

CPYRIGHT

always depend far more on the character of the presidentially-appointed Director than on any Congressional "watchdog" committee which might be established.

But "control" is not the only problem CIA activities present. A number of recent news items can only confirm the impression that, controlled or not, many of these activities have gone far to critically compromise the peaceful efforts overseas of Americans and pro-Westerners.

The placing of CIA operatives, for example, in the Michigan State University task force which assisted Diem in Vietnam casts doubt on the character of all university projects in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The CIA is reported to have attempted to infiltrate the Peace Corps, a move cut short by the angry reaction of the Peace Corps leadership, who knew that such an action would undermine Peace Corps status in every developing nation. The *Times* series reports that the CIA "has poured money into Latin American election campaigns in support of moderate candidates and against leftist leaders. . . ." When an April 30 *Times* story from Santo Domingo refers to the election campaign efforts of "Joaquin Balaguer, candidate of the moderate right and generally considered the favorite of the United States," what is one to think?

Senator Fulbright has expressed concern over the practice of CIA analysts' presenting cases for government policy without revealing their government connections. Fulbright referred to the April issue of *Foreign Affairs* magazine which contains a lengthy article arguing that the Vietcong is completely controlled by Hanoi. The article's author, George A. Carver, Jr., is a CIA employee. *Foreign Affairs*, however, identifies him only as a "student of political theory and Asian affairs, with degrees from Yale and Oxford; former officer in the U.S. aid mission in Saigon; author of 'Aesthetics and the Problem of Meaning.'"

But the problem gets murkier yet. The February 24 issue of *The Reporter* carried an article on the National Liberation Front by Douglas Pike. In many respects, Mr. Pike's article closely parallels Carver's. *The Reporter* identifies Mr. Pike as "a specialist in research on the Vietcong for the United States Information Agency in Saigon . . . who recently spent a year at MIT preparing a definitive study of the National Liberation Front." Now, the MIT Center of International Studies was established in 1951 with CIA money, is headed today by a former CIA assistant director and only recently formally announced it was severing its relations with the intelligence agency. Once again, what is one to think?

Just as Americans don't like Russian fishing trawlers, Asians, Africans and Latin Americans don't like economic aid centers and research projects which serve as bases for intelligence operations. At home, American citizens would like to know the difference between government-supported official statements and independent scholarship. By blurring all the lines, the CIA is making America pay a high price in suspicion and distrust.

CPYRIGHT

SUSPICION AND THE CIA

The New York *Times* performed an outstanding public service by presenting a series of lengthy articles assessing the work of the Central Intelligence Agency. The articles recount the usual horrors: the Bay of Pigs, the attempt to doctor Cuban sugar destined for Russia, the U-2 incident. The vastness of CIA operations are suggested: training anti-Communist police forces in Latin America, promoting anti-Communist student front groups, directly or indirectly subsidizing American publishers, research institutes and universities. The *Times* articles are reassuring to the extent that they suggest that the CIA was brought "under control" as a result of the Bay of Pigs disaster and the replacement of Allen Dulles by John A. McCone. Control of the agency, the *Times* concludes, will