TAX CASE HELD UP FOR C.I.A. CONDUIT

Inquiry Into Kaplan Fund of New York Put Off 2 Years. but a Deal Is Denied

Bŷ E. W. KENWORTHY

Special to The New York Times WASHINGTON, March 4 An investigation of the J. M. Kaplan Fund of New York City by the Internal Revenue Service was held in abeyance for two years because the fund was serving as a conduit for money from the Central Intelligence Agency.

This inaction was acknowledged by tax agency officials when they testified in August, 1964, before the subcommittee on foundations of the House Seleet Committee on Small Business, headed by Representative Wright Patman, Democrat of

However, the officials insisted at that time, and insisted again this week, that the tax agency had not been a party to any arrangement between the Kaplan Fund and the intelligence agency.

'A Sensitive Matter'

They also insisted then, and again this week, that the Kaplan Fund had been given "no immunity," as a result of its C.I.A. connection, from the possibility of having its tax-exempt status revoked or having to pay tax penalties if it were found to be in violation of the law.

Mitchell Rogovin, who was then the revenue service's liaison with the intelligence agency, told Mr. Patman, in explaining the delay, that the use of the Kaplan fund by the C.I.A. was "a' sensitive matter."

"We were dealing with it in

result," Mr. Rogovin said.

Kaplan fund case: (

On March 29, 1957, after) lengthy investigation, Donald R. Moysey, district director of the tax agency for lower Manhattan, notified the Kaplan fund that there was "substan- there were no conferences with tial basis" for revoking its taxexempt status and that it had recommended revocation-"retroactively and prospectively"to the agency's commissioner in Washington.

The reasons given were that the Kaplan fund "was never intended to be from its inceppurely charitable, educational cated that the fund's operations with the C. I. A. was the or other exempt purposes" that it had not operated as such, and that it had borrowed large sums from its creator, J.M. Kaplan, for business and trad-Kaplan, for business and trading purposes.

The Kaplan fund protested this finding, as it was per- sion of the Justice Department; mitted to do,

dation.

Then, on March 24, 1900, Kenneth W. Moe, successor to Mr. Meisels as the direction of Washington, overrode the carlier findings and notified the fund that its returns for the years 1952 through 1956 would regarding their dealings with status for 1951 through 1959. be accepted and its exemption the Kaplan fund."

The Washington office again upheld for those years.

Audit for '57-'60 Begun

However, in January, 1961, the lower Manhattan director began an audit of the Kaplan fund for 1958 through 1960.

It is not clear from the Patman subcommittee hearings; whether the intelligence agency, the fund would be made public made the conduit arrangement ... "he added, with the fund in 1959 or 1960. Mr. Rogovin said the intelliwith the fund in 1959 or 1960. But it seems clear that the arrangement was not put into effect until 1961.

In that year, the fund received \$308,950 from five foundations that Mr. Patman characterized as C.I.A. frontsthe Gotham Foundation, the Michigan Fund, the Andrew Hamilton Fund, the Borden Trust and the Price Fund. The a sensitive fashion, and there Kaplan Fund contributed the same amount to the Institute of International Labor Research,

> In 1962 the Kaplan Fund delivered to the labor institute \$220,000 it received from the Price Fund, Edsel Fund, Beacon Fund and Kentfield Fund - all characterized as fronts.

In 1963, the labor institute was some time delay as a received from the Kaplan Fund agency officer, explained the This is the background of the aplan fund case:

On March 20 1077

In 1964, the year of the Patman hearings, the Kaplan Fund ceased being a conduit.

Meanwhile, according to information furnished Mr. Patman by the Kaplan fund's attorney, the revenue service between agency by tax exempt organ.
July 26, 1962, and July 28, 1964,
about the fund's financial transactions in the years 1957 to 1960

Testimony in 1964

M. Kaplan Fund has been carried out until after the Patoperating as a conduit for chan-cling C. I. A. funds and indi-

Patman and Mr. Rogovin, who is now Assistant Attorney General in charge of the tax divi-

Q. Did the C. I. A. ask the I. iR. S. for its opinion as to On Jan. 7, 1958, the new dis-trict director, Raphael Meisels, be used as a conduit to chanupheld the original recommen- nel C. I. A. funds? A. It did not, to the best of my knowledge.
Q. Did the I. R. S. recom-

conduit to channel C. I. funds? A. Again, not to the best of my knowledge.

of the intelligence agency's in-terest in the Kaplan fund "when they contacted us to indicate that they had been led to be-

whether or not their interest in

gence agency had told the tax service that it had not been aware of the examination of the Kaplan fund that had been going on then for at least six

Unanswered Question

It was never made clear why the intelligence agency did not have this knowledge, or why, when it learned of the situation 'n late 1961, it continued to use the Kaplan fund for two more

When asked about this yes terday, a former high official of the tax agency said, "It's amazing."

And on official in the general counsel's office of the intelligence agency, asked why

But a former intelligence

decision this way.
"They [the C.I.A.] didn't 'know of the I.R.S. trouble. They didn't even look at [Kaplan's] 990-A's." The 990-A is the listing of assets, income from investments and contributions received and disbursed that must be filde with the tax

After learning of the trouble in 1961, the formed intelligence officer said, a decision was; Mr. Patman said that "Mr. made to stop using the Kaplan Rogovin [the tax service liaison made to stop using the Kaplan man] informed us that the J. fund, but the decision was not

He said the intelligence agen-

In the four years 1961 through 1964, the intelligence agency also used the David, Josephine and Winfield Baird Foundation of New York to channel \$4,56,-800 from front foundations to number of organizations. chiefly the African - American Institute, the American Friends of the Middle East and the Inmend to the C. I. A. that the ternational Development Foundation.

It did this despite the fact that in March, 1959, the New York district director of the Mr. Rogovin went on to say York district director of the that "the C. I. A. did not ad-tax service proposed revocation

In late 1961, he continued, the overruled this recommendation, tax service first became aware but only after the D-J-W Baird Foundation and two other Baird foundations - Winthrop Baird Foundation and Lansing Foundation-agreed to distribute all leve that an audit was being their assets to be fide char conducted of the Kaplan fund." table organizations and dissolution were concerned as to themselves by Dec. 31, 1965. their assets to boa fide charitable organizations and dissolve

This agreement has not yet been effected because the D-J-W Baird Foundation is contsting in Tax Court the gov-ernment's claim of \$1,341,679 in taxes for the years 1960 to 1964, and the Winfield Baird Foundation is contesting an assessment for the same years of \$4,235,063.

Similarly, because of a tax case involving a. Kaplan company - Jemcap, Inc.-the tax agency has not completed the audit of the Kaplan foundation for the years 1958 to 1963, which it told Mr. Kaplan would be finished by July 31, 1965.

However, the Jemcap case was settled in February, 1966, for \$450,000, and officials said: today that the whole question of the Kaplan foundation's taxexemption had been reactivated.

characterized as fronts.

I telligence agency, asnew will the Kaplan fund had been selected when it was in trouble less Rogowin Mitchell Approved For Release 2005/01/05 in the fax service faid 7000 703040036-54.3 (general)