

Approved For Release 1999/09/07 : CIA-RDP75-00001R000200320008-3

CIA employee who tells "How I got in and why I came out of the Cold (What right did I have to decide . . . that random victims should die?")

For several months official committees and unofficial publicists have been telling us what to do about CIA. We suggest that at least a passing thought be given to the question, what to do about *Ramparts*?

It's all very well to shrug and say, "CIA deserved what happened to it." That is true enough. CIA was technically incompetent, and it is no surprise when technical incompetence leads, sooner or later, to an accident. CIA was politically incompetent in putting its main bets, in the psywar game, on a presumptively non-Communist Left: not merely attempting to influence leftist organizations, which was proper, but conceiving them as prime bulwarks against Communist advances, counting on individual leftists to conduct the anti-Communist battle, bringing leftists into the circle of "the witty" who knew what was what, recruiting them into "The Company." In truth, of course, many leftists were already present in CIA—among them CIA's chief paymaster to the Left, Cord Meyer Jr., founder of United World Federalists, a CIA officer since 1951. It was inevitable that in a serious political and moral squeeze such as the Vietnam war has brought about, the "non-Communism" of many of this type should prove less compelling than their leftism. It was silly for CIA to give money to Juan Bosch, Norman Thomas, the NSA creeps and such-like, but it was moronic to trust them. For having done so CIA does indeed deserve what it has got.

But the matter can't end there. CIA is not just somebody else's child; it's our baby too, a part of the American household. We can blame it for having engineered its own fall, but its fall concerns, and hurts all of us; badly. On that point let there be no misunderstanding. The entire CIA organization—all its operations and hundreds or even thousands of its officers, agents and contacts—has been gravely hurt. This means a grievous injury to our country's security and interest, an injury that will be a long, difficult, and expensive time healing. Indeed it is hard to imagine an episode that would bring more joy to the Kremlin, Peking and Hanoi than the CIA blowup. To cripple, at a single strike, the entire intelligence and psywar apparatus of the enemy: Not in their most optimistic dreams could the Communists have foreseen so shattering a break. This episode, however much it was prepared for by CIA's technical and political derelictions, was triggered by *Ramparts*.

The March issue of *Ramparts*, featuring the NSA exposé, was actually the fourth of its anti-CIA campaign. The new April issue—announced as usual by full-page ads in the nation's most expensive newspapers—carries three more articles: one by a former

a second on "How the CIA turns foreign students into traitors" and a third on purported CIA operations in the trade union movement.

Some of *Ramparts*' CIA material, false and true, is being written or supplied by persons who worked for or with CIA. Such persons sign an oath of secrecy, and under existing laws are subject to fines (up to \$10,000) and imprisonment (up to ten years) for violating their oaths. In the case of *Ramparts*' CIA informers, Richard Helms, CIA's Director, stated that "CIA would take no action against them." Why not? Is CIA Mr. Helms' personal preserve, so that if he feels permissive about the poachers he may forgive them? What is in question here are crimes against the public law, against "the people of the United States." It is the business of the Justice Department to prosecute for such crimes, whether or not to the personal taste of Richard Helms—or Lyndon Johnson. But further: would it not seem that in obtaining these illegal accounts and publicizing them, *Ramparts* is presumptively guilty of conspiring to break the law? Why should not *Ramparts* also be prosecuted? (Its action in this matter is entirely different from that of reporters who dig out facts from public records or general gossip.)

But whether or not *Ramparts* should be prosecuted, surely it should be put under public scrutiny. *Ramparts* is an expensive job, printed on glossy paper, using many color-pages and buying massive paid promotion far beyond anything usual in its modest circulation range. It carries little paid advertising. Where does all the money come from to meet its deficits, which by now are unquestionably well into seven figures? In attacking CIA, *Ramparts* has made a great fuss about sources of money. Why not the same fuss from someone about the money that has gone to *Ramparts*? There have been several stories naming individuals (including *Ramparts*' publisher, Edward M. Keating) who have allegedly given large sums. The total, however, is not nearly enough. And must we not, in our new sophistication, inquire, in the case of any donor, whether he has given from his own pocket or acted as a "conduit" for a hidden source?

Some of *Ramparts*' multiple links with Communists and Communist causes have already been written about; some are, in fact, quite open. Jessica Mitford, identified under oath as a Party member, is listed as a contributing editor. Managing Editor Robert Scheer was active, like several other *Ramparters*, in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, visited Cuba in defiance of State Department regulations, and made a secret trip to Prague only this February (on the eve of the NSA exposé). A member of

CIA 2-042