

OCT 22 1976

P- BERNIER, LINDA
61291
Org 1 U.N. Association
Pacifica Chapter
CIA Colby, Wm.
Halperin, Morton
Rosebaum, Mark

orig under
Bernier

The CIA: Keeping a Delicate Balance

By LINDA BERNIER

Herald-Examiner Staff Writer

How does a democracy protect its national security as well as its citizens' civil liberties? How much covert work should the CIA and FBI be allowed to do?

Those were the questions 500-600 persons came to hear a panel of experts discuss at a conference last week at UCLA on the role of intelligence organizations in a democracy.

The conference was sponsored by UCLA Extension, the Fund for Peace and the United Nations Association-Pacific Chapter.

Panelists ranged in opinion from former CIA director William Colby to Morton Halperin, a deputy assistant secretary of defense and National Security Council member under Nixon.

According to Colby, the U.S. needs clandestine agents and secret operations at home and abroad — bugging and examining mail at home, spying and supporting "pro-U.S." political factions abroad.

There are still threats of military surprise; of terrorism, and of economic boycotts that warrant covert intelligence operations, said Colby.

But the doctrine for the use of covert activities, he said, should be the same that guides the use of military force — only as much as necessary for our own defense, not for aggrandizement.

"Covert action operations are necessary to deal with the reckless despot who may make a homemade nuclear device in his backyard and intelligence can provide the basis for negotiation and peaceful resolution of diplomatic disputes," he said.

Colby admitted that in the past the CIA might have overstepped its boundaries by gathering too much information while trying to find out if those in the anti-war movement were supported by foreign governments or by

its involvement in assassination plots of foreign leaders.

But, he added, the CIA was under the authorization of the President in these activities. What is needed, he said, are better guidelines for CIA activities and congressional oversight to supervise CIA activities, such as the newly instituted 15-member Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

"We also need a better public understanding of intelligence. You don't abolish a police force if they do something wrong," he said.

But Halperin, now director of a project on national security and civil liberties at the Fund for Peace, believes all covert intelligence operations should be abolished.

It is not a question of making the world safe for democracy, but making the U.S. safe for democracy, said Halperin, giving examples of intelligence operations that destroyed democracy at home and abroad — the demise of democracy in Chile, illegal wire taps, burglaries and opening of mail in the U.S., CIA informants on American college campuses who threatened academic freedom and informants in political organizations who threatened political freedom.

According to Mark Rosebaum, an attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union and the panelist most opposed to intelligence operations, with assassinations and contracts with the Mafia, the CIA and FBI are conducting activities as terroristic as those they seek to protect Americans from.

"Will terrorism be the new term, replacing national security, to cloak intelligence activities?" he asked.

"We should abolish the clandestine services of the CIA," said Halperin, "and return it to its original function of gathering the intelligence of other government agencies and gathering intelligence openly. And the FBI should do what its charter meant it to

do — to conduct investigations of a criminal, not political nature."

Halperin believes legislation is needed to control the CIA and FBI, which should only operate under the authorization of Congress, consistent with the Constitution, and not under executive privilege.

The problem, explained political scientist Lynn Davis, a staff member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, are: what kind of information should Congress have; when should Congress be informed; and by

what right and procedure should Congress disclose covert information.

Can Congress or a congressional committee be trusted with sensitive information? Does a congressional committee speak for the entire Congress? Should Congress have an input in the policy making of intelligence operations? she asked.

Satellite photography and electronic listening devices are by far the most helpful sources of intelligence used today, said Herbert Scoville, Jr., a leading authority on arms control and a CIA director for scientific intelligence and research from 1955-1963.

Other sources of intelligence, said Scoville, include literature and speeches and clandestine operations — from spies and defectors to influencing foreign governments and policies, as in Chile or the Bay of Pigs incident.

While Scoville believes some covert activities are still useful, primarily in the Third World where security measures are unsophisticated, he said the use of spies and defectors in the Communist world, where double agents and triple agents abound, is unreliable.

E 2776

been found to be a possible cause of damage in laboratory rats," Good gues. "Should we be using our chi human guinea pigs for these produc

Additionally, there are ecologica tions. Preplated lunches use a lot o in processing, refrigeration, transp and freezer storage and there is a p' nal waste of foil, cardboard, pla paper.

Pre-plated lunches or pre-cooked meals are being served in schools out the Washington metropolitan a some school districts moving stea satellite feeding programs and resisting the trend.

In the District of Columbia, whi lot of old schools lacking kitchen eq some 20,000 elementary school chi hot-pack lunches each day that h purchased from the Mass Feeding of Chicago. Says D.C. Food Service Joe Stewart: "We've been satisf them and the acceptance level is gave Mass Feeding our specifications for the meals and I can buy these much cheaper than I could produce them locally. They are nutritious."

The dollar savings in satellite feeding programs are undeniable—\$200,000 this year in Arlington County, according to School Food Director Bailey McCreery—but the path to convenience feeding hasn't always been smooth.

In Arlington, for example, where all elementary school meals are prepared at junior high or high schools and shipped preplated, a parent group just last week persuaded the school board to adopt a resolution to vary and improve the school lunch menus.

The group, which ran its own system-wide survey of why the kids weren't eating their lunches, demanded and will presumably get foods that contribute to good eating habits, foods high in protein, fiber, vitamins and minerals. They want excluded from the menu foods that contribute to long range health problems, those high in added sugar, fats, artificial coloring and flavorings.

Montgomery County is switching steadily to satellite feeding programs to save money, even in schools with modern kitchens, and about half its schools have lunches shipped in. One lunchroom in transition, and some turmoil, is North Lake Elementary which in January stopped preparing food on the premises and began shipping in preplated lunches from a nearby junior high.

The PTA wrote to the school board asking questions and expressing concern, but the youngsters make a much more eloquent case for having the old system back in operation. Eating lunch recently with the North Lake youngsters brought forth a barrage of complaints from the kids.

"This new TV food is yuckey," one said. "It tastes terrible. They serve green meatballs. Honest. We have to buy ice cream to fill up on."

On this particular day, their complaints were valid. The hot pack, purchased pre-cooked from the Morton Food Co., consisted of six rubbery meatballs in a watery red sauce, along with some corn. It was edible but not very appetizing or tasty. The cold pack had a very good coconut cookie and the mixed fruit was fine. It also contained a rolled tortilla that was as hard as cardboard, tasted like paste and was, for all practical purposes, inedible.

A sampling of elementary school lunches with youngsters at the District's Giddings School and Arlington's Long Branch produced meals about the same. And a menu comparison for schools throughout the metropolitan area shows little variation from the same six or seven basic entree items although some have more variety.

Fairfax County students have the option of choosing a hot lunch or a cold salad-based

McDonald, LARRY
ORGI Center For
NATIONAL Security
STUDIES

ORGI FUND For Peace

BRASAGE, Robert
(orig under McDonald)

egg, etc.—available on white or whole-grain breads; juice, yoghurt, fresh fruit, cottage cheese, pizza, stuffed eggs, chef's salad, fruit salad, meat and salad plates and cole slaw.

The deli-bar is operated by Macke on a not-for-profit basis and the company's pay-off is the proceeds from the vending machines. Assistant Principal Steve Gurcis says Yorktown is extremely satisfied with the arrangement and the students like it. "Every-body benefits," he said.

While Macke at Yorktown and McDonalds at Benton, Ark., have the same basic operating arrangement, the differences and desirability from a nutritional point of view are obvious. Which of these directions the nation's high school lunchrooms take remains to be seen.

Elementary schools are a different matter. Their direction seems pre-determined and is perhaps irreversible, but that won't stop Mary Goodwin and her supporters from working to halt the trend and push for their ideal school lunch programs. She believes that food can be integrated into the school curriculum at all levels, from consumer lessons to science, anthropology, physics, math and so on.

"Ideally, I would like to see all schools have fresh, regional and local food prepared on site by a well trained staff," she says. "The school kitchen could serve as a learning laboratory on food purchasing, preparation, cooking and service. Children could see whole foods, learn something of the nature of foods.

"The cafeteria manager could come into the classroom for nutrition lessons and consumer topics. This is an excellent way to keep children in contact with the real world rather than a highly mechanized, im-

LEFTISTS ATTACK BALTIMORE
POLICE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years many campaigns have been launched with the goal of curtailing the functions and reducing the effectiveness of our country's police and others of the law enforcement community who with them are responsible for our safety and security. Among those in the vanguard of many of these campaigns have been the Com-

munist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—and the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS.

This month, both of these groups have selected as their target the Police Department of Baltimore and a dedicated public servant, Donald D. Pomerleau, its commissioner since 1966.

On May 11, 1976, a Baltimore newspaper featured a six-column banner headline, "City's Anti-Crime Program Hit by Report as a Flop." and in slightly smaller type, "Pomerleau Seen Running 'Fiefdom.'" There followed a non-story worthy of Jack Anderson in which innuendo was piled upon unsubstantiated allegation and nameless sources vented their spleen on the Baltimore Police Department and Commissioner Pomerleau.

The basis for the newspaper attack on the Baltimore police was a draft copy of a report, "Law and Disorder IV," to be published by the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS—122 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C. 20002 (202/544-5380) and written by a CNSS consultant, Sarah C. Carey, an attorney associated with the law firm of Cladouhas & Brashares.

Funding for the report was provided in part by the New World Foundation, the Fund for Peace, and the Ford Foundation. It should be noted that the New World Foundation, 100 East 85th Street, New York, N.Y., has also funded the notorious Highlander Center, long associated with Communist Party organizing in the South; the youth project which in turn has subsidized the admittedly Socialist Georgia power project and the organizing committee for a fifth estate which was charged by CIA Director Colby with having set up CIA agent Richard Welch for assassination; and the Missecud Foundation, a front for the National Welfare Rights Organization.

The Center for National Security Studies, as I predicted to my colleagues in a report last year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 20, 1975—has remained in the forefront of those attempting to destroy our security services.

Organized in the fall of 1974, CNSS was and is an activity of the Fund for Peace among whose trustees at that time was a Mrs. Louise R. Berman. And I again draw attention to a summary of her record—Combat, December 15, 1969:

Mrs. Louise Berman, who is also known as Louise Bransten was born Oct. 10, 1908. She is the former wife of Richard Bransten, also known as Bruce Minton, former owner of New Masses. During the water-front strike in San Francisco, Louise and Richard Bransten carried out assignments for the Communist Party, working with Earl Browder and Gerhart Eisler. In 1944 Louise Bransten made a loan of \$50,000 to the People's World, which is the west coast organ of the Communist Party.

Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities carry much more information, and testimony implicates her in activities of several known Soviet espionage agents. She was, for instance, in contact in Hollywood with J. Peters (also known as Alexander Stevens and half a dozen other names), a leading figure in the underground American CP and in Soviet intelligence work; she was an associate of Steve Nelson, long time Communist organizer and ring leader

*Norman Kempster, Norman
Borosage, Robert
P-WERKS, John
SOCH.GI.2 The CIA File*

The CIA Proceeds as Usual

By Norman Kempster

THE CIA FILE, edited by Robert L. Borosage and John Marks. Grossman/Viking. 226 pages. \$8.95.

In September of 1974 a group of scholars, journalists and former CIA employes — most of them critics of the way the intelligence agency goes about its business — met for a two-day conference in Washington.

The discussions went virtually unnoticed by the public. The time was wrong. More than three months before The New York Times first wrote of "massive domestic spying" by the CIA, there was little general interest in the topic.

All that has changed. It seems that almost everybody is talking about the CIA — usually in an emotion-charged way that forces people to choose up sides rather than discuss the merits of the issue.

So it is probably the right time to have another look at the 1974 conference. Grossman/Viking has issued some of the conference's proceedings in the form of a series of essays. Edited by Robert L. Borosage, director of the Center for National Security Studies, and John D. Marks, co-author of "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence," most of the contributions have been revised to include the revelations of the last few months.

ALTHOUGH FORMER CIA Director William E. Colby's rebuttal is included,

the book is clearly an indictment of many of the agency's activities.

With a few isolated exceptions, the indictment charges the agency with inadvertently damaging the nation's best interests. There is little of the moralizing of other CIA critics. The argument is not that CIA covert activities are immoral; the argument is that they are stupid.

Morton Halperin, the former National Security Council staff member, argues, for instance, that the secrecy that surrounds CIA activities is often self-defeating. If a plan — like the Bay of Pigs — is known only to its advocates, there is little opportunity to consider the dangers inherent in it. And the intelligence reports, often from within the CIA, which might indicate the plan is a bad one are written off as the product of people who are just not "in the know."

Several of the essays review the long-term results of CIA interference in the domestic politics of other countries. The argument is advanced that even short-

term advantages sometimes produce long-term liabilities.

THE BOOK OFFERS no real solutions except for the suggestion that much of what is now wrapped in secrecy could be done as well, and often better, if it were done in public.

Colby's response is weak. It was probably the intention of the editors that it be so. The agency may have some better answers to the questions posed in "The CIA File." But, if so, the public should demand to hear them.

~~Agent Friend For~~
Peace.

SOCY. of 1 First Principles
 HALPERIN, Morton
 ORIGINALS
 FUND FOR PEACE
 PROJECT ON NATL.
 Security &
 Civil Liberties

First Principles.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

DECEMBER 1975

VOL. 1 NO. 4

In this Issue: **Controlling the Intelligence Agencies, page 3**
 CHRISTINE M. MARWICK

Coming: JAN.: Local Red Squads:
 The Report of the Cook Country Grand Jury

October 31, 1975 Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told the House Intelligence Committee that during the six years he was National Security Advisor all covert operations had been approved personally by the President. The Committee also revealed that, under orders from Nixon over CIA objections, the CIA served as arms supplier to the Iraqi Kurds at the request of the Shah of Iran.

November 2-4, 1975 In a letter to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, President Ford requested that the Senate Report on *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders* be withheld from the public. Ford's letter stated that "publication will harm the national security and possibly endanger individuals." The Committee then voted to bring the matter before an executive session of the Senate; subsequently, the report was released on November 20, 1975. (See *In The Congress, In The Literature and Point of View*)

November 7, 1975 Witnesses testified at a Senate hearing that during the 1950's drug addicts at a federal rehabilitation center in Kentucky were "paid off" in narcotics for participating in CIA-funded experiments.

November 10, 1975 The Cook County Grand Jury released its report, "Improper Police Intelligence Activities." The Grand Jury found that the Chicago Police Department had both violated criminal law in its intelligence gathering activities and made indiscriminate use of undercover agents. This report will be the subject of the January issue of *First Principles*.

November 18, 1975 Senate Intelligence Committee investigators disclosed that the FBI tried to discredit the late Dr. Martin Luther King via undercover operations which included buggings and blackmail. Committee members were told that the late FBI director J. Edgar Hoover decided in 1961 to "smear King" and even decided on "a new national Negro leader to replace him." Other revelations included: Hoover's personal files were largely destroyed in 1972 either shortly before or after Hoover's death; and, obtaining NBC press credentials, the FBI conducted extensive spying of the Democratic National Convention at the request of the Johnson Administration.

November 18, 1975 A witness told the House Intelligence Committee that as an FBI informant he led a group of thirty antiwar demonstrators in a raid on the Camden, New Jersey draft board which resulted in arrests by federal agents. In other testimony, a retired FBI agent said he refused an assignment to obtain a handwriting sample of Andrew Young who was then a black Georgian candidate for Congress (he was elected in 1972 and re-elected last year) because it would be used for counterintelligence purposes.

November 19, 1975 Citing what they described as official sources, the *New York Times* reported that the \$90 billion military budget approved for this year concealed within it \$4 billion for the intelligence community's programs.

November 25, 1975 The Justice Department waived more than \$23,000 in search fees for releasing under the Freedom of Information Act more than 30,000 pages of FBI material on the Rosenberg espionage conspiracy case.

In The News

It is at all times necessary, and more particularly so during the progress of a revolution and until right ideas confirm themselves by habit, that we frequently refresh our patriotism by reference to first principles.

THOMAS PAINE

ORGI ACLU

ORGI FUND FOR PEACE

ORGI Project on
National Security
and Civil Liberties

First Principles

NATIONAL SECURITY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES IN THIS ISSUE SEPTEMBER 1975 VOL. 1

SOCY.01.1 First Principles

(orig under ACLU)

National Security and Civil Liberties:
The Situation, the State of the Current
Law, and Legislative Action
CHRISTINE M. MARWICK

The Principal Unlearned Lesson
Watergate: The Need for a Responsible
Presidency
PHILIP B. KURLAND

ORGI Wiretapping
NOV. 1: Freedom of
Information Act

ALONG WITH THE CONCENTRATION of political power in the executive branch of government has come the claim that "national security" somehow dictates that we must give up some of our civil liberties in order to protect our freedoms. This claim has not been seriously challenged until the last several years; the veil of secrecy placed over the activities of the executive branch also served to protect these actions from effective public and congressional scrutiny.

With the unfolding of recent events, however, the myth of official benevolence, unanimity, and even expertise began to crumble. It began to emerge that for all practical purposes successive administrations had come to think of the Congress and the American public like a foreign power to be deceived and investigated in the interests of the nation's security. From the initial deceptions a ripple effect began as a system of secret actions were taken to reinforce breaches in secrecy — such as the wiretaps that followed news reports of bombing in Cambodia. Using the claims of "national security" as an incantation to overwhelm all logic, legitimate political controversy was cast into the mold of dissidence and disloyalty. As the trickle of information about illegal government activities grew into a river in Watergate, the credulity of the public changed into a healthy skepticism. But, as Professor Philip Kurland notes in his article in this issue, the executive branch still makes a plea to institutionalize the Cold War era's blind trust in the Presidency. For example, the Rockefeller Com-

mission Report, in spite of all its detailing of CIA abuses, calls for an expanded CIA charter which would solve the problem somehow by making many of its currently illegal actions legal. Likewise, the administration bill S. 1 (the reform of the federal criminal code) would define as unequivocal espionage the Ellsberg "offense" of releasing information to the public. The list of such efforts is a lengthy one — the article on page 3 treats more of them.

The focus of First Principles: National Security and Civil Liberties will be on following these issues and the many turns and twists taken in the conflict between expansive claims of national security and civil liberties. We hope to contribute to a return to First Principles — the necessary and vital right of full and informed public participation in government — by increasing public awareness of continuing threats and of opportunities to improve the situation.

Each monthly issue of First Principles will include an up-date on what has happened in the Congress, the Courts, and elsewhere that affects the conflicting claims of national security and civil liberties. There will also be a literature review keeping you abreast of relevant books, articles, and government publications. Each issue will also focus on a particular topic with guest articles, citations of leading cases, and analysis. In this inaugural issue we survey the field as a whole. Next month we will turn to national security wiretaps.

Why First Principles

It is at all times necessary, and more particularly so during the progress of a revolution and until right ideas confirm themselves by habit, that we frequently refresh our patriotism by reference to first principles.

THOMAS PAINE

6 JAN 1975

CIA 401 Espying
Bella

Leftists Seek To Curtail U.S. Security

By Paul Scott

Washington—Those increasing attacks against the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are an integral part of an over-all campaign to drastically curtail every aspect of U.S. national security.

The well-financed campaign is being orchestrated by the left leaning Center for National Security Studies (CNSS) which has its headquarters near the nation's capitol.

Heavily loaded with antiwar activists, radical leaders, and former far-left government officials, the CNSS is run by Robert L. Borosage, a young Washington attorney and active member of the National

Lawyers Guild who was formerly with the radical Institute for Policy Studies.

Key consultants or associates of the group include Morton Halperin, a one time staff member of the National Security Council and a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and one of those subject to a 1959 national security wiretap, and John Marks, once an assistant to the State Department's director of intelligence and coauthor of an anti-CIA book with former CIA employe Victor Marchetti.

The CNSS's power flows from its members contacts within the Administration, the Congress, the press, and private foundations. The Stern and Field Foundations, noted as supporters of radical and far-left causes, already have pumped more than a quarter of a million dollars into the operations of the CNSS.

Another financial backer is the Fund For Peace (FFP), which has been working to disarm the U.S. since 1969.

The CNSS launched the attack against the government's security and intelligence agencies last September with a two day forum led by Richard J. Barnet, a founder and codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies, and Daniel Ellsberg, former Defense Department radical who stole several thousand government documents involving U.S. participation in the Vietnam war.

The principle theme of the conference was that the President and Congress must dismantle or drastically curb the government's covert intelligence and security operations.

THE ATTACK PLAN—Circulated at the meeting was an CNSS document revealing the larger scope of the organization's campaign against all government security and intelligence programs.

It stressed that the CNSS had set up projects to monitor all intelligence and security operations of the CIA, FBI, the military services, and the activities of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

An immediate objective of the group is to force all government agencies to end their surveillance of far-left radicals and their foreign contacts including communists.

One of CNSS's top Congressional supporters, Rep. Bella Abzug, D-N.Y., recently called on President Ford to destroy files the CIA has compiled over the years on American radicals and their foreign connections. This is another goal of CNSS.

Government security informers, who infiltrated the CNSS, report that its members are now working with ultra-liberal members of Congress and the press to try to discredit the CIA and FBI and force those agencies to end many of their security operations.

The findings of the informers have been circulated within the Ford Administration since October 1 but until recently the reports failed to attract any attention outside of the government's security agencies.

ORG 1 Center For National Security Studies
Borosage, Robert L.
Halperin, Morton
Marks, John
CIA 1.04 Marchetti, Victor
ORG 1 Stern & Field Foundations
ORG 2 Fund For Peace
Barnet, Richard J.

Org. Center For
Defense Information
Fund for Peace

7 JAN 1975

Mr. Doron Bar-Levav
Center for Defense Information
122 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Mr. Bar-Levav:

The following is in response to your letter of 8 November 1974 regarding numbers of personnel in this Agency involved in arms control matters.

The CIA Act of 1949 exempts the Agency from releasing to the public information pertaining to its personnel and their assignments. In the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States, CIA has consistently adhered to this exemption.

Therefore, I regret we cannot comply with your request.

Sincerely,

Angus MacLean Thuermer
Assistant to the Director

STAT

Typed:		Dec 74)
Retyped:		(16 Dec 74)
Rewritten:		ber (20 Dec 74)
Rewritten:		(6 Jan 75)

Distribution:

- Orig. - Addressee
- 1✓ - Asst to the Director
- 1 - OGC
- 1 - EO/DDA
- 1 - ISAS/CPB (74-176)
- 1 - ISAS/CPB chrono

NEWSDAY
21 NOV 1974

Colby, William
CONFERENCE
REG. FUND. FOR PEACE
(original Colby)

CIA: Essential to National Security

By William E. Colby

It is incumbent upon our government officials to explain to the public the functions and activities of their particular organizations, and I include in this the Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community.

Our military forces must be responsive to our public but our public does not demand that our war plans be published. Our judicial system must meet the public's standards of justice, but our judicial conferences and grand jury proceedings are not conducted in public. It is even necessary for the Congress to conduct some of its business in executive session, while remaining accountable to the voters for the legislation it passes. Similarly, I believe it is feasible to explain to the American people the functions and activities of CIA and the intelligence community while at the same time maintaining the necessary secrecy of the sources and methods of our intelligence, which would dry up if publicized.

I believe I can respond to the public's need for assurance by reporting fully to congressional committees or other bodies appointed by the public's representatives to receive and retain this sensitive information and to make value judgments about our functions and activities. Another test of our effectiveness lies in the opinions of those in the executive and legislature who are provided the intelligence results of our operational and analytical efforts, but not how these were obtained and produced. There is a final control, of course, in the fact that some of our activities, if badly handled, come to public attention in a somewhat clamorous way.

There have been some "bad secrets" concerning intelligence; their exposure by our academic, journalist and political critics certainly is an essential part of the workings of our Constitution. There have been some "non-secrets" which did not need to be secret; I have undertaken a program of bringing these into the open. But I think that responsible Americans realize that our country must protect some "good secrets."

If our laws provide for criminal penalties for the unauthorized disclosure of certain census information, income tax information, Selective Service information, and cotton and other agricultural statistics, I think it reasonable that there should also be penalties for the unauthorized disclosure of foreign intelligence sources and methods upon which the safety of the nation could well depend.

We endeavor to serve the executive branch by providing intelligence on the facts of the world about us and our assessments of likely future developments. We also try to serve the Congress and the public by providing the output of the intelligence investment made by the United States, to support them in their role in American decision-making. Thus, CIA has appeared before [congressional] committees on 28 occasions this year, and we have cleared for publication some of this testimony on the Soviet Union and China. We also produce a number of unclassified publications and distribute them through the Library of Congress to over 200 libraries and institutes around the country, as well as making publicly available our reports, foreign language and translated documents.

It is a strange anomaly that our country makes publicly available vast amounts of material, whereas the corresponding material about our potential adversaries must be collected by intelligence techniques at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. In this situation, if we cannot protect our intelligence sources and methods, I fear we may reach a situation in which our adversaries profit from our openness while we are blinded by their secrecy.

In a world which can destroy itself through misunderstanding or miscalculation, it is important that our leaders have a clear perception of the motives, intentions and strategies of other powers so that they can be deterred, negotiated about, or countered in the interests of peace or, if necessary, the ultimate security of our country. From closed societies they can be obtained only by secret intelligence operations, without which our country must risk subordination to possible adversaries.

There are still certain situations in the world in which some discreet support can assist America's friends against her adversaries in their contest for control of a foreign nation's political direction. While these instances are few today compared to the 1950s, I believe it

only prudent for our nation to be able to act in such situations, and thereby forestall greater difficulties for us in the future.

In other situations, especially after Nikita Khrushchev's enthusiastic espousal of the thesis of "wars of national liberation," the United States believed it essential to provide paramilitary support to certain groups and nations. In 1962, President Kennedy, for national policy reasons, did not want to use uniformed forces in Laos but also did not want to be limited to a mere diplomatic protest against the continued presence of 5,000 North Vietnamese troops in Laos in violation of the Geneva Accords and their expansion of control over communities who wished to resist them.

Thus, CIA was directed to provide support to those communities, a duty which grew to a major effort, known and approved by the Laos government, but not confronting North Vietnam and its allies with a direct and overt U.S. challenge. As with the Bay of Pigs, when the activity became too large, it no longer remained secret. But it had been reported and appropriated for on a regular basis by the authorized elements of the Congress—the war was no secret from them.

The Phoenix program in Vietnam has been badly misunderstood. I testified fully on this subject in 1971, but selective quotes from that testimony have been used to indicate that I directed a program of assassination, murder, etc., resulting in the deaths of over 20,000 Vietnamese. I then denied and I still flatly deny such a charge or such an interpretation of this program.

On detail from CIA to the Department of State, I was the principal adviser and supervised American support of the pacification program, which focused on securing the willing participation of the population of South Vietnam against terror and invasion by the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong.

September 24, 1974

World food shortages are not going to go away; it will require a long-term commitment on the part of the U.S., Mr. Healey says. "But it's important that we can show [through the petition drive] that the American people think differently than what Mr. Butz is saying." Otherwise, coalition officials feel, the Rome conference will "fall flat on its face."

KNOWLEDGE NOT IMMORAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial addressing the current controversy regarding the Central Intelligence Agency appeared in the Augusta Chronicle newspaper, September 16, 1974.

This editorial entitled, "Knowledge Not Immoral," recognizes the reality and the necessity of the Central Intelligence Agency. It also points out that some authority must control the CIA and we presently have such control by the executive branch with oversight powers in the Congress.

Mr. President, I believe this editorial will be helpful in the current debate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE NOT IMMORAL

Many Americans will find objectionable new attempts by pressure groups to give Congress greater control over the Central Intelligence Agency.

An outfit calling itself the Fund for Peace has called for strict congressional operational control over the CIA, claiming that the CIA's, "secret" role is "immoral" and somehow violates "the United Nations and international law."

What kind of reasoning is this? Is American security to be subjugated to the whims of the United Nations, a majority of whose members could safely be called anti-American?

The gathering of intelligence data on the capabilities and intentions of potential enemies is vital to national security, and can hardly be construed as, "immoral." When the CIA gets out of the intelligence field, of course, then it risks getting out of line.

"Secrecy," CIA Director William Colby rightly says, "is not unique to the CIA." In fact, our armed forces are responsible to the public, but the public doesn't demand that their secret security plans be aired, published, or hacked to pieces by a Senate committee.

It seems to us, that some congressmen and groups like the Fund for Peace, no matter how well-intentioned, have no business denying secrecy to the CIA, an agency whose mission is information gathering and securing the well-being of our Nation.

THE NIXON PARDON

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the bitterness that has swept this country as a result of President Ford's pardon of former President Nixon. As one of those who favored eventual clemency, I do believe President Ford's action was premature. Whether or not the President was right or wrong in taking this step I believe it is time that all Americans come together again to face and solve the very difficult problem of the economy now confronting this country. This is not the time to be concentrating on the divisive issues of the

past. This is the time to be working/together with all we have to assure that the future of the country will not be imperiled. Negative backward looking efforts will do little to help our declining economy.

Vermont Royster recently published an article on the Presidential pardon in the Wall Street Journal. It is one of the most perceptive I have seen on this subject and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A BITTER SPIRIT THAT WON'T DIE
(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—It has been difficult these last 10 days to shake off a sense of sadness about the country.

For one blessed month—from the 9th of August to the 8th of September—you could believe that the country had awakened from that nightmare known as Watergate. All across the land there was a feeling of relief, and a visitor here at that time could hope that we were going to have a time of healing.

The new President had brought a breath of fresh air into the White House. With it had come a wave of good feeling that swept over the press galleries and into the halls of Congress. At long last, or so it seemed, we had a government not preoccupied with the scandals of the past and so ready to turn to the urgent problems of the day.

Yet now, once again, the country and this city are caught up in acrimony. The country is angry, the press is bitter and the recriminations fly through the halls of Congress. Everywhere you turn the ghost of Richard Nixon walks the town.

Especially at the White House. It was President Ford's press conference Monday night, but as question after question returned to Watergate, the tapes or the pardon, it was clear that the wrath of Mr. Nixon still haunts the East Room.

So the sadness is for a new President who in one ill-advised moment emptied his reservoir of good-will. It is also, though, for the revelation of how shallow it was, how ready many were to see it dissipated and how eager they were to leap upon his wounds.

And not the least of the sadness is what these 10 days have revealed of the bitter and vengeful spirit abroad among the people, including some within the press, that will forget nothing and forgive nothing. That, too, has not been a pretty sight.

Begin with President Ford. His blunder was not simply that he pardoned Richard Nixon. It is hardly to be expected that, if it came to that, he would see the former President led manacled to the dock nor, I should hope, that the people would wish him to.

It was not entirely, either, that the pardon was "premature," though that is a word frequently heard hereabouts. No matter what time he picked, there would be those to find it wrong.

A SURPRISE REVERSAL

The heart of the President's blunder was that he did what he seemed to have said he would not do. Only two weeks earlier Mr. Ford appeared to say that he would wait at least until some charges were brought against Mr. Nixon for which he could be pardoned. And until the eve of his decision he misled this own press secretary into misleading the press and the public that this was his intention.

Then he reversed himself abruptly, with no preparation of public opinion, and so casually of a Sunday morning that the people heard the deed before they heard any explanation for it. Shock was then inevitable, and no matter how well reasoned the President's decision the explanation could never catch up.

The damage, then, was to the President's credibility and, not much less important in the real world, to his political skill. It was unbelievably clumsy, and this error was compounded by the bungling that followed over whether he would extend other pardons to those involved in Watergate.

One consequence is that now this President, like his two predecessors, will hereafter have a credibility problem. He lost both his press secretary and the confidence of the press. Moreover, as Dennis Farney reported in The Wall Street Journal, he raised in many people's minds fundamental questions about his judgment.

He showed himself gutsy but exceedingly inept, and in the milieu of Washington, ineptness in a President is almost a cardinal sin. Hereafter neither politicians nor journalists will draw back from criticizing him on anything.

Every President, and Mr. Ford is no exception, comes to office with a store of political capital he can draw on with Congress and the public. But he must spend it sparingly and only upon the most important objectives. Mr. Ford has spent his needlessly and thoughtlessly. For that, he and the country must now pay a price.

But while that is sad, the violence of the reaction from both press and public is no less so. To read some of the press comments, to skim through the mail piling up on Congressmen's desks, is to detect not merely disapprobation of the President's decision but a touch of hysteria.

From many in the press, in the pulpit and among the public comes the accusation that Mr. Ford was not just misguided in his timing nor mistaken in his judgment but that he was immoral. It is his character and not his wisdom that is assailed.

That President Ford might have had some compassion is sneered at. That he might truly have believed it was better for the country to have done with this, that in the long run it was better not to prolong the ordeal, is dismissed out of hand. In these comments on Gerald Ford there is a revelation of how deeply suspicion and distrust have cut into the body politic.

And there is another undercurrent, running through the outcries. Most of these people furious with President Ford say they do not want Mr. Nixon to go to jail, but that any act of mercy or compassion should have waited another time. Yet had the President waited until charges were brought, you wonder if they would not have said he should wait for an indictment. An indictment being brought, that he should wait perchance for a conviction. And then for at least "some" punishment.

"THE WHOLE TRUTH"

Many justify this by saying we shall never know "the whole truth" unless the ex-President himself is brought to trial, as if we did not know enough after all those Senate hearings, all those tapes, all that impeachment inquiry. Yet the man who conducted that impeachment inquiry, House Judiciary Committee counsel John Doar, certainly does not think so. "The facts have been established," he says, and anything else would at most "just be cumulative."

Observing the outcry you cannot escape the feeling that accumulation is what many of these people really want, not just the accumulation of facts but the accumulation of punishment. Clearly much of the anger vented on President Ford is in reality a cry for vengeance on Richard Nixon.

Those who say there should be no pardon, ever, for Mr. Nixon are more straightforward, and their argument has the merit of righteousness. Yet few of them would go so far as to remove charity from the trilogy of virtues or argue there should never be pardons for anyone. So the anger of their righteousness seems to say that for this man alone punishment should have no end.

FUND FOR PEACE

C.I.A.'s Covert Role: Ford's Defense Runs Against Current Trend

CIA. of Colby, William

By CLIFTON DANIEL
Special to The New York Times

CONFERENCE

ORQ 1 FUND FOR
PEACE

WASHINGTON, Sept. 17 — President Ford helped revive a dying issue last night. That issue was whether it was proper for a democracy, using its intelligence agencies to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries.

News Analysis Mr. Ford, at a news conference, seemed to answer the question affirmatively. He acknowledged that the United States had made an effort to preserve an opposition press and opposition political parties in Chile during the rule of a Marxist President, Salvador Allende Gossens, who died in a military coup in September, 1973.

President Ford justified the effort, which was made during the Nixon Administration, by saying that it was "in the best interest of the people of Chile, and certainly in our best interest."

"I am reliably informed," Mr. Ford said, "that Communist nations spend vastly more money than we do for the same kind of purpose."

His response was presumably considered in advance. He had every reason to expect a question on the subject because of the recent disclosure that the Nixon Administration authorized the Central Intelligence Agency to spend \$8-million on covert activities in Chile between 1970 and 1973.

Indeed, Mr. Ford may have had the help of those who authorized those expenditures in framing his reply. In any event, he chose to defend the behavior of the old Administration rather than chart a new policy for his own.

His response was presumably considered in advance. He had every reason to expect a question on the subject. Last week it was disclosed that the Nixon Administration had authorized the Central Intelligence Agency to spend \$8-million on covert activities in Chile between 1970 and 1973. Those activities were approved by the so-called 40 Committee, whose chairman was and is Secretary of State Kissinger.

Mr. Ford possibly may have had the help of those who authorized those expenditures in framing his reply. In any event, the President chose to defend the behavior of the old Administration rather than chart a new policy for his own.

Cold-War Rhetoric Seen

Another kind of reply was possible. The President might have said that he was not responsible for past activities of the C.I.A., but would be responsible for its future behavior, and would accordingly review its policies and plans.

He did promise to meet with the Congressional committees that review the covert actions of the agency to see whether they might want to change the review process. Those committees, however, are not noted in Washington for vigor and skepticism.

Mr. Ford himself was a member of one of them for nine years when he was a Representative from Michigan.

His reversion last night to the reason and rhetoric of the cold war, however mildly expressed, led to speculation that his mind was still set in that mold.

"If it was good enough for Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, then it's good enough for Ford," one of the President's friends remarked today.

"That's the way he thinks."

Even in an Administration that has been dedicated to openness and candor, President Ford was judged in Washington to have spoken with remarkable frankness.

"It is the first time in my memory that a President has come out flatly and said, 'We do it, the other side does it, and we do it,'" said Prof. Richard N. Gardner, a specialist in international law at Columbia University, speaking from New York.

Secret C.I.A. operations such as the overthrow of Premier Mohammed Mossadegh of Iran in 1953 and President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman of Guatemala in 1954, the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961 and later operations in Laos have been identified when they became too big and notorious to be concealed.

However, none has ever been acknowledged as readily and fully as the Chile operation, although the acknowledgment was low-keyed.

It came, oddly, when such activities seemed to be going out of style. Eighteen months ago the Nixon Administration let it

be known that the clandestine operations of the C.I.A. were being curtailed.

MI Just last week, William E. Colby, Director of Central Intelligence, said it was "clear that American policy today is different from when it was confronting worldwide Communist subversion in the nineteen fifties or Communist insurgency in the nineteen sixties."

"As a result," Mr. Colby told the Ford for Peace conference in Washington, "C.I.A.'s involvement in covert action is very small indeed."

Abandoning covert action entirely "would not have a major impact on our current activities or the current security of the United States," Mr. Colby acknowledged.

However, the capacity for such action may be needed in case of some new threat, he added, and it would be a mistake to "leave us with nothing between a diplomatic protest and sending the Marines."

There was a conspicuous difference in tone between Mr. Colby and President Ford, his new boss, but both seemed to take it for granted that the United States had the right to intervene in the affairs of other countries in its own interest.

When Mr. Ford was asked what international law gave the United States the right to "destabilize the constitutionally elected government of another country," the President declined to talk about law, but said, "it's a recognized fact that historically, as well as presently, such actions are taken in the best interests of the countries involved."

Commenting on that, Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, who is a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said today:

"It seems he declared that the United States respects no law other than the law of the jungle in its dealings with foreign countries. He equates us with the Russians. I thought there was a difference, and the difference is what it's all about."

P. Volz, Joseph Colby, William CIA Chile

Denies CIA Role in Chile Coup

By JOSEPH VOLZ

Washington, Sept. 13 (News Bureau)—CIA director William E. Colby insisted today that the agency had "no connection with the military coup" that toppled Chile's Marxist president, Salvador Allende, last year.

Facing a hostile audience at a seminar on the CIA sponsored by the Fund for Peace Colby conceded, however, that agency officers "did look forward to a change of government at the election in 1976 by democratic political forces."

Colby had previously testified behind closed doors before congressional committees that the CIA had an \$11 million covert operation to disrupt the Allende government. He denied published reports that he used the words "political destabilization" to refer to the agency's activities in Chile. He refused, however, to go into detail as to just what the CIA operation was.

A Shout From the Audience

At one point in his speech today, Colby was interrupted by a young man in the audience who shouted, "How many people did you kill in Vietnam?" During the 1960s Colby headed a controversial program in South Vietnam called Operation Phoenix which was described by critics as a plan to assassinate Viet Cong leaders.

Colby insisted that although 20,000 Vietnamese were killed while Operation Phoenix was in force, most died in combat or while resisting arrest by South



William E. Colby
Faces a hostile audience

Vietnamese police. He contended that the aim was to identify and arrest Viet Cong leaders, not to kill them.

Sen. James Abouezk (D-S.D.) asked Colby if he believed the

U.S. government should have a policy of subverting foreign governments. The CIA director responded that he just followed orders from the National Security Council.

Defending the CIA's covert activities, Colby argued that during the cold war era they "assisted in laying the groundwork" for eventual detente with Communist nations.

But the value of covert operations known as "dirty tricks," was disputed by a former assistant CIA director, Herbert Scoville Jr., who contended that "they are of almost no value today." He argued that Spy satellites and other scientific wizardry have made human spies less and less important.

Morton Halpern, a former National Security Council staffer, contended that CIA clandestine operations are so secret that even key officials in the government often are not told thus limiting dissent.

Colby's appearance before a Capitol Hill conference, run by an arm of the privately-sponsored Fund for Peace was seen as another effort to show that the agency realizes it must be responsible to the public.

CONFERENCE
CIA 103 Scoville
Herbert
Halperin, Morton
Org. Fund For
Peace

Borosage, Robert

15 August 1974

Org Center for
Natl. Sec. Studies

← Org Fund For
Peace

Orig under Borosage

Mr. Robert L. Borosage
1930 Biltmore Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Borosage:

Thank you for your invitation to appear at your conference on the Central Intelligence Agency and Covert Actions. As you no doubt are aware from the press, we in CIA have attempted to be responsive to Congressional and public interest in our activities to the extent this is possible while fulfilling my statutory responsibilities to protect intelligence sources and methods. In this we are seeking to conform with our open Constitutional society and at the same time carry out the intelligence functions essential to protect it.

Thus I have accepted invitations to speak before a variety of groups seriously interested in understanding CIA and its functioning. In principle, therefore, I would accept your invitation and welcome the opportunity to present my views on this subject. As you note in your letter, however, I am somewhat impressed with the fact that "most" of the papers and subjects on your program are indeed critical of the Agency and its activities. I am surprised that there is no apparent attempt to examine the need for the contribution that objective and independent intelligence can make to policy-making. I also note that there is no discussion of the potential difficulties posed to our country and our open society by the closed societies with whom we share this world and whose intentions and capabilities vis-a-vis the United States can best be negotiated about or countered if they are known to our national leadership. I think, for example, of the contribution intelligence has made to peace in a variety of situations, from the Cuban missile crisis to the SALT agreements, matters in which I would think your Fund would be interested and would applaud.