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FILES ON CITIZENS

Helms Reportedly Got Surveillance Data in
Charter Violation

By SEYMOUR M. HERSHEY
Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, Dec. 21—The Central Intelligence Agency di-
rectly violating its charter, conducted a massive illegal dom-
estic intelligence operation during the Nixon and Ag-

The disclosure of alleged illegal C.I.A. activities is the first and foremost of rumors that have been circulating in Washington for some time. A number of mysterious burglaries and incidents have come to light since the break-in at the Democratic party headquarters in the Watergate complex on June 17, 1972.

The Watergate matter was added to the Great American Espionage scandal by the appointment of the Watergate Memorial Group—"The Watergate Memorial Group"—by the C.I.A. as part of its effort against dissenting Americans in the late nineteen-sixties and early nineteen-seventies, the sources said. The C.I.A. also set up a network of informants who were ordered to penetrate antiwar groups, the sources said.

At least 80 of the people involved with the C.I.A.'s domestic intelligence program, according to sources, had information on the activities of antiwar groups.

One official, who was directly involved in the initial C.I.A. inquiry last year into the alleged domestic spying, said that Mr. Helms and his associates were unable to learn what Nixon knew, if anything.

Colby refused to comment on the domestic spying issue. But one clue to the extent of his feelings emerged during an off-the-record talk he gave Monday night at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.

The C.I.A. chief, who had been informed the previous week of the inquiry by Mr. Colby, said at the meeting that he had ordered a complete investigation of the agency's domestic activities and had found some improprieties.

But he is known to have added, "I think family skeletons are best left where they are— in the closet."

Colby, these men said, while continuing the same basic programs initiated by his predecessor, was viewed by some as a "harder man."

He was described by an associate as one who is determined and disturbed by what he discovered at the C.I.A. upon replacing Mr. Helms.

"He said himself to me in a conversation..." the associate said. "He was having a grenade blowing up in his face every time he turned around."

The Ellsberg Affair

Mr. Schlesinger was at the C.I.A., the first time an agency official had been arrested in connection with the Watergate burglary, according to sources. The letters which the White House government official to the White House intelligence report to the Justice Department which has been de-

The associate said one result of Mr. Schlesinger's inquiries into Watergate and the Watergate scandal is the effort to keep him from questioning Mr. Colby, who is in charge of the Watergate investigation.

Many past and present C.I.A. men acknowledged that Mr. Schlesinger's reforms were harder to bear because he was an outsider.

Colby, these men said, while continuing the same basic programs initiated by his predecessor, was viewed by some internal critics as the "saving force" at the agency because of his former high-ranking official himself in the C.I.A.'s domestic intelligence services.

But it was because of the prod-
ing from below, some sources have reported, that Mr. Colby decided last year to inform the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Oversight Committee of the domestic activities.

Mr. Schlesinger, who became Secretary of Defense after serving less than six months at the C.I.A., similarly refused to dis-

"There's certainly been no..."
order to destroy them," one official said.

When confronted with the Times's information, C.I.A. officials repeated this week, high-ranking C.I.A. officials confirmed its basic accuracy, as the United Nations confirmed by drawing.

"We are not aware of any plans for coup activities against American citizens," one official said.

"Any plans that we have are being closely monitored by the United Nations," another official said.

The official said that the requirement to maintain files on American citizens was considered by some to be a violation of the 1947 statute and a clear example of an activity, even if involving foreign military forces, from which the C.I.A. is barred.

Professor Ransom was asked if he had not learned of any clandestine domestic C.I.A. activities while he was in the White House.

Rustin Disagrees

Mr. Rustin took vigorous exception to a suggestion by intelligence officials that his White House domestic intelligence plan resulted in increased pressure on the C.I.A. to collect domestic intelligence.

"There was nothing in that program that directed the C.I.A. to do anything in this country," Mr. Rustin said.

The official said that the C.I.A. contribution to the Housing plan was in the foreign intelligence field.

A Spooky Way

"The problem is that it was never a very spooky way," he said.

If you're an agent sitting in a car in New York City and you're not sure whether Jane Fonda is being manipulated by foreign intelligence services, you've got to ask yourself who is the real target," the official said.

Government intelligence officials did not dispute that assertion, but explained that, nevertheless, the C.I.A.'s decision to maintain domestic files on American citizens was "obviously a push at that time."

"Yes, you can say that the C.I.A. contribution to the Housing plan was in the foreign intelligence field," one official said.

The official and others insisted that all domestic C.I.A. operations against American citizens had been authorized, and that instructions had been issued to assure that they could not occur again.

A number of well-informed official sources, in attempting to minimize the implications of alleged wrongdoing ascribed to the C.I.A.'s domestic actions, suggested that they were in connection with the so-called "gray" area of C.I.A.-F.B.I. operations.

American citizens is approached by a suspected foreign intelligence agent.

The legislation setting up the C.I.A. makes the director "responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

One official with close access to the C.I.A.'s domestic activities said length in an interview yesterday that the C.I.A.'s domestic activities were not governed by the agency's legal right to prevent the possible revelation of secrets.

"Gray Areas"

"Look, you run into gray areas," the official said, "and, unquestionably, some of this falls in the gray area where the director does have an obligation to guard his sources and methods. You get some foreign snooping around and you have to keep track."

"Let's suppose as an academic exercise, hypothetically," the official said, "that a foreign agent goes in and says to a Washington newspaper office: 'I've got you. What do you do? Do you do?'"

"Sure, the C.I.A. was following the guy, but he wasn't an American." A number of other intelligence experts, told of that example, described it as a violation of the 1947 statute and a clear example of an activity, even if involving foreign military forces, from which the C.I.A. is barred.

Professor H. Rowan Ransom of Vanderbilt University, considered a leading expert on the C.I.A. and its legal and congressional authority, said in a telephone interview that in his opinion the 1947 statute included "a clear prohibition against any internal security function, under any circumstances."

Professor Ransom said that his research of the congressional hearing at the time the C.I.A. was set up made him aware of tics and tactics intended to avoid the possibility. Professor Ransom said he had put that idea aside during floor debate, "We don't want a Gestapo."

Two months ago, Rolling Stone magazine published a similar list of more than a dozen unsolved break-ins and burglaries and suggested that they might be linked to as yet undisclosed C.I.A. or F.B.I. activities.

Senator Howard B. Baker Jr., Republican of Tennessee, who was vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has publicly spoken of mysterious C.I.A. links to Watergate. The Nixon transcripts of June 23, 1972, show President Nixon saying to H. R. Haldeman, his chief of staff, "Well, we protected Helms from one hell of a lot of things." The remarks, commented upon by many officials, would indicate President Nixon's knowledge of the C.I.A.'s domestic activities.

The possible Watergate link to one of many questions posed by the disclosures about the C.I.A. that the Times sources say they believe can be unraveled only by extensive congressional hearings.

The C.I.A. domestic activities during the Nixon Administration were directed by Mr. Colby and he was still in charge of the Counterintelligence, Department, the agency's most powerful and mysterious unit.

As head of counterintelligence, Mr. Colby is in charge of maintaining the C.I.A.'s "sources and methods of intelligence," which means that he and his men must ensure that the foreign intelligence agents do not report to the C.I.A.

The Times's sources, who included men with access to first-hand knowledge of the C.I.A.'s domestic programs, sharply criticized Mr. Colby for his sharp exception to the official suggestion that the agency's domestic activities were the result of legitimate mimeograph-counterintelligence needs.

"Look, that's how it started," one man said. "They were looking for evidence of foreign involvement in the antiwar movement. That's when it all went downhill."

"Maybe they fumbled with a check on Fonda," the source said.

"But the whole thing just sort of broke down." They're all been in antiwar rallies and take photographs, which is breaking on going even on before the尼克松计划.

Highly Coordinated

"There wasn't a series of isolated events. It was highly coordinated. People were targeted, specifically. They had a list of people they were after," the source said.

"They never said who was targeted, but it looked like it was all related," the source said.

"They were all at the same event," the source said.

"The whole thing was run out of the Nixon White House," the source said.

"The whole thing was run out of the White House," the source said.

"The whole thing was run out of the White House," the source said.

"The whole thing was run out of the White House," the source said.

"The whole thing was run out of the White House."
these things if the F.B.I. isn't doing them as well as they should, as there are no other facilities.

The Times's sources, reflecting the thinking of some of the more C.I.A.-tilted New York Times columnists, call the "red flag" inside the agency, "the whole cynical leadership of Mr. Helms.

These junior officials are known to have been pushing the domestic spying on antianwar activists originated as an ostensibly legitimate counterintelligence operation to determine whether the antiair movement had been penetrated by foreign agents.

In 1969 and 1970, the C.I.A. was asked by the White House to determine whether foreign governments were supplying counterintelligence to the antianwar radicals and Black Panther groups in the United States. That investigation was conducted by C.I.A. officials who reportedly did not know of the alleged secret counterintelligence activities, concluded that there was no evidence of foreign support.

"It started as a foreign intelligence operation and it bureaucratically grew," one source said. "That's really the answer.

The source added that Mr. Angleton's counterintelligence department was simply using the same techniques for foreigners against new targets here.

Along with assembling the domestic intelligence dossiers, the sources said, Mr. Angleton's department was recruiting informants to infiltrate some of the more militant dissident groups.

"They recruited plants, defectors and double agents," the sources said. "They were collecting information and had a lot of counterintelligence information, you use all of those techniques.

"It was like a little F.B.I. operation.

This source and others knowledgeable about the matter agree. One source said that Mr. Angleton was permitted to continue his domestic operations because he was using the power he wielded into the agency as a director of counterintelligence.

As the group that is charged with investigating allegations against C.I.A. personnel made by foreign agents who defect, in other words, it must determine whether a C.I.A. man named by a defector is, in fact, a double agent.

Victor Marchetti, a former C.I.A. official, said in a book published last year that "counterintelligence staff operates on the assumption that the agency has been penetrated by a number of elements of the United States government." It is well known that the C.I.A. has penetrated the agency at various levels.

"The chief of the C.I.A. staff [Mr. Marchetti did not identify Mr. Angleton] is said to have a list of possibly 30 or so key positions in the C.I.A. which are most likely to have been infiltrated by the opposition, and he reportedly keeps the persons in these positions under constant surveillance.

Dozens of other former C.I.A. "men talked in recent years with editors of the New York Times..."
PROXMIKE TO SEEK INQUIRY ON C.I.A. OVER ROLE IN U.S.

Calls for Helms to Resign as Envoy after Reports of Domestic Dossiers

PROTESTS WIDESPREAD

Reaction Is Strong Among Congress Members and Ex-Intelligence Aides

By SEYMOUR M. HERSH

WASHINGTON, Dec. 22 — Senator William Proxmire called today for the resignation of Richard Helms, former Director of Central Intelligence, as Ambassador to Iran and said he would demand an investigation by the Justice Department of alleged domestic spying by the C.I.A.

The New York Times reported this morning that, according to well-placed Government sources, the C.I.A., in direct violation of its charter, had mounted massive, illegal intelligence operations during the Nixon Administration against members of Congress and former Intelligence officials of an investigation and hearings.

The Times's sources said that the C.I.A. under Mr. Helms had established intelligence files on at least 10,000 American citizens. Mr. Helms was named Ambassador to Iran in February, 1973, after heading the C.I.A. since 1966. Today again, he could not be reached at the embassy in Tehran for comment.

Ready for a Trip

Charles Cline, the duty officer at the embassy, said he had seen Mr. Helms this morning and relayed a message from The Times, the third in three days, asking for comment on the report.

"He's right now," Mr. Cline said. "He's getting ready for a trip."

It was understood that Mr. Helms, as a matter of policy, was reluctant to address a sensitive subject by long-distance telephone and had declined to accept calls from this reporter.

In today's report, the sources said that the C.I.A. had conducted dozens of illegal activities inside the counterintelligence operations against suspected foreign agents.

Under the 1947 law establishing the agency, all domestic intelligence functions, including those that were alleged to be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Proxmire has been a leading critic of the C.I.A. in recent years and has pressed for public disclosure of the secret C.I.A. budget and any legislation that would restrict the agency's activities.

He said in a telephone interview that the "all allegations indicate a systematic pattern of illegal activities that cannot be justified in the name of national security."

"Immediate and severe action is necessary," the Wisconsin Democrat said, "to preserve confidence in the intelligence establishment and, more importantly, to guarantee the rights of Americans under the Fourth Amendment."

Mr. Proxmire said he would write Secretary of State Kissinger to "ask for the immediate resignation of Ambassador Helms."

He also intended to write the Attorney General, the Senator said, "to ask for the prompt investigation of these allegations of illegal activities by C.I.A. agents, past or present, and the prosecution of every violation of the law."

Officials of the agency refused to comment today, but William B. Colby, the director of the C.I.A. since September, 1973, when he succeeded James R. Schlesinger, is known to have told associates recently that he was considering a request to the Justice Department for legal action against some of those who had been involved in the alleged domestic activities.

"An Outrageous Thing"

Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a telephone conversation that he was planning to write Mr. Kissinger requesting the return of Mr. Helms for questioning before the committee.

"This is an outrageous thing," said the Queens Democrat. "Heads are going to have to roll if these allegations are proved."

Mr. Rosenthal noted that the House Foreign Affairs Committee now had jurisdiction over C.I.A. matters with the Intelligence Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

Representative Lucien N. Nedzi, Democrat of Michigan, who is chairman of the Armed Services Intelligence subcommittee, said he wanted to look at the pieces. "I'm very concerned about it," Mr. Nedzi added.

Mr. Colby is known to have briefed Mr. Nedzi and Senator

John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, last year on the alleged domestic spying activities. Mr. Stennis, despite repeated requests, has refused to comment.

Increasing Attack

It could not be learned whether Mr. Neldz or Mr. Stennis shared their knowledge with other members of the Senate and House Intelligence subcommittees, whose supervision of C.I.A. activities has come under increasing attack inside and outside Congress.

Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, who is the second-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, indicated in a telephone conversation today that he had not been officially briefed on the alleged domestic spying.

"If the story is true," Mr. Symington said, "and I'm speaking as a member for many years of the subcommittee that is supposed to review the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, it simply verifies the point that I've been making for many years, namely, that this agency does not have good supervision, or review by the Congress, or poor review. It actually has no real review at all."

In an interview on radio in Raleigh, N.C., Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., the former chairman of the Senate Watergate committee who is retiring from the Senate, said he believed reports of alleged widespread domestic spying by the C.I.A.

The North Carolina Democrat said he had become aware of some unauthorized C.I.A. activities while serving with the Watergate select committee and had decided not to pursue them.

"Most of it had no connection with Watergate and we had no authority to investigate anything but the Presidential election of 1972," Mr. Ervin said. "I wanted the Congress, unlike the C.I.A., to stay on the reservation."

Foreign Officials Comment

John A. McCone, a former Central Intelligence director, and Lyman B. Kirkpatrick Jr., a former executive director of the agency, urged Congress to hold a Senate and House hearing to investigate the alleged illegal domestic spying, according to the Associated Press.

"I don't think an accusation that is prominently displayed as this can be refuted merely on a denial by the agency itself," Mr. McCone said. "There should be a penetrating investigation either by the Congress or by President Ford's Foreign Advisory Board."

Mr. Kirkpatrick, now a professor at Brown University in Providence, R.I., said an investigation has now become inevitable.

The two former C.I.A. officials, who left the agency in the mid-nineteen-sixties, denied any knowledge of illegal domestic activities.

"In my connection as director of the agency and connection with it since," said Mr. McCone, "I never heard of a single instance where the C.I.A. stepped over its charter and involved itself with the responsibilities of the FBI."

NEW YORK TIMES
27 December 1974

Arrest of American Who Wrote of C.I.A. Reported in Saigon

SPECIAL TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

No official confirmation of the arrest or details of the charges could be obtained either from the Saigon Government or from the United States Embassy, which is usually informed of such action. But witnesses said they had seen Mr. Marks and an American traveling companion, Barbara Guss, taken into custody by policemen at the home of an American friend on Rue Pastour in Saigon.

Gathering Research

Mr. Marks was understood to have arrived in South Vietnam last Saturday to do a week's research for a magazine article that he is planning to write. In a recent conversation, he said that he had interviewed several members of the opposition, journalists, and had requested appointments with American officials.

He was stationed in Vietnam as a Foreign Service officer for 18 months, from 1966 until shortly after the Tet offensive in February, 1968. He then returned to Washington, where he was assigned to the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

C.I.A. Said Over Book

With Victor Marchetti, who had a 14-year career with the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Marks wrote the book, which the C.I.A. took legal action to have expurgated. The book, published by Alfred A. Knopf, appeared earlier this year with 188 passages deleted. A government request last March ruling reinstated 140 of the deletions, but the intelligence agency is appealing the decision.

The book deals in detail with the role of the C.I.A. in China. It says President Nguyen Van Thieu had frequent contacts with the agency during a program of assassination and torture used against suspected communists and Chiang Kai-shek's forces. That the C.I.A. deal in black-market Vietnamese currency..."
NEW YORK TIMES  
23 December 1974

Ford Forbids C.I.A. to Act Illegally in Domestic Field

BY JOHN HERBERS
Special to The New York Times

VAIL, Colo., Dec. 22 — President Ford said today that he had informed the Central Intelligence Agency he would not tolerate the agency conducting any intelligence operation within the United States in violation of its charter.

Mr. Ford made the statement in response to reporters’ questions aboard his Presidential jet as he flew here from Washington for a 10-day vacation.

He said he had had some “partial information” about alleged domestic activities by the C.I.A. under the Nixon Administration.

The President said he had informed the agency that “this Administration would not tolerate it.” He said that after reading a report of alleged domestic operations by the C.I.A., in the New York Times this morning, he received a call aboard the plane from William E. Colby, the Director of Central Intelligence, who assured him that “nothing comparable” to what was described in the article was going on.

“I told him under no circumstances would I tolerate any such activities under this Administration,” he said.

On Security Council

Mr. Ford has been President since Aug. 9, when he succeeded Richard M. Nixon, who was forced to resign as a result of the Watergate scandals. Prior to that, he was Vice President for eight months and a member of the National Security Council.

Mr. Ford, however, was not clear on several points. He did not say when he had learned of the alleged illegal operations, how much he knew about the intent or nature of the alleged violations, or what steps, if any, he may have taken to find out who was responsible.

He did not comment on the Times information that the agency kept 10,000 files on persons alleged to be involved in the antiwar movement. The C.I.A. charter bars the agency from domestic intelligence work.

Following is a transcript of the questions and answers aboard the plane:

Q. Mr. President, did you see the story on the C.I.A. in the

A. I read it there hurriedly. I got a call on the plane this morning from Bill Colby reassuring me that nothing comparable to what was

WASHINGTON POST  
23 December 1974

McConie Asks Ford, Congress To Probe Charges Against CIA

Former CIA Director John McConie and his executive director-controller, Lyman Kirkpatrick, yesterday urged President Ford and Congress to investigate charges that the Central Intelligence Agency mounted a huge campaign against antiwar forces in the United States during the Nixon era.

“I don’t think an accusation as prominently displayed as this can be refuted — surely on a denial by the agency itself,“ McConie said.

“Tfere should be a penetrating investigation either by the Congress or by President Ford’s Foreign Advisory Board.”

Mr. Ford told newsmen in Grand Junction, Colo., that he had received a telephone call from CIA Director William E. Colby assuring him that “nothing comparable to what was alleged in the article was going on over there and I told him that under no circumstances would I tolerate any such activities under this administration.”

asked whether he knew about domestic CIA surveillance before he saw the article in Sunday’s New York Times, Mr. Ford replied, “I had some partial information.” But he sidestepped questions whether the Nixon administration was responsible for CIA abuses of power.

Kirkpatrick, now a professor at Brown University said: “An investigation has now become inevitable.”

Both he and McConie denied, in separate Associated Press interviews, that any such program was under way when they ran the agency for several years through 1965.

If such a program, which The New York Times said included compiling intelligence dossiers on at least 10,000, was a serious citizen including a congressman, came into existencc, the intelligence experts blamed Nixon.

McConie said Nixon was “unduly agitated” about antiwar groups and might have issued direct orders, bypassing the normal agency channels.

“I was amazed to read the article, and in my connection as director of the agency and my connection with it since, I never heard of a single instance where the CIA stepped over its charter and involved itself with the responsibilities of the FBI,” he said.

“We had the closest possible relations with the FBI when I was there. What’s happened since, I don’t know. It’s en- out of character for the CIA to go beyond its charter. They (CIA) deal with foreign intelligence.”

Kirkpatrick backed up this statement.

“To the best of my knowledge,“ he said, “there was nothing like this. If they did something like this, they were doing something they had no right to do and I deplore it.”

The CIA gathers intelligence abroad and evaluates it at its headquarters in Northern Virginia. The FBI has an analogous task within the boundaries of the United States.

The former chief of the CIA’s intelligence division, Ray S. Cline, discounted the report of domestic spying by the agency, calling The New York Times article "a pastiche of little gossip not worth the paper in a phone interview with Washington Post reporter Marilyn Berger, the C.I.A. may well have kept a special file of names of Americans, that if it did exist, it was probably in connection with foreign intelligence activities.

Cline who joined the State Department in 1969, had left the agency by the time Nixon became President and said he could not vouch for what may have happened then. But he said he was 89 per cent certain that such domestic activities did not occur during his approximately 20 years with the agency, and convinced that if Nixon had asked Richard Helms, then CIA director, to perform such illegal acts, “Helms would have had the good sense not to follow such orders (to carry on) domestic operations . . . He knows it’s illegal, improper.”

If the CIA has a file involving Americans, it could have been part of the normal sharing of information with the FBI, Cline said.
Congress looks again at U.S. secret agencies

By Robert P. Hey
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

- New charges of domestic surveillance made against the controversial U.S. Central Intelligence Agency come against this backdrop:
  - Newly awakened congressional determination to exercise its authority and oversee operations of the government's two most well-known intelligence-gathering organizations; the CIA and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Shortly after the new Congress convenes in mid-January, congressional committees are expected here to investigate these new charges against the CIA.
  - In the past two years, congressional committees have begun unprecedented probing into FBI and CIA activities - most recently CIA actions in "destabilizing" the Chilean Government of the late President Salvador Allende.
  - Growing revelations of incursions by government agencies into the privacy of Americans. Under attack have been the FBI, Army, and the White House "plumbers" during the Nixon administration. Barely a month ago, it was revealed that during the 1960's the FBI under the directorship of J. Edgar Hoover, had engaged in a widespread clandestine effort to disrupt domestic groups ranging from the U.S. Communist Party and other leftist groups to respected civil-rights groups and right-wing organizations. The FBI reports it has ended this program.

Army role exposed

In lengthy Senate hearings, Sen. Sam Ervin Jr. (D) of North Carolina, brought to light the Army's efforts during the 1960's to keep under surveillance and maintain individual files on thousands of Americans who had broken no laws. Included were prominent politicians. The Army says that this practice also has been discontinued.

From the White House "plumbers" came the break-in of the office of the psychiatrist of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg; wiretapping of a few Washington journalists, and the Watergate break-in against the CIA. According to U.S. law, the agency is supposed to operate only in foreign nations, leaving domestic U.S. activities to the FBI. But the New York Times reported Sunday that despite this prohibition, the CIA "conducted a massive illegal domestic intelligence operation" during the Nixon presidency against antiwar groups and other dissident U.S. organizations.

Citing unnamed "well-placed government sources" and its own investigation, the Times reported that a special CIA unit kept files on at least 10,000 Americans and that it reported directly to Richard Helms, then CIA director.

According to Watergate prosecutors, President Nixon urged top aides to try to get Mr. Helms and his deputy in the White House to get the FBI into ending one phase of its Watergate investigation on the pretext that CIA activities would be jeopardized. The CIA refused to go along.

CIA's domestic spying

Throughout the course of Watergate revelations, the question of Central Intelligence Agency involvement in domestic surveillance activities kept surfacing.

Sen. Howard Baker asked pointedly about it during the Senate Watergate hearings. The recruiting of James McCord, a former CIA man, for the Watergate break-in team, raised the question. A cryptic remark by Mr. Nixon on a June 23, 1972, tape recording alludes to success in protecting CIA chief Richard Helms from embarrassing revelations.

Systematic CIA involvement in domestic spying would clearly have been in violation of the CIA's 1947 charter, which reserves the surveillance of American citizens in the U.S. for the FBI.

Now the New York Times has sketched in the rough shape of the long-suspected secret CIA domestic intelligence operation against "dissident" Americans during the Nixon years. The report by Seymour Hersh puts the number of Americans under CIA surveillance at over 10,000 - and including members of Congress. The intelligence activities involved the maintenance of a computerized file for data collected by wiretapping and break-ins. The latter themselves would be illegal covert acts.

The report lacks crucial details like the names of citizens and congressmen spied upon, or details about the alleged break-ins or who authorized the operations.

But it indicates enough about the CIA domestic spying affair to pose a clear challenge to the new Congress to find out what went on and to consider revision of the CIA charter if needed.

It has been difficult all along to grasp how otherwise astute, otherwise experienced people could have gotten involved in the Watergate break-in. A judgment-warping suspicion of dissidents had led the administration to sponsor more than one illegal break-in. Did a pattern of CIA domestic spying actions make it easier for some agency personnel to go along with administration requests?

The public was told repeatedly by an administration resisting the Watergate investigation that the higher good of the republic, such as security considerations, was the basic motivation of the highly placed officials involved.

Instead of high matters of state, however, or substantive domestic or alien threats to the national well-being, only base or confused motives of the officials themselves were disclosed.

Unfortunately as it is to say so, there is no reason automatically to assume the CIA should be exempt from detailed scrutiny of what went on. We hope the new Congress will promptly take up the task.

WALL STREET JOURNAL

23 DEC 1974

- FORD ORDERED THE CIA to avoid intelligence operations inside the U.S.

The President said he had been assured by Central Intelligence Agency Director William Colby that the agency isn't currently involved in anything comparable to widespread CIA domestic spying alleged in a news report yesterday. Ford said he told Colby that "under no circumstances would I tolerate any such activities." The New York Times reported that the CIA violated its charter ban on domestic activity by spying on antiwar groups in the late 1960s and by other domestic espionage in the 1950s.

As Ford put it, "If he had heard of such activity before the article appeared, Ford said he had "some partial information" and "previously made clear that his administration wouldn't permit the CIA to go beyond its 1957 charter.

Former CIA Director John McCone said that when he headed the agency in the early 1960s he "never heard of a single instance where the CIA overstepped its charter" and got into activities permitted only by the FBI.

The congressional committee that oversees intelligence operations is expected to look into the allegations of past CIA transgressions as soon as the new Congress convenes.
Reports of Domestic CIA Spying Put Ex-Chief Helms on the Spot

By Patrick J. Sloyan
Newsday Washington Bureau

Washington—Disclosures of allegedly extensive and illegal Central Intelligence Agency spying inside the U.S. may leave former CIA director Richard Helms out in the cold.

At least that was the reaction of veteran intelligence officials inside and outside the agency which has come under increasing criticism for its involvement in Richard Nixon's Watergate scandal. Yesterday, the New York Times revealed that the agency, under pressure from Nixon, allegedly compiled dossiers on 10,000 Americans opposing administration policy in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The Times' account quoted "well-placed government sources" as saying that a special unit of the CIA reporting directly to Helms had conducted a massive, illegal domestic intelligence operation during the Nixon years in violation of the CIA charter. The Times also contended that a check of the CIA's files by Helms' successor, James R. Schlesinger, "produced evidence of dozens of other illegal activities by members of the CIA inside the United States, beginning in the nineteen-fifties, including break-ins, wiretapping and the surreptitious inspection of mail."

President Ford reacted yesterday by saying he had instructed Schlesinger's successor and the present CIA director, William Colby, that such activity was intolerable. Ford said Colby had called "meaningful comparable to what was stated in the article was going on over there, and I told him that under no circumstances would I tolerate any such activities in my administration."

On his way to Colorado, Ford was asked by reporters whether he had known about such activity before the Times' story, and replied, "I had some partial information." He did not elaborate. When he received that information, he said, "I indicated what I said here, that this administration would not tolerate it, and I was assured it did not exist."

Among those calling for an investigation was Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis), a critic of the CIA in recent years, who said the allegations "cannot be justified in the name of national security." He called for "immediate, serious action," and said he would seek the resignation of Helms from his present position as U.S. ambassador to Iran.

"It looks like they're going to use Helms as a scapegoat," said one expert on CIA infighting. "They're going to throw him to the wolves." The wolves in this case are members of congressional committees charged with overseeing CIA activities that, by charter, are limited to intelligence-gathering outside the U.S. In creating the CIA in 1947, lawmakers feared that if it were allowed domestic activities, it might turn into a second-division arm of the government.

Many critics argue that the CIA became just that under Nixon. One suggestion is that the CIA began gathering domestic intelligence after officials at the highest levels of the administration decided that FBI director J. Edgar Hoover was not cooperating. In 1970, Hoover was said to have refused to participate in a White House project calling for such illegal activities as burglaries or wiretapping against dissidents and antiwar activists.

According to the evidence made public by the Senate Watergate committee and the special Watergate prosecutor, the CIA:

- Blocked temporarily the FBI investigation of the burglary of Democratic national headquarters at the Watergate.
- Provided Nixon's "plumbers" with spy equipment to support the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.
- Compiled a psychiatric profile of Ellsberg that Nixon aides planned to leak to the press in order to smear the man who made public the Pentagon Papers.
- Supported Nixon's plan to have the CIA direct a national domestic-intelligence network to keep track of "enemies."

Those actions and the alleged compiling of dossiers were undertaken when Helms was directing the agency. Aides to the present director, Colby, have confirmed portions of the Times' account. More significantly, Colby has indicated that he may begin legal proceedings against agency officials involved in operations in the U.S. according to the Times. A CIA spokesman said the agency would not comment until the Times story had been studied.

"Colby knows better than anyone that people at the agency were just following Helms' orders," an agency veteran said. "If [Colby] starts rocking the boat, he knows Helms is bound to fall out."

Other agency officials contended that it was Colby's duty to clean house to protect the CIA from congressional cutbacks, even if it means exposing Helms' activities.

Another indication that Helms was in trouble was John Mccone's call yesterday for a "penetrating investigation" of CIA activities during Helms' tenure. Mccone is a former director of the CIA and the man credited with pushing Helms to the top spot. Mccone is a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and he urged that it look into charges against the CIA. The board, however, has no staff and is regarded in intelligence circles to be a puppet of the CIA director's office. "It looks like Mccone is doing what Colby wants him to," a CIA veteran said.

The Times also suggested the possibility that Nixon knew of the domestic CIA activity. In a White House transcript of a June 23, 1972, conversation between Nixon and H.R. Haldeman, his chief of staff, Nixon is quoted as saying: "Well, we protected Helms from one hell of a lot of things."

Mccone, who preceded Helms as CIA director, said the CIA did not overstep its charter during his tenure. He said he felt that Nixon had become "unduly agitated" about antiwar groups.

According to the Times' sources, the domestic-intelligence activities during Nixon's administration were directed by James Angleton, who is still in charge of the CIA counterintelligence department, which the newspaper described as the agency's most powerful and mysterious unit.

The paper said its sources in the CIA took sharp exception "to the official suggestion that such activities were the result of legitimate counterintelligence
needs. "Look, that's how it started," the Times quoted a source. "They were looking for involvement in the antiwar movement. But that's not how it ended up. This just grew and mushroomed internally."

The chairman of the Senate's defunct Watergate committee, Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), said yesterday he believed that both the CIA and Internal Revenue Service had been used during the Nixon administration to spy on disident groups and individuals.
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The Truth Is Needed

By Tom Wicker

President Ford has assured the American people that the Central Intelligence Agency is not now conducting domestic political surveillances in violation of its charter, and that no such activities will be tolerated while he is President.

But how does he know what the C.I.A. is doing? How can he be sure what it will do next year or if its officials are telling him the truth now? Even if they are, suppose a new President pays little attention to the C.I.A. after 1977? Ford is undoubtedly sincere, but in this case his assurances—the assurances of any President—are just not good enough.

Congress, the White House, the American people have been assured repeatedly that the C.I.A., barred by law from any operations within the United States, does not conduct such operations. Now The New York Times has published strong allegations that the agency did just that—and these allegations are supported by Mr. Ford's refusal to say that internal surveillances had not been carried on in the past, and by his concession that he had some of the information in The Times' article before it appeared.

The counterintelligence Department has the responsibility of checking on C.I.A. agents themselves to make sure they have not defected or become double agents, it is clearly hazardous for anyone within the agency to challenge or antagonize counterintelligence.

This many-chambered house of deceit, fear, power and intrigue must no longer be permitted to flourish in its own darkness. It is especially chilling to read, for example, that when James Schlesinger, briefly the agency's director, tried to halt all questionable counterintelligence activities in 1973, and cut back C.I.A. personnel, agency security officials increased the number of his personal bodyguards. If that is true, and if they felt they had reason, every nightmare vision of a shadowy C.I.A. menace will seem the more rational.

But how is the truth to be established? The agency can hardly be trusted to investigate and purge itself; and even if Mr. Colby did the job honestly and ruthlessly, the public could not be expected to accept one more in-house assurance of clean hands. Earlier Congressional and Presidential inquiries, moreover, have usually come dependent on the agency for information and have wound up in its pocket and pleas of its cause.

If President Ford means what he says, he needs the truth more than anyone else. He might come closest to getting at it if he appointed a special prosecutor, with full subpoena power and security clearance, independence such as that granted Leon Jaworski in the Watergate matter, and the mission of investigating every violation of law and its own charter of which any C.I.A. official may have been guilty.

Congress could provide legislation to give such a prosecutor an irresistible legal front. But if Mr. Ford merely accepts C.I.A. assurances instead of taking action to get at the truth, Congress ought to legislate its own special prosecutor. Either way, Congress could also begin the necessary studies of the agency's quarter-century of existence to see if it should be reevaluated, reduced or abolished.

The C.I.A. has functioned too long as its own watchdog, perhaps its own cop. Radical surgery was recently needed to remove the cancer that threatened the Presidency; and radical surgery will be needed just as desperately if a cancer called C.I.A. threatens American democracy itself.
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The Crisis Of Law

By Anthony Lewis

---BOSTON--- Dec. 22--- it is high political drama to learn that the Central Intelligence Agency conducted massive domestic spying operations in violation of its charter. The disclosure, by Seymour Hersh in The New York Times, has given the more profound implications for our view of law.

Here, on top of Watergate, is one more gross example of official crime of lawlessness among those sworn to uphold the law. And that lawlessness brings "terrible retribution," as Justice Brandeis warned nearly fifty years ago: "If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

When President Ford took office, one of his most urgent tasks was to restore public belief in the Government's respect for law. He made matters worse by his pardon of Richard Nixon. Then he unnecessarily degraded international legal standards by condoning surreptitious American aid to the anti-Allende forces in Chile.

ABROAD AT HOME

The corruption of the Nixon years would be the most restoring of symbols. President Ford has at least tentatively decided to appoint such a figure: Edward H. Levi, president of the University of Chicago and former dean of its law school. In character, in professional reputation, in philosophy, Mr. Levi is extraordinarily qualified to serve this President and to maintain the general faith in law.

But the appointment has run into objections from some Republican Senators, notably John Tower of Texas and Roman Hruska of Nebraska. It has therefore become a vital test of the President's understanding and understanding of the appointment of the integrity of this country's intellectual conservatives.

Edward: Levi would generally be
reckoned a conservative in his outlook as educator and lawyer. He is a deliberate man, reflective, with a distrust of instant solutions to hard social problems and an aversion for short cuts in the law.

"The misuse of law as but another device for leverage," he told entering law students, last October, "is profoundly corrosive. On an earlier occasion, he said with regret that the student protest movement, however sincere its feelings, had accepted the legitimacy of 'pressure, leverage, and violence.'"

Mr. Levi has been highly critical of student excesses, such as suppression of speakers with unpopular views. When violence came to the University of Chicago, he said that the day he called police on the campus, he would resign. He meant that calling in the police would signal its own failure failure to maintain the ideals of a university. The remark conveyed something of his values and his view of personal responsibility in a free society.

In the continuing debate on the role of the Supreme Court he is on the side of caution. He said last year that the Court has a very great responsibility, when it interprets the law, "not to destroy the legislative process or the citizen's feeling of participation in the determination of public matters." He used the context of a subversive law on law and morals to criticize the recent decisions on abortion and capital punishment.

Mr. Levi is a quiet man with an understated ironical manner. Anyone who sits at the bar or the law schools around Sidewalk Levi will find a remarkable respect for him, whether or not his views are shared. One admirer explained: "He inspires allegiance because he is trustworthy. He inspires respect because he believes so deeply in the primacy of the mind, in the virtue of reason."

Senator Tower has attacked Mr. Levi because he joined the National Taxpayers Guild in the nineteen-thirties. He was in the Chicago chapter for a few years along with such others as Walter Schafer, who became a great justice of the Illinois Supreme Court. Does the Senator Tower really care about that dusty history? Or is he worried that Edward Levi would be too independent as Attorney General, too resistant to pressure for political use of the law?

The Levi situation is a particular test for constitutional conservatives and thinkers. They have twisted liberals for opportunism, and fair enough. Now they can show us, by remaining silent or speaking in things like John Tower speak for "conservatism" in this country.

"All of us, liberal or conservative, have much at stake in President Ford's selection of a Supreme Court justice. Edward Levi is not the only person to restore the lattered fabric of law in this country. But he would be an exceptional choice for the President, and this time, and to back away now would be one more surrender to pressure."
Ford Orders
Probe of CIA
By Kissinger

By Murrey Marder
Washington Post Staff Writer

A presidential inquiry was ordered yesterday into allegations that the Central Intelligence Agency conducted illegal domestic surveillance especially during the Nixon administration. In addition, up to four congressional investigations were proposed on the same charges.

President Ford, who is vacationing at Vail, Colo., directed Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger to produce a report "in a matter of days" on the allegations. Kissinger's inquiry will be conducted in his dual role as presidential national security adviser and head of the National Security Council staff.

Kissinger, aides said, has been instructed to find out what happened, if anything. He will prepare a report on the charges that center on Helms' tenure as director of the CIA from 1966 to 1973. William E. Colby, the current CIA director also will submit a report for this inquiry.

Investigations into the allegations of illegal CIA activities were announced by Chairman John C. Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and by Sen. John Sparkman (D-Ala.), who recently has charged that congressional monitoring of the CIA is "totally inadequate."

A sharp attack on the announcement that Kissinger will conduct an inquiry into the CIA came from Rep. Michael J. Harrington (D-Mass.), who repeatedly has charged that congressional monitoring of the CIA is "seriously flawed."

"President Ford's move (similarly) is a self-protective reaction not likely to produce results or to lead to adequate oversight of the CIA," Harrington said. He called for a select Senate committee to conduct the inquiry.

This surge of projected investigations followed charges published by The New York Times on Sunday that intelligence agencies' operations now seem likely to face unexpected challenges.

Washington Post Staff Writer

The White House press secretary Robert G. Nesson yesterday that "the President is trying to find out what happened, if anything."

Nessen, reporting on President Ford's on Sunday that "nothing comparable" to what was alleged at improper CIA operations over the years, and that the President told Colby he would not tolerate any activities of that kind in his administration.

But Nessen disclosed yesterday that Colby had informed the President several days ago, prior to the report of the charges by The New York Times, that the President was contemplating such a story.

Nessen said he was uncertain when Mr. Ford received that information, and Nessen did not spell out the President's reaction to Colby's information. Nessen did not explain what new presidential inquiry was ordered until yesterday.

Nessen denied a report yesterday that the Justice Department is also investigating the CIA's activities. "There is no role for Justice at this moment," Nessen said; "it is not involved in any way." Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) on Sunday had called for the resignation of Helms and for a Justice Department investigation.

The question of Secretary Kissinger's awareness of any alleged CIA domestic spying operations during his years at the White House also came up yesterday.

The secretary "doesn't know anything about this," said State Department spokesman Robert H. Anderson. He said "the secretary has never seen any written report by any American citizens to the Central Intelligence Agency, and he doesn't know if any such surveys exist."

Anderson's comments appeared to be limited to disclaiming any knowledge by Kissinger of CIA operations involving antiwar activists. It was not clear whether the denial also covered knowledge of any extralegal operations by the CIA in domestic activities.

According to one source, any covert CIA operations, such as break-ins, conducted inside the United States, require approval at the National Security Council level, then the President or by his special assistant for national security affairs.

Another source said domestic spying by the CIA long predates the Vietnam war controversy in this country and the Nixon and Johnson administrations, and was authorized only if there was a national security factor involved.

Volving a foreign country, Other sources said the foreign link often was tenuous or nonexistent.

Anderson said Kissinger will ask Helms to return from Iran "a duly constituted congressional committee" wants him to testify, but that at present there are no plans for Helms' return.

Although the White House 

A "matter of days," Kissinger 

has been scheduled to leave Washington on Thursday for a vacation in Puerto Rico, return on Jan. 2 or 3.

The swiftness with which congressional committee chairmen acted to plan CIA investigations illustrated the heightened interest and sensitivity that has been developing in the wake of the Watergate scandals, to charge of inadequate congressional supervision of the CIA. Focused bills have been introduced—and pilleon ing that to broaden this supervision, no limitation to a few senior members of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations committees who have met infrequently and have been ineffective in the past.

Sen. Stennis said his committee will conduct an "in-depth investigation" soon after Congress resumes to determine whether the CIA is operating "within the limits of the law and spirit of the 1947 act." Stennis emphasized that strong and effective CIA is essential for national security, but that the "aqueous does not include the operation of domestic intelligence system."

"It is in the firm belief," said Stennis, that Mr. Colby, the present director, has been faithful in observing the basic charter in operating "within the law." Stennis said that last summer he supported an unsuccessful amendment to specify that the CIA's jurisdiction was limited to foreign operations.

Rep. Nedzi said that what he has been told confidentially about the CIA "does not square with the article" in The New York Times containing allegations against the agency. He said that in hearings he plans by his House intelligence subcommittee, "I personally will make every effort to assure that the public will have ample opportunity to judge the accuracy of the allegations and the wider implications without favor and without prejudice." He is particularly interested in "hasty judgments.

Chairman Morgan of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said he is "generally dis" the allegations because "the CIA's responsibilities lie strictly overseas."

He said that while the House Armed Services Committee has primary jurisdiction over the CIA in the House, no committee of the House has jurisdiction over foreign policy-related activities of the CIA in the new Congress.
At Home With the CIA

WASHINGTON STAR
24 December 1974

It continues to mystify us why the Central Intelligence Agency, whose effectiveness depends on the subtlety and savvy with which it carries out its vital mission, manages to get involved in one public controversy after another. Well, there go our superspies again, bumbling across the front pages because some of them apparently could not distinguish between their work and someone else’s. Chalk up another propaganda coup for the CIA’s foreign adversaries and domestic critics, whether or not subsequent investigation establishes serious misdeeds on the part of the agency.

Last weekend’s report by The New York Times of large-scale domestic-intelligence activity by the CIA—apparently in violation of the agency’s 1977 congressional charter—calls for a searching inquiry into what the agency has been up to and what is needed to keep it on the right track in the future. Until more facts are produced, we will not attempt a final judgment on the allegations. But the claim that the CIA maintained intelligence files on at least 10,000 Americans, and engaged in various “illegal” covert operations in this country, deserves the most intense scrutiny in the next session of Congress. This, to be followed by corrective action if needed, is in the interest of American freedom as well as the health of the intelligence community itself.

There is good reason for keeping the CIA out of the domestic-intelligence purview of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, besides the simple matter of observing the law. The CIA has its hands full carrying out its foreign-intelligence mandate with American interests under attack almost everywhere in the world. For this task the CIA needs a flexibility and a freedom from day-to-day public accountability that, if suffered at home, could compromise the constitutional rights of Americans. While much CIA work involves undramatic information-gathering and analysis, the agency also engages in clandestine operations that, again, cannot be countenanced on the domestic scene. The FBI has the clear authority to enforce federal law in this country, and to guard against internal subversion.

Admittedly there are “gray areas,” where the CIA’s foreign counter-intelligence and the FBI’s domestic-intelligence activities might overlap—American suspects with foreign connections and vice versa. But this would not explain a wholesale CIA involvement in the investigation of American dissidents like antiwar protesters and black extremists. There are hints that the paranoia of the Nixon White House was at work, as well as presidential dissatisfaction with the FBI of J. Edgar Hoover and a breakdown of CIA-FBI cooperation. The Nixon crowd managed to involve the CIA peripherally in Watergate, sought greater participation in the coverup and perhaps succeeded in otherwise diverting the CIA from its legitimate field. The new allegations raise serious questions about the leadership of former CIA Director Richard Helms, now ambassador to Iran. If an investigation proves it necessary, Helms should be called back to explain his role.

The objective of future investigations should not be to destroy the CIA, which has performed much of its function ably and is more than ever needed in these hazardous and complicated times. The aim should be to strengthen the CIA’s effectiveness by keeping it on target. Better congressional oversight would be a valuable safeguard, as well as a White House sensitive to the proper use of the CIA and determined to prevent misuse. President Ford promises the latter.

In the process of eliminating any ambiguities about the CIA’s lawful functions and assuring adherence to clear jurisdictional rules, the agency should benefit. At the least, it should get some blessed relief from the repeated controversies that rob it of public and congressional support.
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Unguarded Intelligence

Yet another conspiracy under the Nixon Administration to defy the law and infringe upon the constitutional rights of American citizens has now sprung into the open. Accused of this time is the furtive gathering of information on several thousand American citizens suspected of political dissidence. The activities are illegal—they are flatly illegal activities; there is no alternative now to invoking appropriate legal procedures against the officials responsible.

The basic rationale for the C.I.A. as an independent agency is not at issue; it is unfortunate that a valuable, even essential, institution has been cast under a cloud by the misguided zeal of those inside and outside the agency who thought nothing of twisting and misusing an important nation.

It is reassuring to hear from President Ford and the present director of Central Intelligence, William E. Colby, that all such domestic surveillance activities have been terminated; more to the point is how they could have been permitted in the first place when Federal statutes so clearly bar the C.I.A. from internal security functions.

In defending the C.I.A. against recent months of criticism arising from unwise and even illegal covert activities abroad, Mr. Colby has persuasively argued that the agency was simply carrying out the duties it was charged with. The public disclosures suggest an intolerable breakdown of institutional checks and balances. For many years this newspaper—among others—has urged closer oversight by Congress of the intelligence community. But the first responsibility for preventing any further misuse of power must rest with the C.I.A. and other elements of the intelligence community, if they wish to continue receiving the trust absolutely required for the conduct of their mission.
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The CIA Crisis

Another journalistic flare burst over the Central Intelligence Agency Sunday, briefly illuminating a dark corner of its activities barely glimpsed before. In the early Nixon years, the New York Times reported, the CIA collected information on 10,000 or more American citizens who had some part in the antiwar and other "disident" movements. It did this despite a ban in its legislative charter on "police, subpoena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions." That ban was enacted precisely to block such use of a secret foreign-intelligence agency as a secret domestic police force. Coming hard on renewed public agitation over the agency's conduct of subversion in Chile, the new allegations have created the most serious crisis in the CIA's 27 years.

In 1968-70, it seems, President Nixon asked the CIA to investigate whether foreign elements were behind the Vietnam war protests. Whatever Mr. Nixon's purposes in asking the question, it was a legitimate one for a foreign-intelligence agency to try to answer. The answer apparently was no. But the matter did not end there. Somehow, the CIA undertook (or intensified) a campaign of surveillance of American citizens. They were not suspected of being foreign agents; or if they were, the FBI should have been called. "We do not target on American citizens," then-CIA Director Richard Helms said in a public speech on April 14, 1971. According to the story in the Times, the surveillance program apparently was then in full swing; if that is in fact the case, then Mr. Helms not only violated the regulation governing CIA's activities but then lied about it as well.

It is said that James R. Schlesinger, briefly CIA's director in 1973, uncovered the tracks of the program—the antiwar movement was already dead of natural causes. Mr. Schlesinger, now Secretary of Defense, and his successor at CIA, William E. Colby, are also said to have found and stopped certain other questionable domestic activities, including some touching Watergate. On Sunday, President Ford reported Mr. Colby had told him "nothing comparable to what was stated in the Times article was going on over there." Added Mr. Ford: "I told him that under no circumstances would I tolerate any such activities under this administration." These assurances are, of course, beside the point. The secrecy which allows the CIA to conduct illegal operations makes its formal denials meaningless. The same secrecy makes it possible for the CIA to engage in domestic spying in the future, with or without the President's knowledge or consent.

The Justice Department is already "reviewing" the reported program, apparently with Mr. Colby's approval. However, tortured the legal route may seem, we urge that it be explored. It holds high promise of disclosure of many hidden and hard-to-find aspects of any surveillance program. Fear of prosecution deserves to be added to fear of publicity to deter those public officials who might be tempted to spy on their fellow citizens. It should hardly be necessary to repeat, after Watergate, that officials must obey the law. We presume that the initial quick look which Mr. Ford has ordered Henry Kissinger to take—in Dr. Kissinger's capacity as White House national security advisor—will reaffirm this fundamental point.

In the Congress, fresh appeals have been made for a specific investigation of the alleged spying and for improved general "oversight" of CIA. We have little confidence in an investigation by either the Senate or the House committees which are supposed to oversee the CIA; their record, in so far as they have done anything at all, is one of protecting the interests of the CIA rather than those of the public.

In fact, yesterday a number of congressional committee chairmen announced their intent to delve into the new charges. But a broader approach is essential. The need is not only to get to the bottom of whatever happened a few years ago but to translate concern over this particular episode into a solid institutional remedy for all of the perceived inadequacies of the CIA. The group to take on this task must be at once detached from the Executive (that rules out the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board), expert and authoritative; a bipartisan select committee of the Congress might be the best approach. Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. has proposed one such committee to survey CIA practices across the board to assure it is consistent with existing law.

An even more satisfactory route lies in a second proposal by Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) and Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) for a select committee, which would assess the past record and future role of American intelligence. On the premise that the 1947 law which brought the CIA into being was drafted under the shadow of cold-war circumstances that have greatly changed, it would draft a new law consistent with new circumstances, domestic and foreign alike. Any lingering doubt as to the need for just such a basic and comprehensive procedure has been erased by the new reports of domestic spying and by the government's apparent inability to explain these reports away.
We Don’t Want a Gestapo

Senator William Proxmire is certainly correct to call for a prompt investigation of the latest charges against the Central Intelligence Agency. Those charges are serious and disturbing in the extreme. The CIA is accused (apparently by present and former CIA officials and by Federal Bureau of Investigation officials) of gathering information on private United States citizens. This intelligence gathering often involved violating the constitutional rights of citizens. Even if it had not, it is wrong and illegal for the CIA to engage in such activity. That is sabotage police stuff. When the CIA was created in 1947 Congress took great pains to circumscribe the agency. It was authorized to gather intelligence in foreign countries only. “We don’t want a Gestapo,” a congressman warned during the 1947 debate.

We have ended up with one! According to the allegations, the CIA compiled dossiers on thousands of citizens, including members of Congress, that agents deemed to be “dissidents.” These were for the most part members of anti-war groups, but some others who expressed political objections to one or another Nixon administration policy also seem to have been put under surveillance. All of this activity involving America citizens is said to have started in 1969, under Nixon, but there are also charges that the CIA operated illegally in this country prior to that by doing counter-intelligence work involving foreign nationals.

Senator Proxmire wants the Justice Department to investigate these charges. It should begin at once. If illegal acts have been committed by officials, those officials should be charged and prosecuted to the limit of the law. That would clearly demonstrate to the CIA, to other U.S. intelligence agencies that might believe they are somehow beyond the law, and to the American public that there is not going to be a Gestapo here, that it can’t happen here. In addition to a Justice Department investigation, there also ought to be a thorough airing of these charges by the Congress. And we don’t mean by the Senate Armed Services Committee’s CIA Oversight subcommittee, either. That “watchdog” has been sleeping in the sun for 20 years, as one member, Senator Stuart Symington, has complained. A broader based investigating committee is called for, perhaps a special, short term committee like the Ervin panel of Watergate fame.

Whether or not such a committee is decided on, and whether or not the charges now before the public prove true, there is still a need for a permanent real congressional watchdog for the CIA and other intelligence gathering operations. The potential for abuse—the potential for a Gestapo—is too great to leave oversight to the sort of coziness that, to Congress’ shame, has prevailed. If Congress won’t protect the rights of citizens from arrogant bureaucracies, who will?
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HELM'S DISAVOWS 'ILLEGAL' SPYING
BY THE C.I.A. IN U.S.

Alleged Domestic Operation
Under His Stewardship Is
'Categorycally Denied'

Agency Aide Dissects

Angleton, Who Is Resigning
His Post, Is Said to Agree
With Some Allegations

By SEYMOUR M. HERSH
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24—The State Department said today that Richard Helms, former Director of Central Intelligence and now the ambassador to Iran, had categorically denied that the C.I.A. conducted any "illegal" domestic spying under his leadership.

But James Angleton, who is resigning as chief of the Counterintelligence Division and who has been publicly linked to the spying, was quoted today as saying that he agreed with some of the allegations that were published Sunday by The New York Times.

There is "something to it," Mr. Angleton told United Press International.

His resignation, effective at the end of the month, became known last night.

Meanwhile, Representative Archibald Cox of Maine, whose Senate Intelligence Subcommitte of the Armed Services Committee, said in a television interview this morning, "There's been an overstepping of bounds" by the C.I.A.

Controversy Grows

"You might call it illegals in terms of exceeding their charter," Mr. Cox, Democrat of Michigan, said.

The denial from Mr. Helms was reported by Robert Anderson, State Department spokesman, as an "unsubstantiated" charge, as controversy continued to grow over the domestic spying allegations.

The spokesman said that Mr. Helms, who had denied last week that the C.I.A. conducted any illegal domestic operations against anti-war activists or dissidents, or that any unit to do such was created under him as director.

Mr. Cox, addressing the Senate, said that any denial of the charges by Mr. Helms and former C.I.A. officials expressed "a fundamental wrong assumption at the resignation of Mr. Angleton.

Mr. Neld's televised interview marked the first public confirmation that any domestic wrongdoing had been committed by the C.I.A.

A Question Remains

"But the question of whether there's any ground for criminal prosecution still remains," Mr. Neld added. "I'm not aware of anything in the statute which would allow us to make a case for criminal sanctions.

Mr. Neld, who is known to have discussed the domestic spying allegations last week with Mr. Cobley, said: "I think it is clear that information that has appeared in the allegations and the wider implications of the stories that are circulating presently.

There was some overstepping of bounds," Mr. Neld said, "but it certainly wasn't of the dimension that we're led to believe when we first heard the implications, as I see it, of what has appeared in the newspapers and on the media.

He said that he planned to call Mr. Cobley to testify at hearings into the C.I.A.'s alleged domestic activities.

Additional hearings were announced today by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat of Maine, whose Senate Government Operations Subcommitte of the Senate Intelligence and Security Subcommittee, met earlier this month to hear testimony about revamping congressional oversight of the C.I.A.

Mr. Muskie said he planned to initiate discussions early next week with Senator John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, to determine whether his subcommittee could shun access to classified intelligence material, which traditionally has been supplied only to the

Stennis panel.

"There's really nothing in the Senate rules that excludes other committees from access to this information," the Senator said.

Special Prosecutor Urged

A call for the appointment of a special prosecutor to investigate the C.I.A. spying charges was made today by Representative Paul Findley, Republican of Illinois, who is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In a letter to President Ford, Mr. Findley said that neither denial of the charges by present and former C.I.A. officials nor an internal inquiry by the executive branch would dispel doubts about the agency's domestic activities.

"So tainted has the C.I.A. become that nothing will suffice short of a full-scale investigation and criminal prosecutions where they are warranted," he said.

He praised Mr. Richardson, who was recently named ambassador to England by Mr. Ford, for his "reputation for strict adherence to the laws and his unwillingness to back down on a public commitment."

Mr. Richardson resigned as Attorney General rather than carry out an order from President Nixon to dismiss the Watergate special prosecutor, Archibald Cox.

An Admission Reported

DANIEL SCHORR, a correspondent for CBS News, reported last night that during a four-hour conversation with reporters Mr. Angleton admitted keeping files on Americans like Black Panthers and antiwar demonstrators, but only after they'd contacted agents abroad.

Mr. Angleton denied, according to Mr. Schorr, any specific C.I.A. wiretapping or break-ins, but indicated the F.B.I. was asked to conduct some to help protect C.I.A. sources and methods.
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Domestic Spying Denied
Helms Rejects Charges Made Against CIA

By Murray Marder
Washington Post Staff Writer

Richard M. Helms categorically denied yesterday that the Central Intelligence Agency under his direction from 1966 to 1973 "conducted illegal domestic operations" against opponents of the war in Vietnam.

Helms, who has been U.S. ambassador to Iran since early 1973, also denied that "any unit to conduct such activities was ever created while he was head of the CIA."

That sweeping disclaimer by Helms of published charges that the CIA illegally engaged in domestic espionage during a war critical to the Nixon administration was made public without definition of Helms' terminology. The Helms statement was issued by the State Department in response to an inquiry to Helms from Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. Helms was unavailable for any further explanation.

The Helms denial coincided with comments by Kissinger himself, a former head of CIA counterintelligence, James Angleton, who has suddenly resigned, effective Dec. 31, just before publication of reports of CIA domestic operations have been exaggerated, but it is "not scientific."

Angleton, who said he resigned from the CIA because of "fear" because of what he said has been destroyed by "unauthorized" press releases and interviews with reporter William Colby, who on his way out of the agency said he was "not aware of anything that public can have an opportunity..."

The State Department said Secretary Kissinger received the report yesterday from a present CIA director, William E. Colby, which said that Kissinger ordered the publication of accusations that the CIA breached its authority by conducting covert operations inside the United States. Kissinger said that the report would be "unfair to me". The report would go out "on the next courier plane" to M. J. Leventhal, Colo., vacation headquarters.

Kissinger spoke to the President by telephone yesterday about the CIA controversy, a spokesman said.

No information was available on the contents of Colby's report, nor did officials say whether it concurred with Helms' published denial.

Despite Kissinger's dealings with Colby and Helms, State Department spokesman Robert Anderson said that Kissinger is conducting an inquiry into the CIA charges are the result of a "misunderstanding." Kissinger "has not been asked or he is conducting an investigation of official allegations against the CIA," said Anderson.

Kissinger is only acting on the President's instructions "to transmit a report on these allegations prepared by Mr. Colby," said Anderson, in Kissinger's capacity as assistant to the President for national security affairs.

Despite that narrow definition of Kissinger's role in the rapprochement controversy, Anderson said Kissinger "evidently hopes that new judgments on these allegations will be suspended" until President Ford studies Colby's report and decides if "further steps may be needed."

State Department officials said they were otherwise in a position to amplify Helms' denial which they made public yesterday, because, they said, it was the substance of what they received from him in the Iranian capital of Tehran.

Helms, they said, was responsible to charges initially published by The New York Times on Sunday, which said the CIA during the Nixon administration kept files on at least 10,000 Americans in a special unit and conducted surveillance of antiwar groups. The CIA, the account said, also engaged in domestic break-ins and wiretapping in the United States, although that also is legally beyond the jurisdiction. The latter charge has been aired before.

Spokesman Anderson at the State Department said, "Ambassador Helms categorically denied that under his stewardship the CIA conducted illegal domestic operations against antiwar activists or anyone else, even if such activities do so were created under him as director."

Anderson said he was unable to explain further whether Helms was defining "illegal" or "domestic" or operations. "CIA has was able to find that none of these operations were ever carried out without prior official authority."

Helms left his Tehran post yesterday, Anderson said, under U.S. "policy of "mass action "for October" for him to take leave at this time, and is scheduled to return to Washington Jan. 2 or Jan. 3. That would be when Kissinger plans to return to Washington from a vacation in Puerto Rico, which is scheduled to begin on Thursday.

Anderson said Helms now is "scheduling the holiday with relatives" in Europe. At the American embassy in Tehran, a spokesman said yesterday that Helms was unavailable and his present whereabouts are classified.

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee that has been exploring more effective congressional review of the CIA and the FBI, said yesterday: "Denials simply are not enough. We have to know the substance of their activities, so we can judge for ourselves whether they exceeded their mandate and authority under the law. The legislation denying them (the CIA) domestic jurisdiction is clear on its face."

Muskie said that the limited congressional oversight of the CIA's operations, and "the pressures that were within the last two days require ... inquiry to produce "vigorous" inquiry to produce "active congressional oversight" of CIA operations. Severe, often Committee earlier announced plans to investigate the current charges.

Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi (D-Miss.) chairman of the House Armed Services subcommittee, on investigations, said yesterday on the CBS Morning News TV show that his committee has discussed with CIA Director Colby the "overstepping of bounds" by the agency.

"Information was conveyed to me," said Nedzi, "which suggested the overstepping of bounds, but it certainly wasn't of the dimension of what has appeared in the newspapers...

Nedzi said he thinks it "can be concealed" as in any large bureaucracy. There's been an overstepping of bounds, some improperities, but I want to emphasize that..." the information I have does not equal, as I said, with the information that is being circulated at the present time.

When asked what he meant by "improprieties," Nedzi said, "you might call it illegalities in terms of exceeding their charter." He added that the CIA "shouldn't be active in the United States, but the question of whether there is any grounds for criminal prosecution still remains. I'm not aware of anything in the statute establishing the CIA "that provides for... criminal sanctions."

Nedzi said it was his intent to hold a thorough hearing to make all of this information public so that the public can have an opportunity to judge what precisely took place.
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Accused CIA Aide Disclaims Spy Role

By Ronald Kessler
Washington Post Staff Writer

James Angleton, the Central Intelligence Agency's counterintelligence chief, said last night he has no personal knowledge of alleged CIA domestic spying activities but could not say that they have not existed.

Angleton was named in Sunday's New York Times as having been overseer of a "massive, illegal" domestic intelligence operation by the CIA against antiwar activists and other dissidents. The newspaper said the operation, which it said took place during the Nixon administration, involved establishment of intelligence files on at least 10,000 Americans.

In addition, the Times cited "evidence" of other "illegal" activities, beginning in the 1950s, that included break-ins, wiretaps, and surreptitious inspection of mail. In a rambling telephone conversation of more than a half hour from his office at CIA headquarters, Angleton said he has resigned from the agency effective Dec. 31 but would not say why or whether it was his own decision. He said he has been notified of charges made by the Soviet Union would become more powerful than the United States over the next five years.

Asked if the CIA had engaged in domestic spying activities, he said, "I can't respond to this hypothesis, I don't know."

In a response to this same question at a later interview, Angleton said, "I can't respond to this hypothesis, I don't know."

In a telephone conversation of more than an hour from his office at CIA headquarters, Angleton said he has resigned from the agency effective Dec. 31 but would not say why or whether it was his own decision. He said he has been notified of charges made by the Soviet Union would become more powerful than the United States over the next five years.

In a response to this same question at a later interview, Angleton said, "I can't respond to this hypothesis, I don't know."

"It's not up to the CIA to determine if it's necessary."

"In a response to the question, Angleton, referring..."
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CIA Aide Clarifies Resignation

"United Press International:

James Angleton said yesterday he was "asked by higher authorities" to resign as Central Intelligence Agency counterintelligence chief. He telephoned UPI in Washington last night and said he would like to get some things "straightened out" from previous talks Tuesday and yesterday.

My resignation is futile," he said. "I was not asked. The point I'm making is that the story [in The New York Times] was highbrowly exaggerated and as far as I'm concerned I had no knowledge of any activities of such the agency but I can't speak for the agency.

He said he had no recollection of saying Tuesday that he didn't know of illegal CIA domestic activities. "Why then, he was asked, did he resign if he isn't sure? He wasn't pushed."

"Let's put it this way. Angleton said. "I was asked by higher authorities."

The allegations of CIA domestic activities involving surveillance of as many as 10,000 Americans were made by The New York Times on Monday and President Ford's Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger on Monday made a report "within 94 days."

Earlier yesterday, Angleton suggested that UPI contact former FBI agent Sam Pachem in New York about domestic espionage activities. "Sam knows," said Angleton.

Pachem, now executive editor of New Mexico's Crime Prevention magazine and an FBI agent for 30 years, told UPI in Albuquerque that moves were not to destroy the FBI and CIA.

"Of course I'm saying what I'm saying," said Pachem, "but I'm not spying or even having anything to do with espionage."

He said he did not hear from former Director Richard F. Helms of the CIA under illegal spying activities against antiwar activists in this country.

I support Helms completely, because I think the allegations are absolutely false," said Pachem. Helms has denied the allegations.

"What is appearing in the press concerning the CIA and the FBI is a bonanza for the Soviet Intelligence agency," Pachem said. "They are like our children watching us dress ourselves, observing while we destroy ourselves.
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C. I. A. MAN FEARS FADING OF VALUES

Angleton Quoted as Saying People No Longer Appear to Place Nation First

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25 (AP) - For 31 of his 87 years, James Angleton protected the Central Intelligence Agency's secrets and agents from spying foreign powers, and now he worries about the values that guided him have passed out of fashion.

After allegations that the agency's counterintelligence efforts also included illegal domestic espionage, he has resigned with a denial that he was in any way involved in the alleged domestic surveillance.

Here is a portrait of Mr. Angleton drawn from people who knew him.

He joined the Office of Strategic Services, the precursor of the C.I.A., in World War II. He had entered Harvard Law School after graduating from Yale right before the war, but the outbreak of hostilities cut short his legal education, and he was never to return to academic life.

For much of his career, he matched wits with the intelligence agencies of other countries that were trying to spy on the United States just as the C.I.A. was spying on them. He served as head of counterintelligence since 1954.

Suspicious of Soviet

Out of this experience came a fundamental suspicion of the Soviet Union and particularly of the K.G.B., the Soviet version of the C.I.A.

Mr. Angleton, according to a person who knows him, was obsessed with the K.G.B. and its espionage potential. He was quick to spot its operatives posing as Soviet diplomats, and he has kept posted on contacts between K.G.B. agents and representatives of other countries.

He became known as a hard-line cold warrior. Recently he was quoted as saying that the Communist world had not changed its goal of world domination, despite detente.

His speech is laced with references to military balances of power and what he perceives as foreign threats to democracy and the security of the United States.

"When we went into the [intelligence] business, we thought of the country first," he recently quoted by a friend as saying. "But things have changed now. People want their mortgages earlier, and personal security seems more important than service to the country.

Reflecting on his long career, he indicated an awareness that the world was not necessarily shared by large segments of society. He told an acquaintance that his intelligence work was "a 31-year association in the cause of national security, which people no longer consider important.

"He is known to have strong feelings about each of the six CIA directors he served under. The late Allen W. Dulles was his favorite because of the talent that Mr. E. Dullers recruited for the agency.

Mr. Angleton, a former director of the National Security Agency, was linked to the C.I.A.'s alleged domestic espionage, also ranks him with Dulles.

William E. Colby, the current chief, and Adm. William R. R. W. C. Shackleton, the director for four months in 1972 and now Secretary of Defense.

He is said to admire Mr. Schlesinger, who "grew" the C.I.A. and viewed it with foreign powers.

"No one in the Cabinet more truly understands the perils that this country faces in terms of the balance of forces," Mr. Angleton reportedly said. Schlesinger is the shield for this country."

Mr. Angleton once edited a poetry magazine in college, and a friend says that he was on personal terms with Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot and E. E. Cummings.

Mr. Angleton's resignation was announced Monday at a meeting of C.I.A. officials, his superiors praised his record and said that his resignation was not connected with the allegations of domestic espionage.

Mr. Angleton, a six-footer, with a preference for packing lunch, is a few years younger than the average age of our country, ethics and the law.
CLIFFORD FAVORS
A SPECIAL INQUIRY
INTO C.I.A. ‘SPYING’

DECLARES INVESTIGATION BY
REGULAR CONGRESS PANEL
WOUULD NOT BE EFFECTIVE

BY SEYMOUR M. HERSHEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25—
Clark M. Clifford, the former
Secretary of Defense who helped
to draft the 1947 legislation
setting up the Central Intelli-
gence Agency, urged Congress
today to form a special com-
mittee to investigate the pub-
lished charges of domestic spy-
ing by that agency.

“Previous investigations into
the C.I.A. by ordinary [Senate
and House Armed Services]
Committees haven’t gotten very
far,” said Mr. Clifford, who
served in President Johnson’s
Cabinet. “The seriousness of
this is such that I would recom-
mand a full and exhaustive in-
vestigation by a special com-
mittee.”

Thus far, the chairmen of
four panels—including the
House and Senate Armed Ser-
vice Intelligence Subcom-
mittees—have announced plans
for full inquiries next year
stemming from a report in The
New York Times last Sunday
that the C.I.A. had allegedly
mounted a massive and illegal
domestic spying operation during
the Nixon Administration.

50-PAGE REPORT DUE

In Vail, Colo., where Presi-
dent Ford is skiing and work-
ing, he told newsmen this
morning that he would receive
tomorrow a 50-page report on
the domestic spying allegations
from William E. Colby, the Cen-
tral Intelligence Director. Mr.
Ford said that the document,
which is being relayed to him
by Secretary of State Kissinger,
would be thoroughly studied be-
fore the White House com-
mented on it.

Ron Nessen, the White House
press secretary, said that the
document included several ap-
pendices, but would not elabo-
rate.

In Teheran, Iran, officials at
the United States Embassy said
that Ambassador Richard
Helms, who was the agency’s
director when the alleged spy-
ing took place, had left the
country for an undisclosed des-
ination in Europe. The State
Department said yesterday that
Mr. Helms’ trip, characterized
as a prearranged home leave,
would return him to Washing-
ton early next month.

DENIAL BY HELMS

A “categorical denial” by
Mr. Helms of the domestic
spying charges was relayed to
newsmen yesterday by the State
Department.

The New York Times, quot-
ing well-placed Government
sources, reported Sunday alle-
gations that the C.I.A. had
violated its charter by con-
ducting massive, illegal intel-
ligence operations aimed at
antiboom activity and other
American disaffection in the
United States. Intelligence
files on at least 10,000 American
citizens were compiled, the
sources said.

Two days later, James Angle-
ton, director of the C.I.A.’s
counterintelligence division
and one of the officials singled
out in The Times’ article, resigned
after 31 years of Government
intelligence work.

In a telephone interview, Mr.
Clifford said that he had never
been briefed on any domestic
activities by the C.I.A. during
his service from 1961 to 1968
as a member and later chair-
man of the President’s Foreign
Intelligence Advisory Board.

The board was set up by
President Kennedy, after the
failure of the Bay of Pigs opera-
tion in Cuba in 1961, to provide
high-level outside review of
secret intelligence operations.

“What they [the C.I.A.] did
was just never mentioned to
us during their briefings,” Mr.
Clifford said. “These fellows [at
the C.I.A.] obviously were oper-
ating with the greatest degree
of secrecy.”

“I can tell you,” he added,
“that whatever they did they
did not on my watch.”

C.I.A. any operational power
in the United States, even in
the case of foreign espionage
agents.

“If a secret agent comes to
the United States,” he said,
“the C.I.A. must immediately
inform the FBI.”

If the published allegations
are true, he said, “it means
that the C.I.A. just chose to
regard what the limits of the
act were.”

In a subsequent telephone
interview, Maxwell D. Taylor,
a retired Army general who
served on the President’s For-
ereign Intelligence Advisory
Board from 1965 until 1970, also
said that he had never been informed
of any domestic C.I.A. opera-
tions.

“If you knew the statute under
which the C.I.A. operates,” he
said, “I General Taylor did acknowl-
edge that some highly secret
protocols to the 1947 act had
been agreed upon. Those agree-
ments are known to deal with
the C.I.A.’s overseas activities,

powers, or internal-security functions: Provided further, That the departments and
other agencies of the Government
shall continue to col-
lect, evaluate, correlate, and
disseminate departmental in-
telligence; And provided
further, That the Director of
Central Intelligence shall be
responsible for protecting in-
telligence sources and meth-
ods from unauthorized disclo-
sure;

(5) To perform, for the
benefit of the existing intel-
ligence agencies, such addi-
tional services of common
concern as the National Secu-
irty Council determines can
be more efficiently accom-
plished centrally;

(2) To make recommenda-
tions to the National Security
Council for the coordination
of such intelligence activities
of the departments and agen-
cies of the Government as
relate to the national securi-
ty;

(3) To correlate and evalu-
ate intelligence relating to
the national security, and
provide for the appropriate
dissemination of such intel-
ligence within the Govern-
ment using where appropri-
ate existing agencies and
facilities: Provided, That the
Agency shall have no police,
supersede, law-enforcement

Excerpts From ’47 Law Creating C.I.A.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25—
In excerpts from the 1947 law
that created the Central In-
elligence Agency, Title 50,
Section 403 of the United
States Code:

§ 403. Central Intelligence
Agency

There is established under
the National Security Council
a Central Intelligence Agency
with a Director of Central
Intelligence, who shall be
the head thereof. The director
shall be appointed by the
President, by and with the ad-
vice and consent of the Sen-
ate, from among the commis-
sioned officers of the armed
services or from among
individuals in civilian life...

Powers and Duties

(6) For the purpose of
coordinating the intelligence
activities of the several Gov-
ernment departments and
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Idea for Creating a C.I.A.
Grew Out of Pearl Harbor

BY DAVID BINDER
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25—American political and military leaders created the Central Intelligence Agency during World War II as a needed instrument of global power.

The concept had its origin in the failure of American intelligence services to coordinate signals warning of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. As early as 1944, Gen. William J. Donovan, chief of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, proposed establishment of an agency to centralize intelligence efforts.

Yet the real impetus came from the newly established House Select Committee on Truman in 1946 that the United States must shoulder new responsibility as a major world power and that what was to be seen was to be a menacing expansionist challenge by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Truman established a National Intelligence Authority in March 1946, and, in 1951, a Central Intelligence Group—the forerunner of the C.I.A. But genuine centralization of United States intelligence was still years away.

The Central Intelligence Agency was formally chartered under the National Security Act of 1947.

The United States was already engaged in sporadic undercover political operations against Communist forces at the time of Truman and it was in Italy. But the operations were initially conducted from the Department of State under Frank G. Wisner, a former O.S.S. officer.

"Commitment Becomes Clear"

"Until 1950 nothing much was accomplished," Ray S. Cline, a retired C.I.A. official, recalled. "It was sort of a sounding period." But Mr. Cline, who served as C.I.A.'s Deputy Director of Intelligence from 1952 to 1964, acknowledged that the agency "developed a commitment to political operations" overseas at the very outset.

By early 1951 the C.I.A. had a manpower of about 5,000 and its influence was rapidly spreading around the world and through the Washington bureaucracy. It was a period of adventurism and of some embarrassing defeats.

"Together with a great Intelligence service, the C.I.A. began a series of small invasions of Albania—by sea and by air —in the expectation of sparking an overthrow of the Communist leadership in Tirana. Nearly all of the invaders were captured."

The agency was supervising the operations of another anti-Communist force—11,000 Chinese Nationalists—on the eastern frontier of Burma. The C.I.A. was also, according to Mr. Cline, helping the French in Indochina and the Ukraine to make contact with other anti-Communists.

In Western countries, mainly in Italy, France and Germany, the C.I.A. was secretly sponsoring scores of anti-Communist political parties, newspapers, radio stations, trade unions and even student groups.

The double aim, in the words of an old C.I.A. man, "was to prevent Communist takeovers, such as occurred in Czechoslovakia in 1948, and where possible to push the Communists back."

"Efforts Are Merged"

But grave shortcomings had emerged in the C.I.A.'s attempt to conduct the clandestine collection operation of intelligence separately from activist political operations. "They tended to cross each other," said an agency veteran.

To eliminate rivalries, Walter Bedell Smith, the director from 1950 to 1953, merged the clandestine collection operations with the covert operations. Mr. Wisner was brought over from the State Department. This was the birth of what the C.I.A. called its clandestine services.

In addition, Mr. Smith and his deputy, Allen W. Dulles, placed new emphasis on the analysis of intelligence and on longer-range estimates of enemy manpower potential. Mr. Smith inaugurated an Office of National Estimates under the Harvard historian, Mr. Langer.

The office soon became the apex of the intelligence community, a group of 10 seasoned military men and academics whose job was to sift through masses of intelligence data and make detached judgments on major foreign developments in terms of the national interest.

In the nineteen-fifties, the C.I.A. also developed large-scale intelligence service industries, both in purely technical fields and in social-political enterprises.

Dummy Groups Set Up

It financed establishment of two huge radio stations—Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—located in East Europe and Radio Liberator (later Radio Liberty) for transmissions to the Soviet Union. It set up dummy foundations, dummy components of foreign firms and dummy airlines. It placed agents in American student organizations and trade unions—all with a view to assist in penetrating foreign countries.

On the technical side, the C.I.A. sponsored development of a wide range of reconnaissance and monitoring equipment, among which was the high altitude U-2 spy plane. Starting in 1956, the U-2s ranged with impunity over the Soviet Union, China and later in Vietnam and Cuba bringing back tell-tale photographs of missile sites and other military installations.

When Mr. Dulles succeeded Mr. Smith as director, he persuaded President Eisenhower to accept the C.I.A. as a national service reporting directly to the White House, with its estimates being considered essential elements of the policy-making process.

It was the U-2, however, that caused Mr. Eisenhower one of his greatest embarrassments. One of the spy planes was shot down over the Soviet Union in 1950 on the eve of the president's expanded summit meeting with the Soviet Union's Nikita Khrushchev. The administration at first denied that the craft was a spy plane, and then President Eisenhower acknowledged that it was and accepted responsibility for the flight. That was the beginning of an unmasking of dozens of C.I.A. operations that had been conducted more or less in secrecy—excluding the 1954 toppling of a Communist-oriented government in Guatemala.

Defect Disclosed

The militant anti-Communist mobilization of the United States Government continued undiminished into the Kennedy Administration, which allowed the C.I.A.-managed invasion of Cuba to go ahead in April, 1961.

Its total failure revealed a serious defect in the C.I.A. structure—the men responsible for analyzing and estimating intelligence were kept in ignorance of plans for covert operations like the abortive Bay of Pigs landing.

This was remedied under the new director, John A. McCone, who saw to it that the analysts and estimators were consulted about covert political actions.

But the Cuba invasion disclosed another disturbing trend in United States policy-making: the tendency to allow relatively modest undercover intelligence operations to balloon into large military actions.

It went that way in Indochina, from Vietnam to Laos and Cambodia, and the C.I.A. bore most of the public blame.

"The C.I.A. should have been doing reconnaissance operations, not full scale military operations," Mr. Cline observed ruefully. Still, he recalled the McCone years from 1961 to 1966 as "a period of peak performance" by the C.I.A.

There were C.I.A. voices then, among the analysts, warning against a deeper American involvement in the Indochina conflict. But President Johnson listened less and less to them and more and more to his military advisers.

A decline in the C.I.A.'s access to the White House began, and its role in policy formulation continued to wane under President Nixon. The agency's product remained much the same. But its customer had changed.

President Johnson simply did not like the gloomy assessment of the Vietnam war given him by the agency. President Nixon was determined to end involvement of United States forces in the Indochina conflict and did so through consultations with the pentagon involved rather than with his intelligence advisers.

Mr. Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger, continued to rely on the technical data assembled by the C.I.A., primarily for the conduct of strategic arms talks with the Soviet leadership. But they were hardly interested in the traditional intelligence estimates of the agency.

In late 1972, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger agreed on a major for reform of the C.I.A. The President appointed James R. Schlesinger to replace Richard Helms as director and clean out the agency.

In his few months as director, Mr. Schlesinger reined the retirement or resignation of more than 1,000 of the 15,000 C.I.A. employees. His successor, William E. Colby, a graduate of the service schools, proceeded with a structural reform in 1973, abolishing the old Office of National Estimates system.

The structural changes were demoralizing for many C.I.A. oldtimers. But worse still was a series of revelations throughout 1973 and 1974 that the agency had been involved in some questionable—and even criminal—operations in the domestic politics of the United States. Trust included the Watergate and the headquarters of the Democratic party.

The Nixon Administration's alleged use of C.I.A. operatives to monitor activities of political dissidents—a charge nominally the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The assignment of the C.I.A. to train more than 50 American police officers, including 14 from New York, in clandestine arts.

All these activities were in apparent violation of the C.I.A.'s own charter and mission barring it from internal security efforts.

"We were good and secret and highly motivated until 1965," Mr. Cline remarked. "Now the C.I.A. is in the open and it looks bad."

I am concerned because the idea is being skillfully promoted that subversion is a C.I.A. invention," Mr. Cline commented, "whereas it is a doctrinal part of the Russians."
Tighter reins on CIA expected

By Robert P. Hey
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

Talks with key congressional sources familiar with the CIA controversy over alleged domestic spying make clear that:

- Committees almost surely will investigate and keep tabs on CIA activity far more stringently than in the past. This will be so regardless of how much truth the congressional investigations find in current charges that the CIA violated the law by massive domestic spying on Americans.

- The charges do not square with what key members of Congress have been told about past CIA activities in briefings with present CIA officials. These briefings would indicate that the charges are overblown. But if congressional investigations should prove the charges are largely accurate, several congressmen would feel they had been deceived by the CIA and would be furious.

- Despite President Ford's order that Secretary of State Henry Kissinger investigate the charges against the CIA, congressional investigations will go forward. At least three separate ones are scheduled to begin after the new Congress convenes in mid-January.

1966-73 period involved

Sources note that it was the top CIA officialsdom itself which is reported to have uncovered the domestic surveillance and stopped it — specifically James Schlesinger, now Secretary of Defense and previously director of the CIA.

In advance of the hearings, congressional sources generally assume that no such widespread surveillance existed either under Mr. Schlesinger or William Colby, the present CIA director. Therefore much attention is expected to be focused on CIA activities during the tenures of Richard Helms, now Ambassador to Iran; he was CIA director from 1966 to 1973.

Sen. John C. Stennis, whose Armed Services Committee will hold one investigation, cites as a prime purpose discovering if the CIA is "operating within the letter and spirit" of the 1947 law which established it. He calls the CIA's "necessary component" of the U.S. military, but warns that it "must strictly observe" the law.

In joining the general forecast of increased congressional oversight of CIA activities, one important source notes that 1974 "has been a year of more concern about the CIA, and certainly this [new charge] will greatly intensify it."

He ticks off questions that have arisen about the CIA's activities during the year:

- CIA's loan of voice-changer, wig, and other apparatus to Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt. Originally they were used in the burglary of the psychiatrist of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg; there is some thought in Congress that they may have been retained by Mr. Hunt and used in Watergate activities.
- Unsuccessful efforts by the White House to get the CIA to lie and block aspects of the FBI's Watergate probe.

The suggestions of Watergate committee member Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. that the CIA was more deeply involved in the Watergate break-in than is publicly known.

- Disclosure that the CIA was involved in trying to "destabilize" the Chilean Government of the late President Allende.

Meanwhile, James Angleton has made known his resignation as head of the CIA's counterintelligence operations, according to the Associated Press. In its story on CIA activities, the New York Times charged that Mr. Angleton headed illegal domestic surveillance efforts. But in making known his resignation, Mr. Angleton said he was leaving for the good of the CIA, not because of any wrongdoing on his part.
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Controlling the F.B.I.

From time to time since the death of J. Edgar Hoover, members of Congress and others have murmured quietly about the need to impose more reliable controls on the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Perhaps Congress will be jolted out of its slumber by the revelations about the Central Intelligence Agency's illegal intrusions into the domestic security field, coupled with some devastating observations by William C. Sullivan, formerly Number Three man in the F.B.I., on its abuses and ineptitude in handling this responsibility—a responsibility it botched from the start.

Mr. Sullivan argues that the F.B.I. was not equipped to undertake the domestic security function when President Roosevelt first gave it the assignment in 1939 and that no really effective or controlled program was ever developed. As a result, the activity was susceptible to abuse, as when the bureau accepted such "purely political" assignments as checking up on opponents of lend-lease for President Roosevelt and opponents of the Vietnam war for President Johnson. Moreover, microphones, telephone taps and other electronic devices were among the program's principal tools. Mr. Sullivan notes that their use constituted invasion of privacy and, in some cases, violations of the Bill of Rights. Mr. Sullivan is not sure that a domestic security program is necessary for the nation, but he is quite clear that if it continued, it should be taken away from the F.B.I.

During his stint as Deputy Attorney General, William Ruckelshaus was planning a searching review of its functions and operations, but the "Saturday night massacre" killed that plan. The undisciplined helter-skelter growth of the F.B.I. has never been checked or seriously analyzed. If the Department of Justice does not have the heart for resurrecting Mr. Ruckelshaus' proposed review, it is up to Congress to undertake both the hard analysis and the tasks of supervision and oversight which it has neglected for so long.
The Colby Case

Anybody who wants to know where It's at in Washington these days should pay close attention to William Colby, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. For Mr. Colby is the model of the modern bureaucrat.

In dealing with the Congress and the press he has been openness personified—often to the disadvantage of his colleagues and superiors in the government. His case shows that the sensational revelations about domestic spying by the CIA, while connected, with what used to be wrong here, have nothing to do with what is presently the trouble in Washington.

Mr. Colby is a symbolic figure in many ways. He is typical of the highly professional men (Princeton and Columbia Law School) who could have made it in private life but chose to go into government service because it offered more interesting jobs.

His service with the government led to a distinct institutional loyalty. Mr. Colby has been with intelligence services since World War II, and with the CIA for a score of years. He is totally aware of the agency's bureaucratic inertia. If the word did not have such a very bad connotation, he could fairly be called an apparatchik.

Finally, Mr. Colby has experienced firsthand two blows shattering to the American bureaucracy. He was a leading figure in the Vietnam War—both out in Vietnam and here in Washington. He was also involved in picking up the pieces in CIA after the agency's role in Watergate (notably the Ellsberg break-in) began to surface.

In the light of that experience, Mr. Colby's record is fascinating. He has broken with the tradition which made the top intelligence man a close-mouthed, bad guy who took the rap for his bosses. On the contrary, Mr. Colby has made himself regularly available for speeches and questioning by congressional committees and interested citizens' groups, including newspapermen.

In dealing with the Congress, Mr. Colby has not merely talked to the select number of senior senators and representatives grouped together in an "oversight committee." He has talked to the regular committees on foreign relations appropriations, atomic energy and economic policy. He has indicated that he would welcome a new oversight committee, and would accept any membership on the committee the Congress chose to impose.

In dealing with citizens' groups, he does not merely talk to friends of the CIA. He met with over a hundred journalists during his first year in office, and spoke to the Nieman Fellows at Harvard. He even exposed himself to a group which has as its stock-in-trade hostility to the CIA—the Center for National Security Studies, which staged a program that included an encounter between Mr. Colby and Daniel Ellsberg.

One inevitable result of such openness is the circulation of stories very prejudicial to officials for whom directors of the CIA normally show an exaggerated respect. For example, Mr. Colby—without being obliged to—told a congressional committee a lot of things about CIA activities in Chile which put egg all over the faces of former director Richard Helms, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and eventually President Ford.

Another indirect consequence, given the tenor of the times, is that a great many other intelligence officers are spilling the beans about past operations. Such sources have combined with a notable case of journalist over-play to yield the current crop of stories about CIA spying on domestic dissidents in the Nixon years.

I do not mean to minimize such actions if what actually took place was as advertised in the New York Times by Seymour Hersh, then there were grave violations of the laws governing CIA operations.

But no one should be under the impression that the spirit of the Nixon presidency is still dominant in Washington. There is no present threat to individual liberties from an all-powerful Executive.

The reverse is true. The real danger is weakness at the center, bureaucrats playing to the press and Congress, and demobilization along the line. So those who take upon themselves to be investigators and judges of government behavior have all the more reason to be careful and responsible, to note the present as well as the past, and to avoid the hunt for scapegoats which now seems to be shaping up.
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HELMS WAS VAGUE
IN 1973 ON SPY BID

But Denied Domestic Role
—House Unit Linked Him
to Discussion of Plan

BY SEYMOUR M. HEISLE
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25 —
Richard Helms told the Senate
Foreign Relations Committe
in 1973 that he could not
"recall" whether the White
House had urged the Central
Intelligence Agency to engage in
domestic spying because of
increasing antiwar activity in

The Helms testimony, taken
to a secret Senate committee
hearing on Feb. 7, 1973, came
four months before the first
published accounts of Mr.
Helms's participation in the so-
called Hulton plan for domestic
spying, purporting to be ended
by a White House staff mem-
ber, Tom Charles Hulton. The
plan, which called for some
covert operations acknowl-
edged to be at least nine years
officially put into effect by the
Nixon White House.

Helms Denial Recalled

Documents made available
last July by the House Judici-
ary Committee's impeachment
inquiry showed that Mr. Helms,
representing the C.I.A., had
been an active participant in the
various working sessions
on the plan.

The State Department an-
nounced Tuesday that Mr.
Helms had categorically denied
in a telegram from Iran, where
he is United States Ambas-
sador, that the C.I.A. participat-
ed in "illegal" domestic spying
while he served as its director

Mr. Helms has since left his
post and is officially reported
to be on a prearranged leave.

In Vail, Colo., where Presi-
dent Ford is continuing his
working-skiiing visit, the White
House announced that it was
awaiting a special report on the
domestic spying allega-
tions.

The Ford Administration has
made no official denial or con-
firmation of the alleged spying
since the initial published re-
port in The New York Times on
Sunday.

The Times, quoting well-
placed Government sources,
said that the C.I.A. had
violated its charter by conducting
massive and illegal intelligence
operations aimed at antinarc
and other American dissidents
inside the United States. Intel-
ligence files on at least 10,000
American citizens were com-
piled, the sources said.

The subject of domestic
C.I.A. intelligence was raised
repeatedly during Mr. Helms's
secret Senate confirmation
hearing, as the Senators focused
questions on the fact that two
of the five men arrested eight
months earlier in the Watergate
break-in had some C.I.A.
connections.

Mr. Helms assured the commit-
tee that the agency had not been
involved in any domestic spying.

At one point, Senator Clif-
ford P. Case, New Jersey Repub-
lican, posed the following ques-
tions: "It has been called to my
attention that in 1969 or 1970
the White House asked that all
intelligence agencies join in the
effort to learn as much as they
could about the antiwar move-
ment, and during this period
United States Army intelligence
became involved and kept files
on United States citizens. Do
you know anything about the
activities of the C.I.A. in that
connection? Was it asked to be
involved?"

"I don't recall whether we
were asked," Mr. Helms re-
sponded, "but we were not in-
volved, because it seemed to me
that was a clear violation of
what our charter was.

A moment later, he told
Senator Case what he would
have done if someone had
requested the C.I.A. to become
involved in domestic opera-
tions. "I would simply go to
explain to the President this
didn't seem to be advisable."

In his May 22, 1972, state-
ment on Watergate, President
Nixon disclosed that he met
with Mr. Helms and other top
intelligence officials on June
5, 1970, to discuss "the urgent
need for better intelligence op-
erations."

That report led to a series of
recommendations drafted by
Mr. Huston and approved in
writing by Mr. Helms and
others. The recommendations
for break-ins, wiretaps and the
surreptitious inter-
ception of mail, acts acknowl-
edged to be illegal, to meet the
alleged threat from antinarc
and radical groups who were
said to "seek to confront all
established authority and pro-
voke disorder."

The House Judiciary Commit-
tee's documents show that on
July 23, 1970, Mr. Helms re-
cived a top-secret memoran-
dum on the domestic intelli-
gegence plan from Mr. Huston.

The memorandum called for the
C.I.A. to join other Government
intelligence agencies to evalu-
ate, report on and carry out the
"objectives specified"—that is,
cover actions.

Five days later, the memo-
ramand was recalled because of
an objection by John N. Mitch-
ell, who was then Attorney
General.

In an Aug. 5, 1970, letter urg-
ing Presidential approval of the
program, also included in the
House documents, Mr. Huston
said that the C.I.A. and the
military intelligence agencies
"all have a great stake and a
great interest."

"All of these agencies sup-
ported the options selected by
the President," he said.

In its Sunday dispatch, The
Times quoted a high-level Gov-
ernment intelligence official as
acknowledging that the CIA's
decision to maintain domestic
files on American citizens "ob-
viously got a push at that
time."

Nonetheless, Mr. Helms as-
sured the Senators during his
February, 1973, testimony that he
believed "100 per cent" in the
1974 legislation setting up the
C.I.A. Special Prosecutor John
Jaworski.
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CIA Probe
Asked for
By Clifford

By Ronald Kessler
Washington Post Staff Writer

Former Secretary of De-
fense Clark M. Clifford yester-
day called for creation of a
congressional committee simi-
lar to the one that investi-
gated the Watergate scandal
to probe charges that the Cen-
tral Intelligence Agency
engaged in domestic spying.

Clifford, who helped draft
the 1974 legislation creating the
agency, said a joint com-
mitee of the House and Sen-
ate, with an adequate staff, is
needed to air the charges that
appeared in last Sunday's New
York Times.

The Times alleged that the
CIA had mounted a massive,
illegal domestic spying opera-
tion during the Nixon adminis-
tration. The activities were
said to include creation of files
on 10,000 antiwar dissidents,
wiretapping, mail inter-
ception and break-ins.

The legislation creating the
CIA makes it clear that it may
not engage in domestic activi-
ties, Clifford said in a tele-
phone interview yesterday.

"There have been a series of
incidents that have involved the
CIA," he said. "It seems to
me we should have an investi-
gation in depth. The time has
come for the Congress to look
searchingly into the CIA in light
of conditions in 1973 to see if
improvements are needed in the
act." The 94th Congress will con-

President Ford yesterday re-
cieved a 50-page report on the
allegations from CIA Director
William E. Colby. Ford said he
would not rule out making the
report public, although presi-
dential spokesman Ron Nes-
sen later said parts of the re-
port are classified.

The alleged overseer of the
spying operation, James An-
gleton, former director of the
CIA's counterintelligence divi-
sion, was quoted yesterday by
United Press International as
saying he resigned from the
agency because "higher au-
thorities" wanted him to leave.

In an earlier, Washington
Post interview, Angleton said
he had been asked some time
ago about his activities at the
CIA by the office of Watergate
Special Prosecutor Leon Jaw-
orski.
C.I.A.'s Budget Is So Secret That Even Most Members of Congress Know Nothing About It

BY DAVID E. ROSENBAUM
Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, Dec. 26—Every year, the Senate and House vote to allot money to the Central Intelligence Agency. But most members of Congress do not know how much money they are allocating, or what it will be used for.

In fact, they do not even know when they are voting to allocate it.

It is a system that has been in place since Congress agreed, by law, 22 years ago, that the C.I.A. decide how much Congress and the public should know about the agency's activities. And the agency's budget is one of its best-kept secrets.

To monitor the threat that the Senate and House have formed small subcommittees of senior members, most of them politi
cal conservatives, who, according to experts, rarely challenge the figures and information supplied to them by the agency.

Following a report by The New York Times last weekend that the C.I.A. had allegedly mounted a massive intelligence operation against dissident groups within the United States, in direct violation of the law, Congress, of both par
dies and various ideologies and many other influential persons have called for detailed Congres
sional reviews of the agency's operations.

Proxmire Asks Action

"Immediate and severe action is necessary," said Senator William Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, in a statement that was echoed by many others.

"The seriousness of this is such that I would recommend a full and exhaustive investigation by a special committee," said Clark M. Clifford, the for
er Secretary of Defense, who helped to draft the original legislation that established the C.I.A.

Similar statements have been made each time there has been an intelligence scandal since the agency was created by Congress in 1947.

Yet, Congress has been reluctant to act. More than 200 measures designed to make the C.I.A. more responsive to Congress have been introduced in the last quarter century, but none have been enacted.

The infrequent Congressional investigations have been held in closed sessions and have pro
duced little change in Congression
al oversight procedures.

Congress has continued to al
dow the agency's budget to be camouflaged in the stated budgets of other departments and agencies, and the appropri
tions to be spread throughout a number of different appropri
dations bills.

There is not a single line item in the Federal budget for a single dollar figure in any appropriations bill that can be identified as applying to the intelligence agency.

The prevailing view in Con
gress seems to have been that expressed three years ago by

Senator John C. Stennis, Demo
crat of Mississippi, who is the single most influential member of Congress on intelligence matters.

"You have to make up your mind that you are going to have an intelligence agency and protect it as such and shut your eyes and take what is coming," Senator Stennis said on a Senate floor speech.

His fear that many other members of Congress and the public would know about the agency's activities has not appeared to be realized.

The House and Senate Armed Services Committee each have intelligence subcommittees, not made up of the senior members of the full panels. The Senate subcommittee has five mem
bers, headed by Mr. Stennis. The House subcommittee has seven members, headed by Re
dresentative Lucien N. Nedzi, Democrat of Michigan.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees also have subcommittees dealing with funds for the intelligence agency. In both cases, the subcommittees members are the five senior members of the subcommittees that deal with defense appropriations.

The subcommittees seldom meet. This year, the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee met twice. The House Armed Services Subcommittee met six times and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee five times. The House Appropriations subcommittee did not report a record of meetings.

Minutes of these meetings were not kept, and in most cases the actions taken were not recorded. Not only was the public thus kept in the dark, but so were the other members of Congress.

I do not think there is a man in the legislative part of the Government who really knows what is going on in the intelligence community, and I am terribly upset about it," Senator Howard H. Baker Jr., Re
gublican of Tennessee, told his colleagues in a speech on the Senate floor last October.

Senator Baker and Senator Lowell F. Weicker Jr., Republi
can of Connecticut, introduced legislation in September that would create a 14-member Joint House-Senate Committee on Intelligence Oversight with jurisdiction over all intelligence-gathering activities.

The House equivalent would be a Joint Committee on National Security, a joint committee to study government surveillance activities and a special Senate committee to study how the Senate could improve its oversight of intelligence matters.

The House Armed Services Committee considered but did not act this year on a measure that would further define the prohibition on C.I.A. activities in domestic intelligence.

The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations held 12 days of hearings on Congress, "for Congress to complain that it was not informed of some nefarious action when Congress has permitted itself to remain ignorant or passive when knowledgeable.
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"CIA Using Resources To Aid Iran Repression"

NEW YORK (Kyodo-Reuters) — A Denver lawyer who recently returned from a fact-finding trip to Iran said Monday that American resources were being used through the CIA to "enhance the Shah by assisting him in his pattern of repression.

Iranian jails now hold an estimated 20,000 to 40,000 polit
ical prisoners, he said.

Reynard, a former member of the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, which was founded in 1939 to rescue Czechoslovakians from the Nazi threat and which has sponsored a number of investiga
tions of alleged human rights violations.

With Reynard at the news conference were Iranian phar
macologist Ebrahim Yardi and Pulitzer Prize-winning American journalist Frances FitzGerald, who has visited Iran.

22