

14 May 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR : EO/ICS

SUBJECT : Watergate - Agency File Review

REFERENCE : Memorandum from Inspector General,  
Same Subject, dated 26 March 1974

In accordance with the reference request, I have had a selective review conducted of the USIB Secretariat files. In this review we did not find any material which would be considered relevant to "Watergate." In addition, the executive secretary of the Security Committee was asked to review committee files. A memorandum from [redacted] stating that this review was conducted is attached. A review of the TSCC files was conducted by

[redacted]

[redacted]

Executive Secretary, USIB

**Attachment**

USIB/S/mhb [redacted]

Orig. - Addressee w/att

- 1 - [redacted]
- 1 - USIB Files
- 1 - Dep. Ex. Sec., USIB info

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP80M01082A000900110002-3

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
SECURITY COMMITTEE

10 May 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Secretary  
United States Intelligence Board

SUBJECT : Watergate Related Materials

There has been a complete examination of the files and storage cabinet containers under the control of the Security Committee at CIA. I hereby certify that there are no tape recordings, files or other material in my custody or possession which are either directly or peripherally related to any person or subject matter connected with Watergate.

[Redacted Signature Box]

Secretary

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP80M01082A000900110002-3

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP80M01082A000900110002-3

DCI/IC-74-216  
4 April 1974

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR: [redacted] Chief  
Registry

SUBJECT : Review of Files for "Watergate" Material

STAT

1. In accordance with our discussion today, you will be the action officer for ICS activity in the review of files related to the "Watergate" subject. As we discussed, it is likely advisable to ask USIB/IRAC Secretariat to conduct an independent review and report through you for final ICS accountability. After you have consulted with [redacted] and undertaken the task, you will also be in position to advise on the depth of review recommended for USIB/IRAC committees.

2. If a final report deadline of 27 April to the AD/DCI/IC cannot be met, let's discuss.

STAT

[redacted]  
Executive Officer, ICS

STAT

cc: [redacted]

Approved For Release 2004/10/08 : CIA-RDP80M01082A000900110002-3

CC/1 74-1235

26 MAR 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant to the Director  
Executive Secretary  
Deputy to the DCI for the Intelligence Community  
Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence Officers  
Deputy Director for Operations  
Deputy Director for Intelligence  
Deputy Director for Management and Services  
Deputy Director for Science and Technology  
General Counsel  
Legislative Counsel  
Comptroller

SUBJECT : Watergate - Agency File Review

1. This memorandum relates to the Director's request for a review of Agency files for material connected in any way with what has come to be called "Watergate." At a recent morning meeting, I mentioned that we were preparing guidelines to assist you in carrying out the review within your areas of jurisdiction. The guidelines are now completed, and a copy is attached hereto. The target date set for completion of the review is 10 May 1974.

2. We have devoted much time to consideration of various possible ways in which a review of Agency files might be conducted, and we are convinced that a complete file review, regardless of how conducted, would still not provide absolute assurance against future "surprises." The guidelines we have prepared call for a somewhat selective rather than a comprehensive review.

a. A simple cursory review of all files would likely be of little substantive worth. It would enable the Agency to state that all files have been reviewed; but such a statement would only make more embarrassing any subsequent "discovery."

b. On the other hand, a thorough review of all Agency files would require a truly massive effort extending over a lengthy period of time, involving hundreds of man-years. The

term "Watergate" has come to cover to one extent or another a wide range of topics, events, and personalities, including much historical data. As the Watergate story has unfolded, there has been instance after instance in which a seemingly innocuous item has acquired relevance and significance because of its relation to something else turned up in CIA or elsewhere. For this reason alone, a complete review of all Agency holdings today would not provide a guarantee against new "surprises" tomorrow.

3. The file review which will be necessary in each of your areas of responsibility, even though it can be described as a selective review, will require a large amount of effort and time. It would be totally beyond the abilities of my staff to do all the reviewing. Most of the reviewing and most of the decision-making in connection with it will have to be done in your components and under your management. I and my staff will assist where we can. I suggest that you put someone in charge of the review effort in your area and have him make arrangements with [redacted] of my staff [redacted] for a discussion on "Watergate" and its various aspects and on what is expected in the file review.

4. The guidelines which we have prepared are not as specific as we would like to make them. The fact is, however, that "Watergate" does not have a precise definition.

5. It should be borne in mind that much information about the Agency and Agency activities resides in the minds and memories of Agency employees. Along with the file review, therefore, the memories of Agency personnel must be jogged as part of the effort to ensure that anything relevant which has not been reported previously be reported now.

[redacted]

Donald F. Chamberlain  
Inspector General

Attachment a/s

22 March 1974

WATERGATE - GUIDELINES FOR AGENCY FILE REVIEW

1. The Director has called for another review of Agency files for material connected in any way with what has come to be called "Watergate." The purpose of the review is to the extent possible to ensure that Agency management is aware of all such material in our files and that there will be no future "surprises" in this regard.
2. The review is to be conducted in accord with these general guidelines, which have been prepared by the Inspector General.
3. The review within each directorate and separate operating component will be the responsibility of that particular directorate or separate operating component, the role of the Office of the Inspector General being limited to that indicated in the following paragraphs. On the completion of the review within his area of responsibility, each deputy director and chief of separate operating component will certify in writing to the Inspector General that a review has been conducted in accord with these guidelines, and will report to the Inspector General the findings of that review.
4. The target date for completion of the Agency file review and the reports to the Inspector General is 10 May 1974. If a deputy director or chief of separate operating component finds that he will be unable to meet that target date, he will consult with the Inspector General on the setting of a new target date for his component.
5. The review must be comprehensive. This does not mean that each and every piece of paper under the Agency's control must be looked at and studied in this review. It does mean that all files, including those in archives, in field offices, in proprietaries, and anywhere else, must be considered. It will be up to the management of each directorate or separate operating component to determine what specific files must be physically searched and read, and what files need not be so reviewed. For example, it should not be necessary in this review to search anew through files which are known to contain nothing but past issues of finished intelligence publications.

In making this determination about any given set of files, however, each management level must bear in mind that the term "Watergate" has with the passage of time come to cover a wide range of topics, events, and personalities, including much historical data. In paragraph 8 below, is a list of subjects which are to be considered in particular. This list has been prepared as a guide for the review. It should not be used, however, as reason for excluding other material which, while it may not come properly under any of the headings given, may nonetheless be related to "Watergate" in the broadest sense of the word.

6. Any material relevant to "Watergate" (in the sense indicated above) found in component files will be forwarded to the Inspector General. In some cases (e. g., if a given file or set of files is found to contain significant quantities of relevant materials), a component may find it desirable to segregate certain files for review by representatives of the Office of the Inspector General.

a. Whenever there is doubt as to whether something should be forwarded to the Inspector General or otherwise called to his attention, the doubt should be resolved by forwarding the material to or otherwise notifying the Inspector General.

b. Any operationally sensitive material which require special handling may be discussed directly with the Inspector General.

7. The requirements of paragraph 6 above do not apply to press clippings or to any material which has already been brought to the attention of the Inspector General since the beginning of his office's "Watergate" investigation, i. e., since 14 May 1973.

8. Following is a list of subjects which must be considered in this file review. As indicated above, this list is not necessarily all-inclusive and should not be regard as such. The entire list should be considered within all components, even though the file search on some topics will be more narrowly targetted.

a. Watergate Break-in(s)

This heading covers the June 1972 surreptitious entry into the Democratic National Headquarters at Watergate, the subsequent arrests, and any and all information connecting the Agency in any way to preparations for the break-in(s) in June 1972 or earlier, the individuals involved, and the alleged cover-up efforts.

The "individuals involved" includes but is not limited to those listed in the attachment to 23 May 1973 Memorandum for All Employees, "Agency Involvement in the Watergate Case":

H. R. Haldeman  
John Ehrlichman  
John Dean  
Egil Krogh  
David Young  
E. Howard Hunt  
G. Gordon Liddy  
James W. McCord  
Charles W. Colson  
John J. Caulfield  
Eugenio Rolando Martinez Careaga  
Juan Rigoberto Ruiz Villegas  
Bernard L. Barker  
Virgilio Gonzales  
Frank Anthony Sturgis

b. Daniel Ellsberg

This covers any and all information in Agency files related to Ellsberg, including the requests for and preparation of the profiles on Ellsberg, the case of the so-called Pentagon Papers, damage assessments, Agency associations, the Ellsberg trial.



c. Hank Greenspun

This covers any and all information in Agency files reflecting any knowledge of the alleged break-in, or plans for such, of the files of Hank Greenspun or of the newspaper in Las Vegas with which he is associated.

d. Hunt's 1971 Request on Security Flaps

The review here will be limited, at least initially, to a check of DDO European Division files and records, if any, on the request of Howard Hunt in 1971 to a former chief of European Division for information or background on past security flaps, and on the response to the Hunt request, specifically whatever information may be available about an  The Inspector General will consult directly with the Deputy Director for Operations regarding the review on this subject.

STAT

e. Other Requests by Hunt

This covers any information available regarding any requests by Hunt for Agency assistance on any matter after his retirement from the Agency.

f. National Elections of 1972

This covers any records that might reflect any Agency knowledge, however obtained, reflecting activity related to the national elections of 1972, including intelligence support for candidates, security activity related in any way to political conventions or other meetings, campaign mail, support of other governmental organizations in connection with the campaigns and the elections, and political activities of any sort by Agency personnel beyond that of a legal and clearly personal nature (e.g., personal contributions to candidates).



STAT

a review of Miami/Cuba operational files, and a check and possibly a file review in the Office of Finance. The time frame for material on this subject will be calendar 1972. The Inspector General will consult directly with the Deputy Director for Operations and the Director of Finance with regard to the review on this subject.

h. ITT

This covers any Agency association, however direct or indirect, with ITT and its various components and subsidiaries and affiliates; any records touching on ITT and bearing on CIA/White House relations (including Congressional hearings related to Chile); anything that might reflect any Agency knowledge of the ITT role in connection with the Republican National Convention in 1972.

i. Robert R. Mullen and Company

This covers any and all information regarding Agency association with Robert R. Mullen and Company, including but not limited to the company's provision of cover for Agency personnel.

j. Howard Hughes

This covers any and all information connecting the Agency or Agency personnel with Howard Hughes or any of his enterprises.

k. Robert Vesco

This covers any and all information connecting the Agency or Agency personnel with Robert Vesco or any of his enterprises.

l. Robert Maheu

This covers any and all information connecting the Agency or Agency personnel with Robert Maheu or any of his enterprises.

m. Joint Operations

The review here should cover joint FBI, NSA, or Secret Service operations or activities which the Agency or Agency personnel knew about, supported, or participated in that might bear on or be related to the various aspects of what is known as "Watergate," including CIA support for Secret Service security activities in connection with the 1972 national elections.

9. Questions regarding these guidelines or the review called for may be referred directly to [redacted] in the Office of the Inspector General, [redacted]

STAT

STAT