

In order to insure that inquiries and interrogations conducted in the course of security investigations and adjudicative proceedings do not violate lawful civil and private rights, or discourage lawful political activity in any of its forms, or intimidate free expression or thought, it is necessary that investigators and members of security review boards have a keen and well-developed awareness of and respect for the rights of the subjects of inquiries and of other persons from whom information is sought. Initially, this is a matter of proper indoctrination and training, and subsequently a matter of careful guidance and supervision. The civil and private rights of both the subjects of inquiries as well as of others to whom inquiries are addressed deserve equal concern and consideration on the part of Department of Defense personnel.

It is recognized that the military departments of necessity should learn a great deal about a person before a proper determination can be made with respect to entrusting him with classified defense information or placing him in an otherwise sensitive position. This applies to civilian employees of the Department, members of the Armed Forces, and employees of defense contractors. In making inquiries upon which security decisions are based, the Department of Defense usually enjoys the cooperation of all persons who reasonably may be expected to possess information bearing upon the reliability and trustworthiness of the subjects of such inquiries. This cooperation is based, we believe, in a large part upon the American public's understanding of the Government's purpose and interest in making the inquiries. Questions which are irrelevant or inconsistent with established testimonial privileges or constitutional considerations serve only to detract from the effectiveness of the security program of the Department of Defense.

Persons conducting security investigations and inquiries normally have broad latitude in performing these essential and vital functions. This places a high premium upon the exercise of good judgment and commonsense. While it is virtually impossible to establish elaborate rules which will provide satisfactory guidance in all circumstances, there are certain basic principles which have general application.

Care must be taken not to inject improper matters into security inquiries whether in the course of security investigations or other phases of security proceedings. For example, religious beliefs and affiliations or beliefs and opinions regarding racial matters, political beliefs and affiliations of a nonsubversive nature, opinions regarding the constitutionality of legislative policies, and affiliation with labor unions are not proper subjects for such inquiries.

Inquiries which have no relevance to a security determination should not be made. Questions regarding personal and domestic affairs, financial matters, and the status of physical health, fall in this category unless evidence clearly indicates a reasonable basis for believing there may be illegal or subversive activities, personal or moral irresponsibility, or mental or emotional instability involved. The probing of a person's thoughts or beliefs and questions about his conduct, which have no security implications, are unwarranted. Department of Defense representatives always should be prepared to explain the relevance of their inquiries upon request. Adverse inferences cannot properly be drawn from the refusal of a person to answer questions the relevance of which has not been established.

It is requested that your Department review its applicable regulations and instructions, and those portions of its training and refresher courses for investigators and adjudicators, which deal with civil rights and individual private rights, to determine the propriety of their content. We would appreciate receiving within 30 days a description of the steps your Department may have taken