Approved For Release 2006/01/17 : CIA-RDP80MQ1009A00310001002000

DRAFT Cons

25X1

Executive had

PERSONAL AND NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Rec & 11 m 14

Mr. Clifton Daniel New York Times 1920 L. St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. Daniel:

Two recent experiences move me to write you. A "backgrounder" session on Wednesday, 27 February is the most recent experience.

The situation was similar to that which obtained when I lunched at your bureau and when I lunched with your editorial board in New York. On Wednesday -- as was the case at the lunches -- I said that due to our feeling that definitions of "background", "deep background", etc. were variously understood, I would merely say that those present could use anything I said but not attribute it to me or any government official. A reporter then volunteered, "that's what we call 'deep background' -- the Lindley Rule -- no attribution to anyone".

Since the appearance of the attached story, we have checked back with representatives of all the media present to see whether perchance we did not understand our own ground rules. This has proven not to be the case; those present agree that there was to be no attribution. I wonder, therefore whether there is some New York Times position on attribution of which I should be aware. I know that a Washington paper, for

Approved—For Release 2006/01/17: CIA-RDP80MQ1009A003100010020-0 instance, has taken a position on backgrounders, although it seems to be flexible.

I would be pleased to receive any guidance you can give me.

As to the attached story itself, perhaps I can take this opportunity to clarify two points.

With respect to the phrase "some of the information was purchased", a recheck with the same men who were present confirms my impression that I had said that the collection of information from American citizens and companies was on an absolutely voluntary basis with no payment involved. This appears to have been so understood by all those with whom we rechecked.

The story says "in 'very, very rare' instances, intelligence services had spent 'non-appropriated money' - that is, money acquired by private sources". All present seem to have understood that what I had said was that there were very, very rare instances in which we had been approached with offers of money and that we did not use non-appropriated monies. I expatiated on this further, but that was the main thrust.

Sincerely,

W. E. Colby

NEW YORK TIMES



Business Pose by U.S. Spies Reported

By DAVID BINDER

that business enterprises pro- and-development ventures with operate under the cover of bethat business enterprises providing them with cover reviding them with cover received payments from the United States Government to defray
the costs of running their offfices.

Others function only parttime as agents, he said, and some of them have proved to
be such talented businessmen vate sources.

and-development ventures with operate under the cover of being journalists.

Last year it was disclosed that the C.I.A. had maintained some 30 journalists on its payvery rare" instances, intelliroll during the years since
World War II.

be such talented businessmen vate sources, that they were lured away from The offici that they were lured away from The official asserted that their intelligence positions and United States intelligence servhired as full-time executives ices had not used funds from by the companies that had pro-businesses for the last 10 years. vided cover.

erers, while others had become 1970, to be spent in Chile to de-"a pain in the neck," because feat the Socialist candidate for they "spent only 10 minutes a day" on intelligence activity and the rest of their working day on business assignments.

Official Asks Anongmity

The official made the disclosure during a discussion of relationships between United States intelligence services and private American business.

The official, who insisted that neither his name nor his department be identified, said that the American intelligence services . frequently sought specific information from businessmen, scholars and journalists. Te indicated that some of the information purchased while other items

were acquired by "swapping" data useful to the other party.

vices, when seeking informa- de Gossens. The offer was made Special to The New York Times vices, when seeking information from businessmen, always to Richard M. Helms, who was then the Director of Central Intelligence agents offered to guard the information of the New York Times agency's formulation from businessmen, always then the Director of Central Intelligence, by the agency's formulation from competitors.

In addition, the official said.

In this connection he pointed "We've lost some good ones out that the Central Intellithat way," the official said. He gence Agency had rejected an added that some of the busi-offer by the International Telemessmen-agents had been "very phone and Telegraph Corporavaluable" as intelligence gath-

He said that intelligence ser-the presidency, Salvador Allen-

as businessmen.

In addition, the official said,
He said that some were fullthe intelligence services partime intelligence operatives and ticipate sometimes in researchits practice of having agents

ell attach a Clim Xerox.

Approved For Release 2006/01/17/: 14-RDP80M01009A003100010020-0

	OFFI	CIAL ROUTING	G SLIP	
го	NAME AN	ID ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DCI			
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
ACT	ON	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE	REPLY
APP	ROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMM	ENDATION
COM	MENT	FILE	RETURN	
CON	CURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATU	RE
	Ho It con a da	wistic of, mai	, for	- -

25X1