

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-1

WASHINGTON TIMES
31 January 1984

U.S. intelligence

The scorecard shows 'plusses'

By Edward Neilan
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

Fifty major terrorist organizations are now operating worldwide and all of them are for hire, a government source said yesterday.

U.S. intelligence has increased the number of agents combating these terrorists, some of whom operate on a free-lance basis and others

who have organizational backing or operate under the tacit blessing of the Soviet Union.

The administration is endorsing an international approach to fighting terrorism similar to worldwide measures against piracy in centuries past.

A highly placed source, speaking on the condition that names would be withheld and no one would be quoted directly, gave this overview of world intelligence issues:

The defection or expulsion of 147 Soviet KGB agents in 20 countries around the world last year amounted to a tremendous setback for Moscow. The effect has been so serious that Soviet emphasis is being shifted from intelligence to counterintelligence.

In addition to the KGB reversals, the Soviet Union and client states suffered setbacks or found their hands full in Nicaragua, Afghanistan and Cambodia. Other nations are experiencing more success in resisting Soviet-sponsored infiltration.

Terrorism remains the one area where Soviet-backed operations are increasing and there is concern that the upcoming Olympic Games

in Los Angeles will be eyed as a target by these groups.

The main training grounds for the most active terrorist groups are Libya, South Yemen, Syria, Bulgaria and the Soviet Union.

It is known that the Oct. 23 bombing of the U.S. Marine headquarters in Beirut was carried out by a Shi'ite group of about 20 members. The mission was launched from a

base camp in the Bekaa Valley. The members of the group stopped off at a mosque in downtown Beirut for blessing before carrying out the attack.

The source said published reports that as many as 500 American intelligence agents are aiding the 12,000 to 18,000 contra guerrillas

fighting against the Marxist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua are erroneous. The figure is closer to 20 and the results of their efforts were described as remarkable.

Reports that the administration was downplaying an alleged Soviet role in the 1981 attempt to assassinate Pope John Paul II also were denied. The source said the KGB was known to have been involved in murder in the past and there were direct links between the alleged assassin Mehmet Ali Agca and Bulgarian intelligence, which in turn works closely with the KGB.

There has been a gradual buildup in the CIA's Directorate of Operations as part of the administration's response to Soviet-backed terrorism and other clandestine operations.

The directorate was reduced when the CIA was headed by Stansfield Turner in the administration of President Carter. President Reagan replaced Turner with William Casey, who served in the World War II Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor of the CIA.

Mr. Casey was presidential campaign manager for Mr. Reagan.

The source said U.S. intelligence operatives now combine both approaches as in a recent reaction to a terrorist incident in Africa in which hostages taken by terrorists were freed unharmed.

Described as "Star Wars in the bush," the case was satisfactorily handled by teamwork among the local U.S. intelligence station chief, a pair of agents flown out from Wash-

ington, plus information gleaned from sophisticated photography techniques that pinpointed locations of guards.

An analysis of the photographs was done in Washington and flown back to the site, where it was used to extract the hostages without injury.

Now That It's Official, Campaign Is a Central White House Concern

By STEVEN R. WEISMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30 — With President Reagan a declared candidate for re-election, White House officials report that the campaign has become a central fact of life in planning, scheduling, policy decisions and Presidential appearances.

The officials said today that Mr. Reagan would make perhaps two political trips a month before the Republican National Convention in Dallas, Aug. 20-23.

In addition, members and former members of the Cabinet will join with perhaps 20 Senators and Representatives to serve as "surrogate" speakers at political events throughout the country. "I'll be all over the place," said Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige.

Some Won't Campaign

Officials said certain Cabinet members would follow the precedent of being exempted from direct campaigning, except for general speeches defending Administration policies. These would be Secretary of State George P. Shultz, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, and William J. Casey, the Director of Central Intelligence.

Also exempt would be Edwin Meese 3d, the White House counselor, after he is confirmed as Attorney General.

James A. Baker 3d, the White House chief of staff, is widely regarded as the chief of the campaign, though Senator

Paul Laxalt of Nevada is officially the chairman of the Reagan-Bush '84 Committee and Edward J. Rollins is the campaign director. Mr. Baker's primacy is symbolized by his holding every Tuesday of political strategy meetings attended by all the senior advisers at both the campaign and the White House.

As the campaign permeates the White House, Mr. Baker and Fred F. Fielding, the President's counsel, have directed that certain precautions be taken to keep government and political activities separate. For example:

¶ Memorandums have been sent to staff members of the National Security Council and the Office of Policy Development to avoid participating in any campaign-related activities. These staff members fall under the Hatch Act, which bars certain Federal employees from engaging in politics.

¶ Although Mr. Baker holds the weekly meetings in his White House office, other Government offices have been declared off-limits to political events.

¶ The Reagan-Bush '84 Committee is paying for some Presidential activities previously paid for by the Government, including the reception for campaign workers Sunday night and Mr. Reagan's trip to Atlanta last week.

¶ White House officials have been directed not to use Government cars to travel to events at the campaign headquarters. On Sunday, it was reported that Mr. Baker used a Government car to travel to a television studio for an interview, but drove his own car to a fund-raiser later.

¶ Mr. Baker has designated his executive assistant, Margaret Tutwiler, to serve as the direct liaison representative with the campaign. The Reagan-Bush campaign has installed and paid for a separate non-White House telephone in her office for calls to discuss

campaign-related activities.

These and other legal precautions are part of what one White House aide said was "post-Watergate overkill" aimed at skirting abuses like the political scandals that helped drive Richard M. Nixon from the White House 10 years ago. Some of the precautions actually began in October, when the Reagan-Bush '84 Committee was formed.

WASHINGTON

REAGAN LOYALISTS LIVE IT UP

BY NORMAN D. SANDLER

For most of the politicians and pundits, the suspense had ended weeks ago.

But when President Reagan made his re-election bid official Sunday night, jubilation swept over hundreds of loyalists who had to hear the words from Reagan himself.

The celebration was in full swing long before Reagan went on television from the Oval Office. For some, it did not end until long afterward.

Lured by 10 bars, wide-screen televisions and entertainment by Lionel Hampton and his band, more than 1,000 Reagan loyalists marked the formal start of the campaign in rousing style in the ballroom of a hotel not far from the White House.

There were hats, buttons and red, white and blue balloons. Banners suspended from railings sounded the Reagan campaign themes. "Let's finish the job," read one. "America is back," declared another.

Fortified by the hype and hoopla, the crowd burst into applause and cheers when Reagan's image appeared on a huge television screen at 10:55 p.m. EST, drowning out the first few words of the announcement they had come to hear.

The cheering and chanting went on for a full 60 seconds after his image faded from the screen. As the crowd broke into song -- "As Reagan and Bush go marching in ..." -- one veteran campaign worker summed up the night's events.

"Not much of a surprise," he said, "but a hell of a way to start a campaign."

The guests included veterans of past Reagan campaigns and converts like George Wittgraf, who four years ago helped engineer George Bush's victory over Reagan in the first-round Iowa caucuses.

This year, Wittgraf is co-chairman of the Reagan campaign in Iowa.

If anyone had any doubts about what Reagan would say, they hid them well.

"I think Reagan just might announce tonight," said GOP strategist Stuart Spencer, who has been involved in the campaign for months.

"Confident? Sure I'm confident," said longtime Reagan associate Lyn Nofziger, sporting a Mickey Mouse tie.

CIA Director William Casey, who managed Reagan's 1980 campaign, was there. So was Max Hugel, a campaign aide who resigned under fire early in the administration as Casey's deputy for covert operations.

Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., had a handshake for everyone. Asked about Reagan's Southern strategy, Thurmond replied, "It's gonna go real good."

Those most responsible for planning and carrying out the campaign sounded optimistic chords, but added a note of caution to keep the troops on guard.

"We're expecting a close race and a tough race. These things have a tendency to tighten up," said White House chief of staff James Baker, who ran George Bush's 1980 campaign against Reagan for the Republican nomination and will help direct this year's effort from the White House.

Edward Rollins, who transferred from the White House to the campaign committee last October, exhorted the campaign workers to work hard.

"The campaign organization they have is going to be a hell of a lot better than the candidate they have," Rollins said.

WASHINGTON
BY DANIEL F. GILMORE

The expulsion, defection or transfer of 147 Soviet countries around the globe during 1983 has clearly put agency on the defensive, U.S. officials said Monday.

Aside from their KGB losses, they said, the Soviet suffered serious resistance and more forceful reactions by governments to infiltration attempts. The officials also said Soviet agents face other problems around the world, notably in Afghanistan and Cambodia.

At the same time, they said, U.S. intelligence has been increasing manpower to counter some 50 major, identifiable terrorist groups worldwide, many of them under Soviet control or operating with Moscow's tacit approval.

The officials requested that their names, and the names of the government agencies for which they work, be withheld.

They said the administration is moving toward a concerted international effort to combat terrorism and likened the approach to international efforts to halt piracy during the 16th and 17th centuries.

The sources said the CIA's Directorate of Operations, which supervises agents abroad and clandestine operations, has been built up to strength following a cutback made under Stansfield Turner during the Carter administration.

Turner was succeeded as CIA director by William Casey, a former chief of the World War II Office of Strategic Services that preceded the CIA, and former presidential campaign manager for Ronald Reagan.

Turner was said to have been intrigued by technical gathering of intelligence. He cut back heavily on headquarters experts and analysts and relied heavily on machinery.

Casey, however, is known to prefer people to machines for close-in intelligence gathering and assessment.

There is every sign Casey intends to stay on as chief of all U.S. intelligence agencies and continue his present policies if Reagan is re-elected.

At the State Department, a spokesman confirmed that U.S. officials held two days of meetings last week with officials from the "summit seven" countries to discuss "our continuing joint efforts on protection of diplomatic personnel" from terrorists.

The State Department said the president will soon announce a legislative package that will outline the American role in cooperative measures to combat terrorism.

The seven nations who meet annually at the economic summits are: Britain, Canada, France, Japan, Germany, Italy and the United States.

On other matters, the officials disputed published charges that the administration is "covering up" alleged Soviet complicity in the 1981 attempt to assassinate ~~the pope~~ Pope John Paul II.

Approved For Release 2005/11/28 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400050003-9
CONTINUED

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-4WASHINGTON POST
30 January 1984

FILE ONLY DCI

Casey Says Hart's Criticism Of Finances Is 'Demagoguery'

CIA Director William J. Casey accused Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.) yesterday of "demagoguery" for criticizing Casey's financial transactions while in office.

Campaigning in Iowa Saturday for the Democratic presidential nomination, Hart rebuked President Reagan for condoning what Hart called a staggering amount of unethical and improper conduct on the part of high-ranking officials. Hart criticized Casey, among others, for not putting his holdings in a blind trust until mid-1983, when the

Sénate "threatened to pass a resolution demanding that he do so."

In a statement, Casey assailed Hart for "this bit of demagoguery." Casey said he had been complying with the Ethics in Government Act, which called for mandatory disclosure of financial transactions, and termed it "rather shabby for Hart" to find fault now with dealings that were duly reported under the law. Casey traded more than \$3 million in stock in 1982 through an investment adviser.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-7WASHINGTON POST
29 January 1984FILE ONLY *de 1*

Hart Takes President to Task for Appointees' Unethical Conduct

By George Lardner Jr.
Washington Post Staff Writer

In the toughest speech of his presidential campaign, Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.) accused the administration yesterday of a staggering record of unethical and improper conduct and sharply chastised President Reagan for condoning it.

"Abuse of government has become a way of life in this administration, yet it seems to concern no one very much—including the president himself," Hart said. "I think it should . . .

"To date," he said, "almost 50 high-ranking officials of the Reagan administration have faced serious allegations involving criminal wrongdoing, unethical behavior or abuses of power and privilege . . . To date, at least 25 high-ranking appointees have resigned, been fired or had their nominations withdrawn in the wake of scandals involving their integrity."

Hart laid out his complaints before the George Washington Debate Society in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Aides said he intended to make them a major theme of his campaign.

"Too many Reagan officials seem

to have been appointed not for their commitment to public service, but for their ability to feather their own nests," Hart said. "They view their jobs not as stewards of the public trust, but opportunities to feed at the public trough."

Hart said the lessons of the Watergate scandals that seemed so clear in 1974, the year he was first elected to the Senate, seem to have been forgotten completely.

"Once again, we are hearing about political hit lists, about secrecy oaths and lie detectors, about favoritism in high places, about illicit taping of official conversations and about lying by senior government officials,"

he said. "And once again, allegations of official misconduct are followed by pronouncements of presidential confidence and support."

Hart said it was time that the president, "the man ultimately responsible for the behavior of his appointees," be called to account.

"Ronald Reagan can blame Congress for his own runaway deficits. He can blame other nations for his own foreign policy failures. He can't blame anyone but himself for the ethical problems of his own people

. . . . Such a persistent pattern of wrongdoing can only suggest that this president condones wrongdoing by subordinates, and in keeping many of these people in power long after scandal has undercut their effectiveness, Ronald Reagan demon-

strates not strength but weakness," Hart said.

The speech contained no new allegations or disclosures. Hart's press secretary, Kathy Bushkin, said it was intended as a catalogue of the kind of conduct Hart had in mind.

Among those he singled out:

- Attorney General William French Smith, who "participated in a tax shelter deemed impermissible by the Internal Revenue Service [and] received a \$50,000 severance payment from a company on whose board he once served."

- Presidential counselor and Attorney General-designate Edwin Meese III, who "received a loan arranged by an accountant who was subsequently appointed to the Postal Service Board of Directors."

- CIA Director William J. Casey, who "resisted putting his holdings in a blind trust" until pressured by the Senate to do so last July, and "traded over \$3 million in stock in 1982 while serving as CIA director."

- USIA Director Charles Z. Wick who "secretly taped conversations with other government officials and then lied about it to reporters."

- Reagan's first Veterans Administration chief, Robert P. Nimmo, who "spent \$54,183 to redecorate his office, then sent the old furniture to his daughter, an official at the Commerce Department."

- The secretary of the Navy, John F. Lehman Jr., who "maintained a connection with a firm despite his promise to divest himself of it completely after taking office because of its work advising defense contractors."

Beyond that, Hart said that government was no longer the referee for competing claims, but was now on the side of private interests.

"A lawyer for foreign nuclear utilities was put in charge of nuclear exports," he said. "Toxic-waste officials have been put in charge of toxic-waste cleanup. Defense contractors supervise weapons procurement."

Calling the issue fundamentally a moral matter, Hart contended that the administration's record amounted to a betrayal of the public trust that could no longer be tolerated.

"This president has made his personal strength one of the tests of this election," Hart said. "But true strength begins with the willingness to put the public good above personal and political loyalty. And by this test, the president has failed . . . Our public servants must be charged with a higher duty than merely staying out of jail."

SAN FRANCISCO
NEUTRALITY
BY SUSAN GOLDFARB

A federal appeals court Wednesday halted at least temporarily a judge's order that the attorney general investigate the president for supporting covert CIA activities in Nicaragua.

The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals suspended U.S. District Judge Stanley Weigel's order to conduct a preliminary probe of President Reagan and his top advisors until it has a chance to consider the government's appeal.

Rep. Ronald Dellums, D-Calif., and two individuals brought the suit against Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, CIA Director William Casey, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and other high-ranking officials, charging violation of the Neutrality Act.

The act specifies the United States cannot provide aid to overthrow a government with which it is not at war.

The lawsuit claims the United States has been conducting military training of Nicaraguan exiles in Florida since 1980, even though Nicaragua is not a declared enemy.

According to Dellums, the military training plan provided at least \$19 million to finance covert paramilitary operations against the people of Nicaragua. He said the plan also trains armies of 10,000 to 15,000 Nicaraguan exiles in the U.S. and Honduras; conducts CIA intelligence activity and sends hundreds of CIA agents and government officials to Honduras to assist in attempts to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.

Under the Ethics in Government Act, citizens can bring the attorney general information they believe incriminates federal officials and he must conduct an investigation.

Attorney General William French Smith had refused to probe the president.

The penalty for violating the Neutrality Act is up to three years in federal prison and fines of up to \$3,000.

Clark Backed Meese For Attorney General

By Lou Cannon and David Hoffman
Washington Post Staff Writers

President Reagan named his long-time counselor, Edwin Meese III, as attorney general after Interior Secretary William P. Clark urged the appointment of Meese rather than White House chief of staff James A. Baker III, administration officials said yesterday.

"There is no doubt that [Clark] tipped the scales," one official supportive of the Meese appointment said.

However, sources close to Baker, while acknowledging that in the past he had expressed interest in becoming attorney general, said he realized as soon as Smith resigned that it was a foregone conclusion that Meese would replace him.

"Any attorney always wants that job, but Baker had been asked by the president to run the campaign and had made his commitment to him," an official close to Baker said.

This official said he considered it likely that the chief of staff would be given a major Cabinet post if Reagan is reelected. However, Baker's supporters said he is more than content to see Meese, his chief remaining rival in the White House power structure, leave for a Cabinet post and give him undisputed authority as the No. 1 presidential assistant.

"He will be the real chief of staff for the first time," one official said.

Clark's intervention on Meese's behalf was the latest episode in a long saga of staff infighting and maneuvering in the Reagan administration.

Conflict between Baker and Clark was a major reason why Clark gave up his post as national security affairs adviser last October and asked

Reagan to appoint him interior secretary after James G. Watt resigned.

When that happened, Baker and deputy chief of staff Michael K. Deaver teamed up in an effort to get the president to install Baker as national security affairs adviser and name Deaver to succeed Baker. But this was blocked by Clark, who called on his old California ally, Meese, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and CIA Director William J. Casey to persuade Reagan to drop the idea.

The president sided with Clark and his allies, reportedly changing his mind after telling Baker and Deaver that their proposal had been accepted.

On Thursday it was Clark's turn to return the favor, and he did so without hesitation, according to officials, who said he met with Meese before he saw the president privately and urged that the counselor be named attorney general.

Neither Clark nor those who supported the action could say yesterday whether the visit was necessary.

Some believe that Reagan would have named Meese, a loyal aide since 1967, to the post no matter what anyone said. Others said that Baker also had a claim on the job and some interest in it and that Clark's support for Meese was important, perhaps decisive.

But Baker's allies expressed satisfaction with the outcome, saying it would make it easier for the chief of staff to coordinate political activities and run a smooth campaign.

"Jim's campaign role in 1984 is vital to the reelection of the president," Deaver said.

Meese's departure is likely to leave a void for conservatives, who have turned to him as their chief conduit to the president after Clark

left. Officials were uncertain how that void would be filled, but some suggested that John A. (Jack) Svahn, director of the Office of Policy Development, would inherit the role of dealing with conservatives inside and outside the administration.

Another possible candidate for this role is Faith Ryan Whittlesey, director of the Office of Public Liaison.

Whoever performs this function,

conservatives are looking ahead to what they believe will be a second Reagan term. Many would like Clark to return to the White House as chief of staff, and the ready access he has to the president, as demonstrated by his meeting in Meese's behalf, is considered a sign that he could do so.

Officials said yesterday that no

decision had been made about who in the White House staff will oversee the policy office run by Svahn, which had been under Meese. Officials said presidential assistants Richard G. Darman and Craig Fuller would get enhanced duties.

Also unsettled yesterday was who will inherit Meese's spacious West Wing office.

WASHINGTON POST
23 January 1984

Smith Quits Top Justice Job; Reagan to Nominate Meese

By David Hoffman
Washington Post Staff Writer

Attorney General William French Smith submitted his resignation to President Reagan last week, and Reagan has decided to nominate White House counselor Edwin Meese III to replace him, administration sources said yesterday.

Smith told the president in a private Oval Office meeting last Wednesday that he wanted to leave the administration to return to his Los Angeles law firm, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, where Smith had become a millionaire practicing corporate labor law before joining the administration, the sources said.

Meese will not be replaced as White House counselor, a job that put him at Reagan's elbow during the first three years of the administration and often brought him into conflict with Reagan's other senior advisers, the sources said.

Meese's appointment will thus leave White House chief of staff James A. Baker III in undisputed control of the presidential staff for the first time since the 1980 election, when Reagan's top three advisers first divided their responsibilities, officials said.

Reagan accepted Smith's resignation on Thursday and decided the same day to give the job to Meese, 52, a former prosecutor and law professor who has worked for Reagan since he began his terms as California governor.

Smith, 66, will announce his resignation today, the officials said. They said Reagan told his top three advisers—Meese, Baker and deputy chief of staff Michael K. Deaver—last Thursday of his decision to give Meese the job.

They said that it was not certain if Meese's nomination as attorney general would be announced immediately, but that the president had decided to make the nomination, which requires Senate confirmation.

Neither Meese nor Smith could be reached for comment yesterday. Asked about the shift as he returned to the White House yesterday afternoon from Camp David,

Md., Reagan made a quip about the Super Bowl, saying, "There's only one thing on my mind: the football game."

Baker, who previously had given serious consideration to leaving the White House to become major league baseball commissioner, will remain as chief of staff through this year's campaign, the officials said.

The wealthy Houston lawyer, who was George Bush's campaign manager in 1980, often has been a target of criticism from conservatives. Baker and his staff, which includes Deaver and presidential assistant Richard G. Darman, are expected to assume control of some of the policy-making and other functions that have been Meese's responsibility, they added.

Smith is the sixth member of Reagan's original Cabinet to leave, following former secretary of state Alexander M. Haig Jr., transportation secretary Drew Lewis, interior secretary James G. Watt, health and human services secretary Richard S. Schweiker and energy secretary James B. Edwards.

Meese's departure will further thin the ranks of Reagan's original senior staff. Recently, communications director David R. Gergen and chief lobbyist Kenneth M. Duberstein left the White House for jobs outside the administration.

Disclosure of Smith's resignation comes the week of Reagan's third State of the Union address and a week before the president is expected to announce that he intends to seek a second term.

Shortly after Reagan's 1980 election, Baker and Meese initialed a written agreement that delineated their separate responsibilities along with Deaver's. This "Big Three" triumvirate, with Meese in charge of making policy and Baker in charge of implementing it, proved to be a crucible for increasing tensions between them.

Meese said in an interview last month that the tensions were no different from those two law partners

might experience. But it has been no secret in the White House since the first days of Reagan's term that Meese and Baker, both lawyers, have sharply different views of White House tactics and strategy.

Baker has tended to take the more pragmatic approach, and his position gave him chief responsibility for the major negotiations and compromises with Congress that marked Reagan's first three years, including the early budget and tax cuts, the bipartisan Social Security compromise and the later tax increase. His deputy, Deaver, who held sway over Reagan's schedule and appearances, was influential in deciding how the president would tackle a major problem or issue.

Meese, who had been responsible for dealing with the legislature when he was Reagan's chief of staff in Sacramento, was in a much different position at the White House. He was far less involved in day-to-day politics, and, according to his colleagues, he focused more on keeping the administration on Reagan's conservative course.

Inevitably, this produced second-guessing between the two sides of the White House, a tension between pragmatism and ideology that mirrored a larger conflict at work in the Reagan presidency.

The original "Big Three" advisers became four when William P. Clark became Reagan's national security affairs adviser in January, 1982. Until then, Meese had directed the

activities of Reagan's first national security adviser, Richard V. Allen. Clark had direct access to the president, however, and one of his first actions was to see that control over matters dealing with foreign affairs was taken from Meese.

CONTINUED

On the Trail of a Mole

INTREPID'S LAST CASE

By William Stevenson.
321 pp. New York:
Villard Books/Random House. \$16.95.

By James Bamford

ON a warm September Thursday in 1945 a tired young man in baggy pants crisscrossed the city of Ottawa with his wife and 2-year-old son. All day and the previous night he had been pounding the streets searching for someone who would take an interest in a shopping bag of papers he carried. First he visited the night editor of *The Ottawa Journal* who glanced at the pile and said, "No thanks." Then he trudged over to the Ministry of Justice where a policeman told him to come back the next day. At 8 o'clock the following morning the young man again made his way to the Ministry of Justice and asked to speak to the minister. He was sent to the Parliament building and, after a two-hour wait, was told the minister was too busy to see him. Then it was back to the *Journal*, once again to the Ministry, and finally to the Crown Attorney's office. Nobody seemed to care a whiff about his bag of papers.

The young man was Igor Sergeievitch Gouzenko, a slight, 24-year-old Russian attached to the cryptographic section of the Soviet Embassy. And what he was hauling around the Canadian capital were several reams of the Soviet Union's deepest secrets — including evidence that Moscow had penetrated the Manhattan Project and walked away with key pieces to the puzzle of the atomic bomb.

Mackenzie King, the Canadian Prime Minister, had been informed of the Russian and his bag of secrets within half an hour of Mr. Gouzenko's first approach to the Ministry of Justice, but delayed taking any action for fear of offending the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin. Mr. Gouzenko was "a political hot potato, too hot to handle," King later wrote. Eventually persuaded otherwise, the Prime Minister granted permission for accepting Mr. Gouzenko's appeal for political asylum.

For protection, the Gouzenko family was hidden at Camp X, a secret, wartime espionage training center bordering Lake Ontario. There, during long interrogations, Mr. Gouzenko told of extensive Soviet penetration of the West and named a Russian agent in Canada with the code name Elli. Later identified as Kathleen Willsher, a confidential sec-



THE ROYAL GAZETTE/KEVIN STEVENSON
Sir William Stephenson, code name
"Intrepid," accepting the General Donovan
Award in September 1983.

retary to the British High Commissioner, she was apprehended and prosecuted. But Mr. Gouzenko was later to suggest there was a second Elli, a Soviet mole high in British intelligence circles whose cover has never been blown.

Among those initially involved in the Gouzenko affair in 1945 was Sir William Stephenson who, under the wartime code name Intrepid, was in charge of London's New York-based British Security Coordination office. The B.S.C. was responsible for all clandestine British activities in the Western Hemisphere and for close liaison with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Office of Strategic Services, the wartime undercover intelligence operation.

Sir William and the B.S.C. were the subjects of William Stevenson's earlier best sell-

Continued

ARTICLE APPEARED ON PAGE A-1 Approved For Release 2005/11/28 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400050003-9
NEW YORK TIMES
21 January 1984 FILE ONLY -DCI



Associated Press

INAUGURAL ANNIVERSARY: President Reagan at the celebration yesterday of his three years in the White House. He told a gathering of workers, "We have

made a new beginning." Others, from right, are Edwin Meese 3d, counselor; William J. Casey, head of the C.I.A., and Bill Brock, trade representative.

Opinion • Commentary

The Quiet American

By John L. Hess

New York

I BEG the privilege of nominating Robert E. White for the Quiet American Award.

The award is of course named for the hero of Graham Greene's novel about Vietnam: the clean-cut, high-minded, liberal CIA agent who tried to build a third force between the French colonialists and the Communist-led Vietminh. You know how that came out.

Mr. White, who is as high-minded as they come in the Foreign Service, was ambassador to El Salvador in 1979 and 1980. Like Saigon in the 1950s, it was a bad time.

In El Salvador a coup turned sour, a land-reform led to bloody repression and death squads were butchering innocents, including the archbishop, four American churchwomen and two U.S. land-reform advisers.

One of the first acts of President Reagan was to fire Ambassador White. When it was perceived that Mr. Reagan was engaging us in a savage little war, he retorted with rare truthfulness:

"I didn't start the El Salvador thing. I inherited it. And the previous administration, they were doing what we're doing."

The State Department certified repeatedly that the human rights situation was improving, until President Reagan vetoed the law requiring such perjury.

The murders continue at a rate of 100 or more a week. Our statesmen grumble about them, but continue to pass the ammunition. Indeed, Henry Kissinger would step up the flow.

"It is almost a rare thing to die a natural death in this country," said

Bishop Gregorio Rosa Chavez in a Christmas sermon. "It is almost a miracle."

To his great credit, Mr. White has passionately denounced our complicity in this slaughter. He appeals for peace, democracy and justice in El Salvador. But *not* for us to get out of there, for heaven's sake.

"In regard to Central America," he writes in the current *Atlantic Monthly*, "the world divides into three parts," which he defines as "those who exult in the Sandinista revolution," "the Reagan ideologues" and "those of us" who would promote "stable, democratic governments."

Mr. White's world excludes most Americans. Few of us exult in the Sandinista revolution, few of us support murderous dictatorships and, as Mr. White should be among the first to know, few of us support his benign meddling.

Indeed, a New York Times/CBS poll found that only a tiny minority knew which side Mr. Reagan was on in Nicaragua and El Salvador. (Mr. Reagan himself got them crossed up once. He said the Salvador guerrillas threatened our supply line to Europe).

The public's ignorance is not totally discreditable. It is natural to tune out news about distant tragedies that we can do nothing to relieve. That is folk wisdom.

People in Mr. White's world do not agree. Last spring, *Foreign Policy* quarterly gloomily published a Gallup poll that dramatized the split between the public and leaders of government, business, the media and academe.

The question was mushily posed: Should we have an "active" world role? That could mean Mr. Reagan's wars, Mr. White's reformist meddling, or support for the UN Children's Fund. The leaders, of course, all said yes to activism. Fully one-third of the public said no.

Note that this was a response of instinct or, one might say, common sense. Nothing in the media would encourage such an "isolationist" (I

prefer "non-interventionist") response. And if the question had been properly put, the vote against meddling would be overwhelming.

The public instinct is right. The Quiet American may meddle with the highest motives, for human rights, land reform, democracy; other forces will resist and, in the end, the guns will speak.

Then the Andrew Youngs, the Cyrus Vances and the Robert Whites will get pushed aside by the Zbigniew Brzezinskis, the William Caseys and the Caspar Weinbergers, who will say that they didn't start it, but they will bloody well finish it.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-3WASHINGTON POST
19 January 1984

FILE ONLY -dc

Depositions to Replace Canceled Hearings on '80 Debate Papers

By Howard Kurtz
Washington Post Staff Writer

Rep. Donald J. Albosta (D-Mich.), saying he wants to avoid "partisan bickering and a media extravaganza," yesterday canceled long-planned public hearings into how Ronald Reagan's 1980 campaign obtained documents from the Carter White House.

Instead of the hearings, which were to begin next week, Albosta said his staff would seek to obtain sworn depositions from key witnesses in an effort to resolve conflicting accounts of how the Carter documents were obtained.

Rather than question witnesses publicly during a presidential election year, Albosta said his Post Office and Civil Service sub-

committee "should now attempt to conclude the investigative phase of its work without the potentially circus atmosphere of public hearings."

Albosta said the sworn depositions, to be compiled by his staff based on earlier interviews that were not under oath, will be crucial in resolving discrepancies in the investigation. "It appears that not all of the unsworn statements to the subcommittee and the FBI have been truthful," he said.

White House counsel Fred F. Fielding assured him this week that President Reagan will encourage members of his administration and campaign to sign the sworn statements if asked, Albosta said.

Rep. Daniel B. Crane (R-Ill.), the panel's

ranking minority member, welcomed Albosta's decision. He said the seven-month-old probe has cost "hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars," and complained that Albosta has refused to detail the cost. Albosta said the costs were a matter of public record.

Steve Hemphill, the committee's Republican counsel, said, "We've said all along that this subcommittee does not need to conduct an investigation that is often criminal in nature in trying to find a culprit."

As for the allegation that witnesses have made false statements, Hemphill said, "I'm aware of no evidence of any crimes. We're dealing with people's memories that are four years old. It's possible to have a lapse in memory and still be telling the truth."

Albosta dismissed suggestions that he postponed the hearings indefinitely because of a lack of progress. He said the probe "has borne considerable fruit, as will be demonstrated when the subcommittee's findings are released," probably in March.

Albosta said the probe is necessary to develop legislation to curtail future campaign abuses. He added in an interview that he has ruled out asking key witnesses to take polygraph tests, a possibility the panel had been considering.

Albosta said public hearings "would have been almost a three-ring circus because it's an election year. I would have been accused of partisan politics and all kinds of things, no matter how much I tried to avoid it." *

White House chief of staff James A. Baker III, CIA Director William J. Casey and political consultant Paul Corbin are among those expected to be asked to sign depositions. They have been central figures in the controversy over how the Reagan campaign obtained President Carter's debate briefing book shortly before the crucial Oct. 28, 1980, televised debate between Reagan and Carter.

Baker has said he received the Carter briefing book from Casey, but Casey has said he never saw the material. A Republican congressional aide has told the FBI that Corbin once claimed to have given the briefing book to Casey, but Corbin reportedly has denied making such a claim.

18 January 1984

CIA: Bane of Insider Author's Existence

By Ralph W. McGehee

The Central Intelligence Agency's prepublication review requirement is an issue of paramount importance. A similar kind of censorship is also threatened by President Reagan's March, 1983 executive order which places hundreds of thousands of government employees under identical constraints. Supreme Court decisions and liberal interpretations of the executive order could extend life-long prepublication review constraints over an additional several million government employees and employees of firms doing classified government work. This is a major threat to our constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech and forbodes the approach of 1984 and the national security state.

I am a retired CIA officer who earned numerous awards and medals including the prestigious career intelligence medal. During my last ten years with the CIA I protected its false information on Vietnam. The deficiencies that created the Vietnam War permeate CIA operations and I felt an imperative to tell this to the American people and wrote a book about my experiences. The book did not attempt to reveal the identities of my associates or other classified information.

I had opted for early retirement in 1977 and immediately began research for a book. I feared possible CIA retribution if it discovered I was writing an expose and attempted to keep my activities secret from my friends and family members not living at home. My fears were justified as the CIA soon discovered what I was doing and placed me under close, intimidating, multiple types of surveillance, a surveillance that continues to this day.

I was confused about how to proceed. I could not contact a publisher for anything I might tell him might violate prepublication review restrictions. I decided to work alone without benefit of a contract or guidance from an editor. This was a mistake that cost two years of misguided effort.

On Feb. 26, 1980, following three years of research and writing, I submitted a

manuscript to the CIA. A month later the Publications Review Board (PRB) notified me that it had identified 397 classified items in the text varying in length from one word to several pages. Over the next weeks I worked with a representative of the PRB to prove that those deleted passages did not contain classified information. I sourced my claims primarily to information appearing in the cleared writings of other agency authors.

We agreed on a number of revisions, and I rewrote the text accordingly. Dismayed that I had defeated its claims of secrecy, the PRB reversed earlier decisions and began classifying information that only a short time before it had judged to be not classified. This forced me to again prove many of those claims false and to rewrite the text. Finally, I overcame all objections, and for the first time I had a manuscript, truncated as it was, to shop around to publishers.

The search for a publisher was a long time-consuming effort. Many publishers admitted I had a viable manuscript but all said it needed better focus and rewriting. None but a small ideologically motivated publisher would risk the time and uncertainty of battling the CIA's review process.

Sheridan Square Publications agreed to publish the manuscript only if I would rewrite it as an autobiography. As an aid, I prepared a 50 page outline and sent it to the PRB. In the transmitting letter, I advised that I only wanted the outline for discussions with an editor following which I would rewrite and resubmit the manuscript. The PRB refused to deal with an outline. (Yet a few weeks later the CIA learned that I was to give a speech to the Association of Asian Studies and sent me a registered letter advising that I must submit the speech for review even if only in outline form.) After I had submitted three chapters, the PRB demanded that I complete the entire rewrite before it would release any material. I then had to rewrite the remaining text without the opportunity of consulting my editor.

Led by William Casey, the CIA in early 1982 decided regardless of the legalities to stop my book. It attempted to do this by reclassifying everything of substance that was in my first chapter. When I pointed out

that Executive Order 12065, then in effect, Section 1-607 said "Classification may not be restored to a document already declassified and released to the public under this order and prior orders," the PRB responded in essence that that was tough.

The PRB had ruled that I could not discuss my training or the training site at Camp Peary even though such topics had been declassified and well publicized. More oddly, the PRB ruled that details of the personality test it gives recruits were classified. Yet a proprietary company had copyrighted and published the test. Also, Jack Anderson's column had carried, in over 1,000 newspapers, those same details that the CIA was claiming were classified.

I appealed those and other decisions to Admiral Inman, then the deputy director of the CIA. He recognized the total illegality of the Board's decisions and ruled in my favor in every single instance.

The CIA, however, was determined to prevent publication of my expose. It ruled that the entire second chapter was classified. I contacted *The Washington Post* and the subsequent public exposure forced the CIA to relent. If the story had not run it would have been the end of my book. Embarrassed by the *Post's* article, the PRB assigned a representative to again work with me over the classified items, and I again rewrote and resubmitted the manuscript. Finally in mid-1982, after more than five years of struggle, I had a cleared manuscript.

From my experiences I conclude that the CIA, reacting as any bureaucracy, uses prepublication review and spurious claims of national security to prevent the American people from learning of its illegal and embarrassing operations. It attempts to deny to the American people information essential to the good of the nation and to our democratic processes. The CIA's efforts demonstrate what we can expect from other agencies given the same authority under President Reagan's executive order.

The national security state regards truth as its greatest enemy and cries national security to destroy our freedoms. I fervently hope that something can be done to prevent this from happening.

Ralph W. McGehee is a former CIA agent. He is the author of Deadly Deceits: My 25 Years in the CIA. This article is adapted from testimony he gave in the House of Representatives in hearings on 1984: Civil Liberties and the National Security State. McGehee's testimony was submitted to the PRB for clearance.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-1WASHINGTON POST
18 January 1984

Reagan Set To Build a Space Post

Manned Station Would Orbit Earth, Do Multiple Duty

By Philip J. Hilts
and David Hoffman
Washington Post Staff Writers

President Reagan is expected to announce next week, in his State of the Union message, plans to build a manned space station to orbit the Earth with permanent, rotating crews of astronauts, according to White House officials.

NASA, which has been lobbying strongly for the space station, presented the agency's plans to the president on the same day he spoke to astronauts in the Spacelab orbiting in the space shuttle last month.

NASA Administrator James N. Beggs has sought the space station as a science laboratory, astronomical observatory, space manufacturing center, servicing facility for spacecraft and an assembly site for larger orbiting structures.

It "could represent a fundamentally new and versatile capability to support activities in space over the next 30 years," he has told Congress.

But the estimated \$8 billion to \$20 billion cost of the station that would be orbited in 1991 or 1992 has triggered intense opposition in the administration and among some scientists. The Department of Defense, the CIA and the space science board of the National Academy of Sciences either oppose construction of the station or are neutral. The president's Office of Management and Budget has strongly opposed the project, according to administration officials.

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and CIA Director William J. Casey have opposed any major commitment to space station funding because they fear it could draw money from their own space programs, officials said.

Military and intelligence agencies are concerned that they would have to share the space station with civilian agencies such as NASA and sometimes with the astronauts of other countries. The Pentagon would prefer to operate on its own in space.

Officials on both sides of the argument say that, from the point of view of space hardware development, a manned space station is the next logical step. Other major steps to follow, such as establishing a base on the moon or sending a man to Mars, are usually seen as taking off from a space station rather than from Earth.

A recent study by the Office of Technology Assessment, the technical arm of Congress, provided another motive for building the station. That report said that the Soviet Union is embarked on an ambitious space station program, and the Soviets are slowly but methodically pulling ahead of the United States in creating a permanent human presence in space. The report pointed out that the United States lacks such a national goal for space.

Beggs said that initial funding for the space station could amount to \$100 million in the fiscal 1985 budget, but the funding would increase rapidly over the subsequent few years. The space station would be made of a series of linked modules carried into space by the shuttle. It would house up to eight men and women at a time.

During the budget battles in the administration, when NASA turned to others for support, it found little enthusiasm in some agencies.

When the National Academy of Sciences space science board was asked whether basic research in science would "require or be enhanced by the space station," said Thomas M. Donahue, chairman of the space board, the answer was no.

Though scientists could use the space station if it were launched,

Donahue said, on scientific grounds alone "I don't think you could ever really justify \$20 billion for a space station."

"Just like the Apollo [manned moon landing] program, it could go ahead for reasons other than science. That was not driven by scientific reasons. The purpose of Apollo was to establish the preeminence of of the U.S. in a visible technological enterprise. It was a response to a challenge from the Soviet Union," he said.

He added: "Of course, the challenge now is not so great, and we're putting up something in 1991 that is

pretty close to what the Soviets already have up there."

The space station could also damage space science programs, as the space shuttle has, he said.

"The shuttle has seriously damaged the space science program," Donahue said. The reason is not the shuttle, but that "it has been delayed so long. Meanwhile, other means [of conducting experiments in space] have been phased out. Space science has been waiting. Money was spent keeping teams at NASA and in industry marching in place. Money was going to this, rather than" space science such as planetary missions and the exploration of Halley's comet when it comes by.

Robert Laudise, of ATT's Bell Laboratories and a member of the space science board, said, "The conclusion of the materials scientists [in industry] is . . . don't build a space platform on our account. The experiments, you could do cheaper in other ways, and many you could do on Earth."

Laudise said that materials science—such as growing crystals for computer chips or making new alloys—would be fascinating in space, but probably not worth the huge cost because it is unlikely to lead to any real manufacturing in space for decades.

"I personally think [a manned space station] is a fine idea," he said, but it cannot be justified scientifically, only on political and psychological grounds, he added. He said the nation needs to feel on top of the

ASSOCIATED PRESS
16 January 1984

FILE ONLY — D

WASHINGTON
Briefing Papers
BY DAVID GOELLER

A House subcommittee chairman, his investigation apparently stalled, announced on Wednesday the indefinite postponement of public hearings into how Carter administration documents reached Ronald Reagan's 1980 campaign organization.

"Because of the issues and the persons involved, there is potential for public hearings to degenerate into partisan bickering and a media extravaganza," said Rep. Donald J. Albosta, D-Mich., who had planned to start hearings Jan. 26.

While Albosta talked of his desire to avoid that "potentially circus atmosphere," a source familiar with the investigation said it simply had come up dry in an attempt to identify anyone in the Carter White House who may have passed documents, including campaign debate materials, to the Reagan camp.

Albosta said the investigation still would try to obtain written statements under oath from unidentified individuals in an effort to clear up "serious unresolved conflicts" in statements made to House investigators and FBI agents, who conducted a separate probe.

But essentially the House investigation "all fell apart," said the source, who spoke only on condition he not be identified. "I'm aware of no evidence of any crimes being committed."

Among the unanswered questions in the case is who slipped the Carter materials to the opposition, and at who's, if anyone's, request.

The White House has long acknowledged that Reagan's campaign received documents prepared to ready Carter for a pivotal debate against Reagan a week before the 1980 election.

James M. Baker III, the White House chief of staff, has said that he received copies of the briefing papers from the campaign director, William Casey.

Casey, now CIA director, has said that he does not recall ever seeing the briefing papers during the campaign.

Last November, Albosta said classified documents had been found in Reagan campaign files by investigators working for his human resources subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

But the source who discussed the case on Wednesday said he knows of no classified documents, beyond several State Department papers dealing with Iran that reached the Reagan campaign from at least two people — Rep. George Hansen, R-Idaho, and an attorney representing some of the U.S. Embassy personnel taken hostage in Iran.

The contents of these documents were not secret by the time the campaign received them. Excerpts previously appeared in French and U.S. newspapers, and Hansen inserted them into the Congressional Record several months before personally giving Reagan copies of the documents.

Asked about the source's statements, Albosta said through an aide that "the postponement of hearings has nothing to do with the amount or quality of information discovered by the subcommittee."

Packed With Optimism

By Jacqueline Trescott

The well-heeled supporters of Ronald Reagan, who last night were enjoying a raw bar and each other's company, didn't need a pep talk or a cheerleader's yell, but W. Clement Stone came up with a couple anyway.

The first was based on the multimillionaire's philosophy of positive mental attitude. "How is your PMA?" Stone asked the 100 onlookers, coaching them to answer with "terrific." They did, and he had them repeat it.

"How do you feel? I feel healthy. I feel happy. I feel terrific," he again exhorted. When the crowd had repeated that slogan three times, Stone said, "Let's talk about the campaign."

The '84 campaign requires money, and last night's gathering was for the frontrunners of Republican contributors—the members of The President's Committee, a part of the Citizens for the Republic. The political action committee was founded by Ronald Reagan in 1977 with leftover campaign coffers of \$1 million, and Stone, a Chicago insurance executive, is the chairman of the select group.

The members, who each gave up to \$5,000 for the GOP cause, are in town for two days of meetings, a White House tour and a closed-door reception tonight with President and Mrs. Reagan. Last night the committee members and their spouses met at the Capital Hilton to talk informally with Cabinet and Cabinet-level appointees.

Many of the guests, who included Elizabeth Dole of Transportation, Donald Hodel of Energy, John Block of Agriculture, James Miller of the Federal Trade Commission, Thomas Pauken of ACTION and Gerald Carman of the General Services Administration, were asked to sign a red-leather, gold-embossed photo album of the administration, titled "The First Reagan Administration." Each contributor received a copy.

Edwin Meese, counselor to the president, was signing for Annette and James West, a real estate contractor from Pittsburgh, and tried to play down reports that he might be switching jobs. "I have heard those stories for three years and I don't pay them any attention," he said, smiling.

Generally, the administration officials and the party's financial backers talked about how well the GOP would do in November, even though the president isn't expected to announce until Jan. 29.

This PAC, however, doesn't spend money on presidential elections. "We are out there to find the supporting cast," said Curtis Mack, the executive director. The group, said Mack, has spent "about \$1.4 million over

the last three election cycles. This year, as in the past, 80 percent of the people we support are nonincumbents."

John Henry Dudley, a retired businessman and banker from Los Angeles, said he didn't have any doubts the president will win. "The president says 'you can't knock success,'" said Dudley, acknowledging that Reagan used the phrase most recently to compliment Jesse Jackson on his Syrian mission. Dudley

plans to give \$25,000 to several Republican funds; \$5,000 is the federal limit that may be given to each fund.

Lee Donald Taicher, the president of Caressa Inc., a shoe company, was donating for the first time. "I'm so impressed with the job he is doing I wanted to contribute to the experi-

Robert Liebeskind, a radiologist from Plantation, Fla., said one of Reagan's strengths is that "he has brought pride back to being an American."

Sunday's televised debate among the Democratic contenders, many in the crowd felt, had only helped the president's cause. "I think it was very encouraging for the president. The competition isn't that tough," said Donald Devine, the director of the Office of Personnel Management.

"That was something every voter in America should see," said Lyn Nofziger, the general chairman of Citizens for the Republic and currently on leave two days a week to work on the Reagan-Bush reelection effort. "It showed the strength of Ronald Reagan."



16 January 1984

FILE ONLY

WASHINGTON

REAGAN'S IMAGE HELPS SHIELD HIM FROM CONTROVERSY

BY HELEN THOMAS

President Reagan's image as "an honest, straight-forward man" has helped shield him from a number of controversies that have forced more appointees out of government than at any time since Watergate, aides say.

Part of Reagan's ability to avoid personal involvement while appointees are falling by the wayside is because "when he was elected people wanted to see him succeed," said David Gergen, departing communications director. "They don't hold him personally responsible because they like him." Gergen also acknowledged there are "definite attempts" to protect Reagan when controversy emerges.

"There are a lot of lieutenants to give blood, but only one five-star general," Gergen added. "When there is a bruising battle, someone else should be out in front."

The list of presidential appointees who quit under fire in the last 12 months includes Interior Secretary James Watt; Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Anne Burford, plus a raft of other EPA officials; Lynn Helms, who resigned as head of the Federal Aviation Administration when past business practices were questioned, and Paul Thayer, deputy secretary of defense, who left the No. 2 Pentagon post to defend himself on stock manipulation charges. Richard Allen, Reagan's national security adviser, departed earlier amid controversy.

Others who have survived allegations of wrongdoing and stayed on the job include Labor Secretary Raymond Donovan, whose business associations were under investigation, and CIA Director William Casey, who failed to fulfill full financial disclosure requirements.

White House spokesman Larry Speakes said Reagan "comes across as an honest, straightforward man" and the public does not link him to allegations against his appointees.

He said the only time he thinks the White House was hurt was when the daily airing of the charges against Allen and Mrs. Burford "went on so long." The "longer it drags on," Speakes said, the more it can touch the presidency.

"I think it's an important asset for him (Reagan) to be above the fray," Gergen said, adding that Reagan's predecessor, Jimmy Carter, "was too much involved in everything."

Gergen also believes the March 1981 attempt on Reagan's life gave him an "additional aura."

Reagan's own sense of privacy also "has kept him in good shape," and that is "part of his staying power," Gergen said.

CONTINUED

2.

Once in a while, when news stories get under his skin - particularly if they involve a friend -- Reagan drops his guard. He made it clear he thinks both Mrs. Burford and Watt got a "bum rap."

Speaking of Mrs. Burford's critics, Reagan said, "Frankly, I wonder how they manage to look at themselves in the mirror in the morning."

More recently, Reagan rose to the defense of U.S. Information Agency Director Charles Wick, a close friend from Hollywood days, who acknowledged taping conversations other officials, including White House chief of staff James Baker.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 6NEW YORK TIMES BOOK REVIEW
15 January 1984STAT
STAT

Did Agca Act Alone?

By Edward Jay Epstein

THE PLOT TO KILL THE POPE

By Paul B. Henze.

216 pp. New York:

Charles Scribner's Sons. \$14.95.

THE TIME OF THE ASSASSINS

By Claire Sterling. A William Abrahams Book/

264 pp. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. \$14.95.

ON May 13, 1981, Mehmet Ali Agca, an escaped murderer from Turkey, raised a pistol above his head in the piazza in front of St. Peter's Basilica in Vatican City and shot and wounded Pope John Paul II. Captured at the scene by Italian police, he freely admitted firing the shots and was tried and sentenced to life imprisonment. Mr. Agca had previously confessed to the political assassination of a well-known newspaper editor in Istanbul and in February 1979 he had threatened in a letter to kill Pope John Paul II, whom he accused of being "the Commander of the Crusades" against Islam. So, investigating agencies and the media quickly concluded that he acted as a lone fanatic when he shot the Pope.

Now two well-documented books strongly dispute this conclusion. Paul Henze's "Plot to Kill the Pope" and Claire Sterling's "Time of the Assassins" are both based on extraordinary investigations into Balkan intrigues. They both relentlessly trace the assassin's trail to Rome, beginning with his dramatic escape from prison in Turkey in November 1979, and following his passage through Iran, Bulgaria and Germany. They give similar descriptions of the final arrangements for the assassination, saying that Mr. Agca was picked up at 3 P.M. that day by a Bulgarian intelligence officer and airline official named Sergei Antonov who was accompanied by two Bulgarian diplomats. They handed him a gun and drove him to St. Peter's Square to shoot the Pope. Both authors reach the same conclusion — the papal assassination had been organized and controlled by the Bulgarian secret service on behalf of the Soviet Union's security agency, the K.G.B., and Mr. Agca merely served as a paid gunman.

These books also proceed from a common origin, the Reader's Digest. Mr. Henze, who was the Central Intelligence Agency station chief in Turkey from 1974 to 1977, was hired in the summer of 1981 by the Reader's Digest

to investigate Mr. Agca's background in Turkey and his connections to Bulgaria. After Mr. Henze had completed his original investigation, Mrs. Sterling was retained by the Reader's Digest to prepare a magazine article about Mr. Agca. She then conducted her own inquiry, drawing on high-level sources in Italian intelligence she had used for her last book, "The Terror Network." Her article, published in September 1982, reopened a debate in the media about whether Mr. Agca really did act alone.

Mr. Henze continued to fuel the controversy by selling his research on the Bulgarian connection to other news organizations, including NBC (which broadcast its own White Paper on the plot in September 1982) and Newsweek. He made it available later to The New York Times for a fee. He also wrote articles under his own name in The Christian Science Monitor and Encounter. Both Mr. Henze and Mrs. Sterling then expanded their investigations into these two books. In her autobiographical account, Mrs. Sterling focuses on press and government reactions to her disclosures about the assassination attempt. Mr. Henze writes about the wider geopolitical context and motivation of the assassination attempt.

Although evidence, unlike acts of faith, is contingent on external circumstances, Mrs. Sterling and Mr. Henze both hold their evidence to be incontrovertible. Mrs. Sterling insists that the "logic [is] inescapable," that Mr. Agca had "come to Rome as a professional hit man, hired by a Bulgarian spy ring," and Mr. Henze places the existence of the plot "beyond debate." Although they both rely on the Turkish journalist Ugur Mumcu's investigation into the Bulgarian connection and repeatedly cite him as a source, they do not even contend with the very different answer he arrives at based on very much the same evidence. Mr. Mumcu concludes in his book, "Agca Dosyasi," that Mr. Agca attempted the assassination not on behalf of the Bulgarians or the K.G.B. but for a neofascist Turkish terrorist organization called "The Grey Wolves" (whose members literally howl like a wolf pack). Mrs. Sterling does not even mention his conclusion, or his book about Mr. Agca, while Mr. Henze pre-emptively dismisses the book on the grounds that Mr. Mumcu is a "leftist."

Mrs. Sterling and Mr. Henze base their theory that the Bulgarians arranged the assassination attempt on three main findings. First, they show that Mr. Agca received considerable assistance from Turkish fugitives for many months after he escaped from the Turkish prison where he had been confined in 1979 — including money, a faked passport, hideouts, contacts and the weapon to use against the Pope. Then they establish that the immediate source of this support was a group of Turkish arms smugglers based in Bulgaria. Finally, they demonstrate that these Turkish smugglers had close liaisons with the Bulgarian secret service.

To be sure, they support these findings with convincing arguments and evidence. Even if these three layers of conspiratorial connections are fully accepted, how-

CONTINUED

WASHINGTON POST
14 January 1984

Chief of Staff Baker Affirms Intention Not to Serve in a Second Reagan Term

By Lou Cannon

Washington Post Staff Writer

White House chief of staff James A. Baker III, telling a home-state newspaper what he long has been saying to his friends, has declared that he doesn't intend to stay in his job if President Reagan is reelected.

"I think the president would be better served by someone else in this job in a second term," Baker said in an interview with the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Baker's comment reflected what other White House officials consider the open secret that he wants out of a job he once said he intended to hold for only two years. Last month Baker considered an exploratory proposal by a group of baseball owners that he become major league baseball commissioner, replacing Bowie Kuhn.

Yesterday, in the wake of the Star-Telegram story, Baker's friends and associates reiterated that he would be more than willing to stay with the administration for a second term, but not in his present post. He has complained about the long hours and the demanding nature of the job.

Both Baker and White House counselor Edwin Meese III are considered prospective replacements for Attorney General William French Smith, if he should step down in a second term. Baker is also known to be interested in becoming secretary of state, defense or treasury, or CIA director if William J. Casey should leave that post.

White House spokesman Larry Speakes, asked about the reports yesterday, observed that both Baker and deputy chief of staff Michael K. Deaver had talked repeatedly about leaving during the last 1½ years and that neither had left.

"They both serve at the pleasure of the president, and I think Baker will be here as long as the president wishes him to be here," Speakes said.

Both Baker and Deaver have been targets of administration conservatives, whose opposition surfaced at a critical time last October, when William P. Clark replaced James G. Watt as secretary of the interior. Baker and Deaver had worked out a plan, which President Reagan reportedly had accepted, that would have moved Baker into Clark's old job of national security affairs adviser and made Deaver the chief of staff.

But Clark and Meese, joined by Casey and Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger, opposed the proposal and persuaded Reagan to change his mind. Officials said that both Baker and Deaver were disappointed but agreed to stay on through the 1984 elections.

Since then, two high-ranking White House officials, both of them close to Baker, have left the administration. Kenneth M. Duberstein, assistant to the president for legislative relations, took a private lobbying job, and communications director David R. Gergen resigned to write and lecture at the Institute of Politics at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-17

WASHINGTON POST
12 January 1984

FEDERAL TRIANGLE

Nicaragua Aid Probe Resisted

The Justice Department said yesterday that it will appeal a federal judge's order that it investigate whether the Reagan administration is illegally providing covert aid to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.

U.S. District Court Judge Stanley Weigel in San Francisco ordered the department to investigate President Reagan, Secretary of State George P. Shultz, CIA Director William J. Casey, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and other high-ranking officials.

The government had argued that the Neutrality Act, which says the United States cannot provide aid to overthrow a government with which it is not at war, does not apply to actions authorized by the president.

The suit, filed by Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D-Calif.), a Nicaraguan citizen and a Florida woman who lives near paramilitary camps where Nicaraguan exiles have been trained since 1980, contended that the act does apply.

The judge also refused to delay the investigation until the government has a chance to appeal his ruling.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 4-3WASHINGTON POST
12 January 1984

FILE

Uncle Sam Tries to Get Synfuels Industry to Bloom in the Desert

By Milton R. Benjamin
Washington Post Staff Writer

DAGGETT, Calif.—In the midst of the arid Mojave Desert, the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corp. is attempting to make the synfuels industry bloom by sprinkling \$120 million in price supports on the Cool Water coal-gasification plant.

The project is no mirage. The 25-story plant, being built by a consortium that includes some of the nation's largest and most profitable companies, should be generating electricity by fall from coal converted into synthetic natural gas.

But, like a desert wisp, an elusive question rides the dry Mojave wind:

How did Cool Water, a demonstration project far smaller than the commercial synfuels plants that the Synthetic Fuels Corp. is supposed to aid, become the only project blessed to date with taxpayers' money?

The answer lies partly in the altered energy economics of today's global oil glut; partly in the short, unhappy life of the government-funded Synthetic Fuels Corp., and partly in the legitimate desire of private industry to take advantage of available government largess.

For the same reasons and in much the same way, the Great Plains coal-gasification plant, which is also being built by a consortium of large companies near Beulah, N.D., belatedly is trying on a far larger scale to get the Synthetic Fuels Corp. to ensure its profitability.

But, despite the controversy surrounding the bid by Great Plains, the Synthetic Fuels Corp.'s decision to aid the Cool Water project—less than one-20th the size of the North Dakota plant—raises questions some critics find equally troubling.

The Cool Water project was born in 1978. The Electric Power Research Institute—alarmed by soaring

fuel costs faced by American utilities—teamed with Texaco Inc. and Southern California Edison in planning an innovative facility that would produce synthetic gas and burn it to generate electricity.

Texaco had developed a coal-gasification process that promised to be more efficient than the German Lurgi process, which will be used at Great Plains. And the Cool Water project represented an opportunity to test the gasification process on the largest scale to date. Texaco agreed to put up \$45 million.

General Electric Co., which has developed much of the instrumentation and equipment, and Bechtel Power Corp., the prime engineering contractor, were brought in as equity partners. They each agreed to put up \$30 million.

All three huge firms clearly hoped that the experience they would gain from their investment in Cool Water would give them a competitive leg up in designing, constructing and operating other plants of this kind.

Southern California Edison, a huge utility in the nation's most environment-conscious state, was interested in a plant that could use coal and yet emit virtually none of the sulfur or nitrogen oxides viewed as a leading contributor to acid rain. The utility was in for \$25 million.

A consortium of utilities and manufacturing companies from Japan, which also relies heavily on coal, came in for \$30 million. Also, the Electric Power Research Institute put up \$95 million.

While Cool Water was viewed as a demonstration project that would operate for 7½ years, the soaring oil prices of 1979 and 1980 led the partners to believe that they might have the best of all worlds: a research endeavor that did not lose money.

"The economic studies that were run indicated that part way through

the 7½ years we would cross the line and become economically competitive with oil and gas," said program manager Wayne M. Clark.

But then came a leveling in oil prices. Suddenly, the economics of Cool Water looked less attractive.

So the consortium turned to the Synthetic Fuels Corp. for aid.

The problem, however, was that the corporation, endowed with \$15

billion by Congress to encourage development of a "commercial" synfuels industry, legally was not supposed to help research and demonstration projects.

In 1981 the Synthetic Fuels Corp. told Cool Water that it was ineligible for aid because it was not a commercial synfuels plant. What's more, many staffers reportedly believed that Cool Water's well-financed sponsors would proceed with the research effort without federal assistance.

Then came the global oil glut and falling oil prices. Many of the early synfuels dreams that the Synthetic Fuels Corp. had envisioned financing—the huge Hampshire project near Gillette, Wyo., and the even larger Breckinridge project in Kentucky—began to fall by the wayside.

By late 1982, three years after the Synthetic Fuels Corp. had been set up with \$15 billion to give away, it had begun to appear that the corporation faced the embarrassment of launching, as its first project, a controversial scheme to produce methanol from a peat bog in North Carolina.

Not only were eyebrows raised about the peat, which many viewed as a dubious synfuels resource compared with the nation's vast reserves of oil shale and coal, but there was

talk about the North Carolina project's sponsorship, which included Ford administration officials and CIA Director William J. Casey.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE F-10NEW YORK TIMES
11 January 1984

Judge Rules on Nicaragua Rebels

Special to The New York Times

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 10 — A Federal judge here has refused to reverse a ruling directing Attorney General William French Smith to study charges that the Reagan Administration's support of Nicaraguan insurgents violates the Neutrality Act.

The judge, Stanley A. Weigel, who had handed down his original ruling on Nov. 3, denied a Justice Department request for a reversal. He rejected the argument that the executive branch was not subject to the 1794 act, which makes it a criminal offense to furnish money or prepare for a military enterprise against a country with which the United States is at peace.

[In Washington, John Russell, a spokesman for the Justice Department, said the Government would seek a stay of the ruling from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco and would also file an appeal of the judge's decision.]

Judge Weigel had asked the Attorney General for an inquiry in response to a lawsuit filed July 8 by the Center for Constitutional Rights in New York and the National Lawyers Guild in San Francisco on behalf of Representative Ronald V. Dellums, a California Democrat, and two private citizens.

Concern Over Undeclared War

If, on investigation, information provided the Attorney General were to show violations of the Neutrality Act, Judge Weigel said today, "there is a danger that, unless the violations be terminated, the nation may be involved in a war not declared by Congress."

In the lawsuit, the plaintiffs said they provided information to Attorney General Smith on Jan. 27, 1983, charging President Reagan and members of his Administration with approving a covert plan of the Central Intelligence Agency to finance and take part with

Nicaraguan exiles in attacking and seeking to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government from training camps in six states and from bases in Honduras in violation of the Neutrality Act.

The plaintiffs said that the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 required the Attorney General to investigate charges on receiving specific and credible information that a Federal official had violated the law. Agreeing, Judge Weigel ordered the Attorney General on Nov. 3 to conduct such an investigation within 90 days or appoint a special counsel to do so as provided by the Ethics in Government Act.

In asking for a reversal, the Government argued that the Neutrality Act was meant to apply to the adventurism of private citizens and not to the executive branch in making foreign-policy decisions. Judge Weigel rejected the argument, holding that history and judicial precedent "demonstrate the reasonableness of the view that the act applies to all persons, including the President."

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE B-6

NEW YORK TIMES
10 January 1984

Transcripts Said to Show Wick Taped Journalists

By JANE PERLEZ

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9 — The director of the United States Information Agency, Charles Z. Wick, today gave two Congressional panels 81 transcripts and four tape recordings of his telephone conversations as well as notes from 83 conversations.

The transcripts included conversations Mr. Wick had with the acting chairman of one of the committees, and with two television journalists, Walter Cronkite and Sander Vanocur, a committee member who saw the transcripts said.

At the same time, Mr. Wick acknowledged in a written statement that he had given "misinformation" about his practice of tape recording telephone calls without always informing the other party.

In his statement, Mr. Wick's first comment on his secretly taped telephone conversations since he denied the practice, then acknowledged it two weeks ago, he said that "my anxiety and faulty recollection" had resulted in the "early confusion."

The transcripts were delivered today to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in two black binders by the agency's general counsel, Thomas E. Harvey, and Mr. Wick visited both panels today. The information agency, which runs the Voice of America, disseminates information about the United States abroad.

'A Very Dumb Thing'

In comments after visiting the Senate panel, Mr. Wick said: "I did a very dumb thing. Now I can see that."

In his statement he said he now understood that "taping of others without their consent is unfair, invades their privacy and can lead to other, more dangerous practices." He asserted that he had used "recording equipment in the way others use written notes."

Mr. Vanocur, a correspondent for ABC News, and Mr. Cronkite, the former CBS News anchor, were taped by Mr. Wick, according to a person who saw the transcripts.

The transcripts included a conversation Mr. Wick held with the acting chairman of the House committee, Representative Dante P. Fascell, a committee aide said.

The discussion, in February last year, before Mr. Fascell, a Florida Democrat, became acting chairman, involved the agency's budget over

which Mr. Fascell's subcommittee has jurisdiction, the aide said.

Other transcripts included conversations with "prominent Government and media people," a member of one of the two committees, who asked to remain anonymous, said after viewing them.

A committee aide said staff members, after an initial review, had concluded that "most" of the transcripts, notes and tapes were made without permission from the other party.

Mr. Harvey asked the House committee to classify the transcripts and tapes as "executive session material," which then could not be released publicly until the U.S.I.A. agreed, a committee staff member said.

The request, contained in a letter that Mr. Harvey wanted the committee staff to sign, was refused, the aide said. He said none of the material was classified on national security grounds.

Access to Material Limited

But in respect to Mr. Wick's "right to privacy," the committee was allowing only a few staff aides and members of the committee to review the material until it was determined what was in it, the committee aide said.

Mr. Wick, who met with the House committee staff for two hours, was asked whether he had taped President Reagan, Mrs. Reagan or William J. Casey, the Director of Central Intelligence, the aide said. Mr. Wick denied ever taping any of them, the aide said.

President Reagan strongly backed Mr. Wick last Friday, saying he could understand how Mr. Wick had forgot-

and Congressman

ten always to inform his callers of the taping.

Among those Mr. Wick is known to have secretly recorded are the White House chief of staff, James A. Baker 3d; Walter Raymond, a member of the National Security Council; Kenneth L. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and two members of his staff, Casper Weinberger Jr., and John Hedges, who have since left the staff.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 11NEW YORK
9 January 1984

FILE ONLY -JCI

Casey Tips His Nephew

CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICAN Larry Casey is hoping that some political intelligence will help him win Long Island's 3rd Congressional District seat this year. The insider's input has come from his uncle Bill—C.I.A. Director William Casey.

The super-spook, who comes from Roslyn Harbor, ran for the seat himself in 1966, with teenage Larry on his campaign team. Casey lost the primary, but that doesn't worry his



Casey: Getting good advice.

nephew, who recently told *New York*, "Bill's given me private advice, and that's been helpful."

The 34-year-old lawyer, chief of staff for Congressman George Wortley, of Syracuse, said he would decide this month whether to challenge Robert Mrazek, the Democrat who won the district from John Le Boutillier in 1982. That election was "a rejection of Le Boutillier, not an endorsement of Mrazek," young Casey contended.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-5WASHINGTON POST
9 January 1984

FILE ON

Timing of Visit Poses Questions In Debate Case

By Howard Kurtz
Washington Post Staff Writer

A political consultant who has been questioned about whether he gave President Carter's debate briefing book to Ronald Reagan's then-campaign manager, William J. Casey, visited Casey at Reagan headquarters three days before the 1980 presidential debate, according to sources familiar with the investigation.

Paul Corbin, a consultant whose Democratic ties go back to the Kennedy administration, signed in at Reagan campaign headquarters on Oct. 25, 1980, three days before Reagan met Carter in the televised debate that was widely regarded as a turning point in the campaign, sources said. They said Corbin wrote in the office log that he was there to see Casey, now CIA director.

The visit came one day after the Reagan-Bush Committee wrote a check to Corbin for \$1,500 for what Federal Election Commission records describe only as a "field trip." Investigators are trying to determine whether Corbin was paid on Oct. 24 or went to the headquarters the next day to pick up the check. The Reagan committee also paid Corbin \$1,360 on Nov. 3 for "professional services and phone," according to the FEC.

United Press International reported yesterday that it had obtained a copy of the Reagan campaign's reception desk logs and that they show Corbin signing in to see Casey at 9:35 a.m. on Oct. 25, 1980, and departing 10 minutes later.

A House Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Donald J. Albosta (D-Mich.), is looking into the timing of Corbin's visit and whether it might be related to the question of

how the Reagan campaign obtained documents and information from the Carter White House. The panel is to begin hearings Jan. 26.

Republican congressional aide Tim Wyngaard has told the FBI that Corbin claimed last spring that he had given Carter's briefing papers to Casey before the 1980 presidential debate, The Washington Post reported recently.

Corbin has declined to comment on the matter, but associates of his have said he denies ever obtaining the Carter briefing papers or making such a claim to Wyngaard. Corbin's attorney, Herbert J. Miller, declined to comment yesterday.

Casey has strongly denied that he received the Carter papers from Corbin or anyone else, calling such suggestions "totally false." Casey has said that confusion may have arisen because Corbin did give him a six-page memo from a New York lawyer outlining possible statements Reagan might make in the debate with Carter. Casey also has said he is a friend of Corbin's and authorized the campaign to pay Corbin for routine political work in Florida.

CIA spokesman George Lauder said yesterday that Casey is cooperating with the investigation and will have no further comment.

CONTINUED

Keith Corbin
Guard/Receptionist on duty

VISITORS LOG #1

Date
10/25/80

Visitor's name (printed)	Visitor's signature	Office visited	Staff sponsor	ID no.	Time in	Time out
Richard J. McNamee	Richard J. McNamee	Pres	LEE TRAXLER	248	8:45	6:30
WAYNE CIMONS	Wayne Cimons	Pres	LEE TRAXLER	221	8:45	X
Myron M. Ward		Pres		225	7:45	X
John Daniels			Campaign '80		8:45	11:15
Bruce Rogers	Bruce Rogers	Sched	Scheduling	175	9:00	X
Mary Keall	GAC	Pres	Research	236	9:10	5:15
Tom WHITE	White	Computer	Computer Support	197	9:15	5:15
J. Newbauer	J. NEWBAUER	Scheduling	Kay Beccol	241	9:20	X
Wesley Almon		3rd floor			9:21	9:25
Tom COOKE	Thomas M. COOKE	3rd floor	Julie COOKE	48	9:30	9:45
Alice Anne English	Alice Anne English	Pres	M. C. English	257	9:35	9:45
PAUL CORBIN	Paul Corbin	Casey	Casey Carter	208	9:35	9:45
Theresa Hobbard	Missy Hobbard	Tuition	Susan Summell	269	9:40	12:00
Paul R. Logan	Paul R. Logan	Reception	LABOR	242	9:40	6:15
J. Carl			Tuition Sponsor			
MARLA REMER	Marla Remer	Supplies	Diana Remer	223	9:00	11:15
M.B. Williams	M.B. Williams	Aspen	Sharon Hawthorn	252	9:00	11:30
Don		Casey	Casey Carter	118	11:00	5:25

United Press International

Visitors log from the Reagan campaign headquarters lists Corbin's visit to Casey as the 12th entry for Oct. 25, 1980.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE B-7

NEW YORK TIMES
9 January 1984

FILE ONLY *mc*

Briefing-Book Figure Called on Casey in '80

WASHINGTON, Jan. 8 (UPI) — Three days before Ronald Reagan met President Carter in a crucial debate in 1980, a political consultant who has been questioned about how Mr. Carter's debate briefing book was passed to the Republican team visited the office of the Reagan campaign chief, William J. Casey, it was learned today.

Copies of reception desk logs from Reagan campaign headquarters show that Paul Corbin, the consultant, signed in at 9:35 A.M. Oct. 25, 1980, and listed his destination as "Casey." Mr. Corbin departed 10 minutes later.

A Republican Congressional aide, Tim Wyngaard, told the Federal Bureau of Investigation recently that Mr. Corbin, a political maverick, boasted last spring that he gave the Carter debate briefing book to Mr. Casey. Mr. Corbin has denied doing so.

Investigators for a House Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee looking into the passing of Carter White House papers to the Reagan campaign are interested by the timing of the Corbin visit and have questioned both Mr. Casey and Mr. Corbin about it.

Mr. Casey, now the Director of Central Intelligence, did not return calls on the matter. A spokesman, Dale Peterson, said Mr. Casey was "cooperating with the F.B.I. and Congressional investigations and has no comment at this time."

Mr. Corbin was not available for comment.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-4WASHINGTON TIMES
9 January 1984

FILE ONLY

Reagan's support of Wick cools dispute over taping

By Jeremiah O'Leary
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

Just as U.S. Information Agency Director Charles Z. Wick's candle seemed in danger of flickering out in one of Washington's periodic media hurricanes, he got the only vote that counts in the White House — from President Ronald Reagan, his long-time friend.

Mr. Reagan has seen enough of these firestorms in the past three years — Alexander Haig, Richard V. Allen, Anne Burford, Paul Thayer, William J. Casey and his former deputy at CIA, Max Hugel, Labor Secretary Raymond Donovan, Interior Secretary James G. Watt, Joseph Canzeri, Kenneth Adelman and more — to know that sometimes the victims are reduced to ash. It may be that the president also remembers the watchword of the late Rep. Sol Bloom that, "One, with God, is a majority."

President Reagan acted decisively over the weekend to declare that Mr. Wick is secure in his job at USIA despite the clamor over his foolish practice of surreptitiously taping some of his phone calls, including two calls to the White House chief of staff, James A. Baker III. Clad in a Marlboro Country lumberjacket as he was embarking for a weekend at Camp David, Mr. Reagan strode over to the waiting press and settled the question of Mr. Wick's future, if not the controversy.

He acted after counselor Edwin Meese III had said, "As far as I am concerned, I would consider it (taping calls) unethical in my own case. The president himself does not record telephone conversations and I think that Wick and others do not either any more." Mr. Meese appeared to be seconding an earlier statement by Mr. Baker in which he described the practice as "not good ethics."

Taping phone calls and conversations has been on a par with wife-beating or cheating

at cards in this town ever since the disclosure of Oval Office taping helped drive the final nail into former President Richard M. Nixon's coffin. The late President John F. Kennedy did it, too, but he was long dead before the press and public knew of it.

Mr. Reagan gave Mr. Wick his unequivocal vote of confidence in the nick of time with the press slaving for the transcripts of some 200 Wick conversations being delivered today to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by USIA. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee also will get a set. All this

guarantees leakage on the scale of the Johnstown flood before the cock crows thrice.

The president said, "I don't think that Charles Wick is a dishonorable man in any way. The nature of the things that he was recording — and I can understand his forgetting sometimes when he was talking to people, particularly that he knew — but the purpose of that was different than it is from someone that is trying to keep a record on other people's conversations. What he was actually trying to do was to be able to immediately transcribe so that he could provide the suggestions that were being discussed to the people who would have to implement them.

"Let me just say this: He has done a splendid job. I think the Voice of America, the whole United States Information Agency, is far superior to anything that has ever been and he's going to continue there."

Mr. Wick's most serious offense in Washington terms may have been that he did not level with The New York Times when he was asked about any phone tapings. That was dumb. The New York Times already had been given some of the transcripts and promptly waved them to Mr. Wick and its readers.

In fact, what Mr. Wick did is a violation of federal regulations, according to the General Services Administration, and at least two of the calls to Mr. Baker may prove to be a felony according to a Florida state law. The practice is not prohibited in the District of Columbia. The USIA's counsel, Jonathan W. Sloat, advised his boss in a 1981 memo that taping calls is improper if the other party on the line is not made aware of the recording. Mr. Sloat submitted his resignation last month.

But beyond all that, unless there are bombshells yet unknown in the transcripts bound for Capitol Hill, Mr. Wick has survived this dip in the piranha pool. So have Messrs. Casey, Donovan and Adelman.

Mr. Wick's style and flamboyance do not appeal to everyone. But for all intents and purposes, Mr. Reagan seems to have tilted the scales for his old pal and the Wick-hunt is not now likely to end up with the USIA director burning at the stake.

FILE ONLY

WASHINGTON

CONSULTANT VISITED CASEY'S OFFICE THREE DAYS BEFORE DEBATE
BY GREGORY GORDON

Three days before Ronald Reagan met President Carter in a crucial 1980 debate, a political consultant who has been questioned about how Carter's debate briefing book was passed to the GOP team visited the office of Reagan campaign chief William Casey, it was learned Sunday.

Copies of reception desk logs from Reagan's campaign headquarters, obtained by United Press International, reveal consultant Paul Corbin signed in at 9:35 a.m. on Oct. 25, 1980, and listed his destination as 'Casey.' Corbin departed 10 minutes later.

A Republican congressional aide, Tim Wyngaard, told the FBI recently that Corbin, a political maverick who performed some work for the 1980 campaign as well, boasted last spring that he gave the Carter debate briefing book to Casey. Corbin has denied doing so.

Investigators for a House Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee looking into the passing of Carter White House papers to the Reagan campaign are intrigued by the timing of Corbin's visit and have questioned both Casey and Corbin about it.

A former Carter White House clerical aide has said he photocopied a dozen to 15 copies of the thick, domestic section of the Carter briefing book on Oct. 23.

But congressional investigators have been unable to prove any transfer of Carter documents occurred during Corbin's trip to the Reagan offices in suburban Virginia. Casey and a lawyer for Corbin have declined comment on the matter.

'It's been my position that we have nothing to explain, and consequently I have no comment' on Corbin's visit, said Herbert J. Miller, Corbin's Washington attorney. Miller previously has asserted his client has done nothing wrong.

Casey, now the CIA director, declined to return calls from UPI. A spokesman, Dale Peterson, said Casey is 'cooperating with the FBI and congressional investigations and has no comment at this time.'

Corbin was not available for comment.

Federal Election Commission records show Corbin was paid \$2,860 by the Reagan campaign for work in Florida in the fall of 1980.

According to the records, the Reagan camp issued the first check - \$1,500 for a 'field trip' -- on Oct. 24, 1980, the day before Corbin went to Casey's office. The second check, for \$1,360, was dated Nov. 3, 1980.

White House chief of staff James Baker, who headed Reagan's debate strategy preparation, has said he recalls receiving a copy of the briefing book from Casey.

CONTINUED

Casey has denied ever seeing the briefing book, insisting he "wouldn't touch it with a 10-foot pole." The Washington Post recently quoted sources close to Casey as saying his "conscience is clear" and that he is willing to submit to a polygraph examination to prove his innocence in the briefing papers mystery.

Rep. Donald Albosta, D-Mich., chairman of the House subcommittee, has acknowledged the panel considers the Casey-Corbin connection one of the "important leads" in its inquiry and that he has not ruled out exercising the panel's authority to administer lie detector tests.

Congressional sources, however, said the use of polygraphs would be precedent-setting, and such plans probably would be quashed by resistance from Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino, D-N.J., and other members.

Albosta has scheduled the long-delayed start of hearings climaxing his subcommittee investigation for Jan. 26, but has declined to disclose witnesses who would be asked to testify under oath and warned of the penalties for perjury.

Possible witnesses would include Baker, who has cooperated with the subcommittee; Casey, who has said he does not recall seeing the briefing papers; and Corbin, who sources have described as uncooperative.

Asked if Corbin would be a willing witness at the hearings, Miller, his attorney, said he has "not been notified" Corbin's testimony would be requested and declined further comment.

In a story in its December issue, Nashville Magazine quoted Corbin as saying he was hired by the 1980 Reagan campaign to organize the east coast of Florida and that he reported to Casey and Baker fewer than six times each. The magazine quoted Corbin as saying he was paid only \$1,800 in reimbursed expenses.

PAUL DUKE: Good evening with reporters Charles McDowell of the Richmond Times Dispatch, Lee May of the Los Angeles Times, and Hedrick Smith of the New York Times.

DUKE: And something special -- a story of the plot to kill the pope, and how the United States is conspiring to cover up the plot. This from Claire Sterling, a free-lance journalist stationed in Rome.

DUKE: Let's pay, let's pay attention now to Claire Sterling who is a renowned American journalist who has lived abroad for many years and is a recognized authority on terrorism. Claire, among other things, you have advanced the theory that there is no question that there was a plot to kill the pope three years ago, that there is no question there was a Bulgarian connection, that through that there was a Soviet involvement, and now you're saying that there's a massive cover-up on the part of American intelligence authorities and other Western democracies. I think, first of all, we'd like to ask you basically what, what do we know about the plot against the pope?

STERLING: Well, we know that this hit man, this Turkish hit man, had a pure right-wing terrorist image, part of it authentic, part of it cultivated, and that he was taken out of prison for where he was on trial for another murder to which he had confessed in Turkey. He was taken out of prison by right-wingers who happen to also work for a Turkish arms mafia based in Sofia, sponsored by, controlled by, and supervised by the Bulgarian secret services. This is documented knowledge: that the Turkish mafia operating out of Sofia brought him to Sofia, got his false passport, supplied him with money, sent him on his way to Rome, using then in Europe other right-wing gray wolf terrorists operating in Europe, who happened also to be couriers working for the Turkish mafia pushing heroin. So that they were employees of the Turkish mafia which was, in turn, controlled, still is controlled by--and this is documented, I repeat--by the Bulgarian secret service, so that we also know the plot is established. I mean, it is impossible that this man was a loner. Not only impossible, it's been ruled out by Italian courts. He was not a loner. He was not crazy. He was perfectly sane. He was a professional hit man. This man, this was decided at the beginning by the Italian courts.

DUKE: So it was all carefully planned to kill the pope? So if we know all this, why hasn't it been broadcast all over the world?

STERLING: Well, I ask you, you know, but it's not just the pope. This is, this is the culmination of many years of, of a cult of disbelief for one thing on the part liberals in the West who cannot bring themselves to believe that the Soviet Union is capable of at least as black deeds as the United States. And this in turn has been encouraged by the kind of word that's been handed out to the press by members of the U.S. intelligence community primarily, although it's true of all the West, who have, who have been denying the Bulgarian connection because, I think, they... First of all, the president wanted to have a summit meeting with, with Andropov, who was head of the KGB when this hit was ordered and is now the head of the Soviet Union, and because the whole theory of detente is, if you say out loud what you know about the underside of Soviet policy, you destroy or threaten detente or what is left of it. And therefore, silence, as far as the public is concerned, the public should not know, must not know.

MCDOWELL: Claire, Ronald Reagan is president of the United States; a man named Bill Caseys is head of the CIA--the most conservative anti-Soviet political figures we've

The Ethical Dimension of Covert Action

By Anne C. Rudolph

Never before has the United States engaged in such prolific and costly covert operations. Under the Reagan administration and CIA Director William Casey, the mission and morale of the Agency's clandestine services has been rejuvenated after the decimation suffered under the Carter Presidency. A *Newsweek* report last fall stated that the House Intelligence Committee is informed of 12 to 14 covert operations, seven or eight of them considered major, as compared to two or three covert operations undertaken during the Carter years (here "major" is defined as any covert operation costing between \$5 million and \$7 million).¹ With the resurgence in activity comes serious questions regarding the prudence, efficacy, and propriety of American intelligence operations.

Yet, most of the questions in the public debate concerning covert operations revolve around purely pragmatic considerations regarding the degree to which covert operative capability enhances our national security interests. Policy makers who favor a U.S. role in the manipulation of events hesitate to recommend a covert campaign because of the risk of exposure and the political drawbacks of a leaked operation.

In a survey on intelligence and covert operations administered to career intelligence professionals, over two-thirds of those surveyed regarded covert operations as essential to diplomacy, but with the caveat that such activity be undertaken only as a last resort before war.² Many stated the marginal benefits may not be worth the costs involved. They argued the costs occur when covert activity pre-empts a policy-making role or injures U.S. integrity abroad.

Considering the outcome of a covert action is necessary to the decision to engage in such an operation, but such thinking does little to assist the policy maker in reasoning and justifying the

intention to initiate covert action. These purely consequentialist considerations escape thoughtful motives for operations and offend liberal democratic principles when secrecy impairs accountability. The calamities incurred due to a foreign policy divorced from ethical reasoning may be the most avoidable threat to our national security.

Abandoning all covert activity, as the Church Committee recommended in 1975, would be imprudent. There are just causes for the U.S. to retain some covert operative capability. But the increase in scope and intensity of activities commands attention to the ethics of intelligence operations. The utility of moral reasoning to the policy maker is vital to process competing moral claims that confound clear and consistent reasoning in the debates over covert actions. Claims based on U.S. responsibility beyond its own borders challenge principles of self-determination in the decision to intervene in another country.

But the statesman need not be doomed to moral dilemmas, nor must citizens accept a compromise of ethical standards to accommodate perceived national purpose. The moral reasoning of a policy maker must reveal intentions, question means and act as a process to deal with the competing moral claims in answering the question: under what circumstances is covert action morally justifiable?

The guideline for reasoning must transcend a Cold War rationale of stopping the Russians. A formula is required that goes beyond the baseline rules of "don't make things worse" and "don't get caught" to include deontic, or obligatory, rules that incorporate national and transnational values.

Decisions to engage in covert activity based wholly on consequential considerations lack the moral integrity of deontic rules. For instance, assured success of a covert campaign does not merit our intervention if there lacks a just cause to intervene. The consequentialist approach may be tempting for a superpower that can reasonably insure the

ends results from the means; however, it may also invite condemnation of U.S. aggression from abroad.

The reason to engage in covert activity must not be founded exclusively on deontic rules without considering the consequences. The principles of an open society should not preclude the use of secrecy when necessary, nor should the principles of liberty and justice be the guidon illustrating our prerogative to interfere in another country. Such reasoning would be detrimental to our national security interests or, again, invite hostilities from abroad.

This argument depends on a conceptual understanding of the meaning of covert activity as distinguished from secret or clandestine activity. Secret is the generic term for activity conducted without the knowledge of others. Clandestine connotes an intentional protection of secret materials, events, or people designed to remain secret indefinitely (e.g., names of agents).

Covert is understood as secret activity with a public manifestation. The public dimension may include a wide array of activity extending from political advice and counsel to paramilitary activities involving coups and assassinations. Covert action includes: financial support to a radio station or publication (usually pro-U.S.); subsidies to political parties; support to private organizations and labor groups; propaganda; training personnel; and economic operations (aid, arm sales). Generally, covert operations are designed to "alter political, economic and military realities."³

Conceptually, covert action is intervention of a secret kind. Understanding covert action in these terms provides for a useful framework with which to construct a moral argument. More specifically then, the question the statesman must now ask is:

- Can the obligation of the U.S. to intervene to influence the events of another country, while withholding such infor-

Continued