

NEW YORK, N. Y.
WORLD-TELEGRAM
& SUN

E, 373,849

MAY 5 1965

Candid Look At 'Science Of Spying'

By HARRIET VAN HORNE

66 IN THE SPY BUSINESS, the dagger is replacing the cloak."

With this chilling observation, NBC's John Chancellor last night opened an hour-long examination of the Central Intelligence Agency titled "The Science of Spying." The reaction is bound to be one of outrage. And that is as it should be. With this documentary, produced by Ted Yates, NBC returned to the fine, fearless tradition established by its early "White Paper" studies, a tradition shamefully abandoned in recent years.



Harriet Van Horne

The great value of this candid, disturbing study was that it examined the ethics of spying in a free society. Repeatedly raised was the question, "If, to survive and remain free, we must adopt the ruthless tactics of our enemies, are we ultimately the victors or the vanquished?"

Considerable time also was given to probing the question of the CIA's burgeoning powers. Because of its vast appropriations, its freedom from direct Congressional and executive control, the CIA has been able to carry on a "second foreign policy," in the view of its critics. Whether so much power exists—and whether it is good or bad for the country—was discussed by Allen Dulles, former chief of the CIA, and Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D., Minn.), longtime critic of CIA interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

What has the CIA been up to in recent years? Chancellor was able to give only the briefest summary within this crowded hour. He did mention such items as "supplying 100,000 Laotian tribesmen with rice and bullets through secret contracts with so-called private airlines, the overthrow of the premier of Iran in 1953 (to save American and British oil investments) and the upsetting of a leftist government in Guatemala. CIA spying in Cuba and Indonesia were also mentioned.

In defending the work of the CIA, Allen Dulles struck this viewer as a man who doth protest too much. I was also disturbed by his repeated qualification, "as far as I know," and not only because of the grammatical construction. Asked about the morality of CIA operations, Dulles replied, "Well, only as far as I know, we don't engage in assassinations and kidnaping, things of that kind. As far as I know we never have."

Dulles also pointed out that he was a "parson's son." "I hope I have the same moral standards," he boasted.

Richard Bissell, former director of plans for the CIA, took a more realistic stance. But the pious, guarded note was still there. "I will not deny," he said carefully, "that there were occasions when Americans had—as people do in wartime—to undertake certain actions that were contrary to their moral precepts." He did not specify the actions.

A short time later we heard one Fred Sherwood, former attaché to the American embassy in Guatemala, describe the United States effort to oust Jacobo Arbenz from the presidency. Sherwood told of "a group that tried to bring in some Puerto Rican and Cuban gangsters who made an offer—a package deal, so to speak—to assassinate any 12 Communists for \$50,000."

The deal, he added, never came off. "We were successful in raising only a part of the money."

The chief pilot for the CIA-sponsored liberation army in Guatemala was described as "a freebooter named Jerry Delarm, who strafed the city and blew up the government oil reserves." (And what would Dulles' father, the parson, have said to that, one wonders?)

Easily the most impressive voice on last night's show was Sen. McCarthy's. He said he would not go so far as to call the CIA a threat to our Constitutional liberty—"but I do think it intrudes upon traditional areas of representative and Constitutional government. . . . In some cases the CIA makes its own policy."

In closing John Chancellor probably put the problem as neatly as anybody could. To wit, how are we to reconcile "the necessity for the CIA with its secret offense against public morality?" How indeed?

FOIAb3b

CPYRIGHT