

4
ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE

LOS ANGELES TIMES
30 July 1980

HOWARD ROSENBERG

SECRET IS OUT: CIA TV SERIES PROPOSED

Is TV ready for the CIA? Not only that, "The CIA" would be made with the technical and "interpretive assistance" of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO), whose 2,800 members include some 1,100 ex-CIA personnel. Co-executive producer Larry Thompson insists he's "not on some crusade to cleanse the CIA."

The operative word for "The CIA" is "proposed." The script hasn't even been written.

It's a "script development deal," said Scott M. Siegler, CBS vice president, dramatic program development. "That means it's one of a number of scripts being considered for a pilot and a decision is probably nine months away."

However, Siegler added, "On paper, at least, it's stronger than most, and it could be a breakthrough."

Twentieth-Century-Fox-TV and Thompson, Penny, Wagner Productions, which was formed for the occasion, are collaborating on "The CIA." The script will be written by former OSS officer Edward Anhalt, who won Academy Awards for his writing of "Becket" and "Panic in the Streets."

"So far, so good. But anyone familiar with how "The FBI" glorified the bureau for eight seasons on ABC can be excused for snickering about something called "The CIA." The AFIO would have no creative control, but would critique for "authenticity" and suggest themes for stories from time to time; should "The CIA" be picked up for a series, said AFIO president Jack Blake by phone for McLean, Va. He expects "The CIA" to show the agency's warts, "but this is not to say you're going to have anything like (the

will recognize the stories," he said. It would be revolutionary, indeed, for a government-regulated TV network to deal in a weekly series, if at all, with the CIA's alleged roles in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile and early backing of the Shah of Iran. However, Thompson won't talk about specifics.

Former CIA director William Colby once told Thompson that "the problem with the CIA was that it is so secretive that the public didn't know what it did, and when they did get information, it was in a vacuum."

Would "The CIA" show the unglamorous, unheroic seamier side of spying that hasn't been seen weekly on TV since CBS carried the British series "I Spy" some 15 years ago?

"There are good guys in the CIA and there are bad guys," said Thompson. "They may get to a point where they have to make a decision about what justifies the means. Some mistakes will be made and we will show the missions that aren't successful. But each week, if you like the characters, you'll understand they are American citizens

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE D-1

WASHINGTON POST
27 July 1980

How Italian Communists

Walk a Tightrope

By Oriana Fallaci

ORIANA FALLACI: Mr. Berlinguer, this is intended to be an interview on the Italian Communist Party (the biggest communist party in the West) vis-a-vis the international crisis. That is, vis-a-vis a reality which threatens to fall into a third world war. So the subjects will be many and the first one will inevitably be your rapport with the Soviet Union. I begin it with a brutal question: Don't you ever break with the Soviets? Each time it seems that a tremendous earthquake is going to erupt, or God knows what schism, and instead, when the tempest is over, the sun shines again.

ENRICO BERLINGUER: I wouldn't call it sun, and I wouldn't say that it shines. Just think of the positions taken in these last six months by the party. I mean our condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, our refusal to take part in the European Communist Party meeting organized by the French and Polish CPs, our trip to China to reestablish our relationship with the Chinese. However, it's true that we have not broken with the Soviets, that we do not break. You ask me why. Because this is the policy we follow with all: to affirm our autonomy, to say without hesitation what we think, and at the same time to maintain the thread of the rapport — that is, an open dialogue. Didn't we do it with the Chinese also? Yet our points of view remain different from those of the Chinese also.

Q: And thus we get to the subject of the rapport between the ICP and the Americans. An important subject because I think that the Americans don't understand much of what happens in Italy. Just think that often, the man in the street doesn't see the difference between the ICP and the Red Brigades.

A: This isn't possible! Anyone knows that for years the ICP has been on the front line of the struggle against the Red Brigades, the terrorism, in defense of the democratic state! Anybody knows that the Red Brigades have been murdering Italian Communist Party members! What you tell me is really disconcerting! Don't they read the newspapers? Maybe the newspapers don't follow very much the Italian events! As a matter of fact, I noticed that an event as important as our trip to China was not emphasized at all by the newspapers.

Q: I don't know. But let's concentrate on the rapport which was totally closed during the Nixon administration when Kissinger said: "No communist party has even been organized democratically; no communist organization has ever differed with the Soviet Union on foreign policy; no communist party has ever shared power with other parties."

A: Let me start by saying that we Italian Communists don't live in anxiety of receiving recognition from the rulers of the United States or of the Soviet Union or of any other country. We may understand the American preoccupations for the Atlantic Alliance. In fact, those American preoccupations are our preoccupations also. We may be interested in knowing their judgments of us because such judgments are related with the good rapport that Italy must have with America, and we care about that good rapport. But we do not live in the anxiety I mentioned, and I refuse Mr. Kissinger's verdicts, his belief that the participation of a western communist party in the government would necessarily mean a point in favor of the Soviet Union. The Americans who think like Mr. Kissinger have an old and distorted idea of the Italian Communist Party, not only on the theme of our rapport with the Soviets but also on our concept of socialism. They do not understand, or they don't want to understand, that we respect the Atlantic Alliance and that our goal is not to take power alone as a communist party. It is to participate in a government coalition together with other democratic forces and of the left, according to the rules of democracy and our constitution.

Q: Yet, you just told me, you are Communists. Not liberals, not social democrats, not laborites; Communists who remain Communists. And saying, "When a communist party went to power, it remained in power" is a sacred truth.

A: It also happened that we were chased from power by force. It happened in Spain where we participated in a government coalition, it happened in Hungary in 1919. Anyhow, there is something metaphysical in these doubts. Because they all depart from the nature of the communist party and, in fact, it is not invariable. Not even for the

UNDERWRITING THE RIGHT

Public TV's
C.I.A. Show

JOHN S. FRIEDMAN

One of this season's most popular public television programs was *Free to Choose*, written by and starring controversial economist Milton Friedman, among whose previous activities was advising the Pinochet Government in Chile. The show examines almost every facet of the free enterprise system except the source of the funding for Milton Friedman's series debut on public TV. As far as the average viewer of *Free to Choose* could tell from the credits, the money was provided mainly by foundations rather than corporations; once again, it seemed public television had provided an independent forum for controversial programs.

But did it? If a program on the energy crisis were funded by the Mobil Oil Corporation or the Exxon Corporation, the conflict of interest would be obvious, but the ethical problems raised by foundation sponsorship of public television are less clear-cut. The general public regards foundations, for the most part, as charitable organizations functioning on behalf of some ill-defined public interest, and the foundation world has worked hard to foster this image.

But it is precisely this benign public view of foundations that has made them increasingly attractive "neutral" sponsors for controversial public television shows. Corporations and institutions whose images are tarnished now seek such "neutral" intermediaries to convey their views.

The Smith Richardson Foundation of Greensboro, North Carolina, is one such ideological middleman. This non-profit foundation, which provided seed money (a small but crucial sum) for *Free to Choose* as well as for other programs of similar conservative hue, has had close ties to the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Department for many years. Its funding of programs dealing with foreign policy or domestic spending raises serious questions about what should constitute a conflict of interest. Of equal importance is the viewers' right to know the ideological leanings of the underwriters of such programs so that they can better assess their objectivity.

Raising money for public programs is as uncertain as panning for gold. Advertising isn't permitted on the system, which is partially funded by the Government. Producers of controversial programs have a particularly difficult task because underwriters are reluctant to support them.

One reliable and lucrative source of funds, however, has been the Smith Richardson Foundation. With assets of approximately \$60 million, the foundation has since 1955

given about noncommercial *Choose* (the \$105,000 for examined topic policy; \$50,000 ing station, American for *Gift*, a series because KEF funds. In ne most difficu for preprod In addition of \$47,500 public static grew out of *of the Real*.

The new p supported ir being prepa brochure wh tions ought letter reveals

involved in all the complexities of the past, we thought it better to look ahead and examine what role the C.I.A. might play when confronted with a crisis in the future."

Drafts of the story and teleplays are being reviewed by "consultants," according to the promotion brochure, who include William Colby, former director of the C.I.A.; Samuel Halpern, former C.I.A. executive assistant to the deputy director for plans; John Maury, former C.I.A. chief of Soviet operations, legislative counsel for Congressional relations and Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Cord Meyer, former chief of the C.I.A. covert action staff, chief of the London station and assistant to the deputy director.

Despite the fact that Smith Richardson Foundation money and other grants have not been enough to produce the program as yet, the initial biases of the project and of a key underwriter indicate some of the problems raised by Smith Richardson as a donor of such money for public TV programs. The more one knows about the foundation the more disturbing these problems become.

In 1935, the Smith Richardson Foundation was incorporated in North Carolina under the name of the Richardson Foundation. It was established by the late H. Smith Richardson, the son of the founder of the Vick Chemical Company. The company's name was changed to Richardson-Merrell Inc. in 1960 and the foundation, which is in-

CONTINUED

BOSTON GLOBE
17 July 1980

Secret US base reported wiretapping Europe phone calls

By Linda Melvern
Special to The Globe

A secret American base operated by the National Security Agency is listening in on European telephone calls, the British weekly news magazine "New Statesman" reported yesterday.

The article, the result of a five-month investigation, says the base employs more than 800 American civilians and appears to be the biggest telephone intercept center in the West. The base is directly linked to the British telephone microwave relay network that carries international telephone calls in and out of the country, the magazine said.

The British Ministry of Defense denied the base monitors transatlantic or domestic calls in the United Kingdom and said the base serves as a "rapid relay communications center

for United States forces in Europe." The base exists with the "full approval of the British government," the Ministry of Defense told the New Statesman. The London office of the National Security Agency (NSA), which is a branch of the US Defense Department, also said that the station is a communications relay center for the Defense Department.

Charges of wiretapping are not new in Britain. In February this year the New Statesman revealed the headquarters of the British national telephone tapping center in Chelsea, a section of London. This led to questions in the House of Commons. The home secretary, William Whitelaw, subsequently assured Britain that no wiretaps were conducted unless he or a secretary of state signed an authorizing warrant.

According to the New Statesman, their investigation suggests that one of the minor roles of the base involves the interception of Irish traffic. "Some gesture towards assistance with the anti-IRA (Irish Republican Army) campaign might make the existence of the base more palatable to the host government," it states.

A recent statement by a former US Air Force colonel, who supervised some NSA activity during the 1960s, reinforces the point, says the news magazine, that everything going across the Atlantic could be read by the NSA somewhere.

"The NSA has the capacity to, and at varying times does, monitor everything," Col. L. Fletcher Prouty, a retired Air Force officer who served in the Pentagon's Office of Special Operations in the 1960s, said in an affidavit prepared last year.

"For example, transatlantic communications are carried on cable or by satellite. There are three satellites over the Atlantic, each capable of transmitting 20,000 circuits," Prouty said. "There are eight transatlantic cables with about 5000 circuits. NSA monitors all these circuits, collects and records the electronic information transmitted and its computers can pick out the messages it wants by 'key word'."

Menwith Hill, the Yorkshire NSA station, has been in operation for more than 15 years. Three past and present US intelligence officials confirmed the role of the base from first-hand knowledge, says the New Statesman, which also published details of a computer delivered to the base in the early 1960s which is capable of sifting through thousands of calls for those of intelligence interest.

A relay tower at the heart of this countrywide microwave system is just five miles south of the NSA base. The tower, known as Hunter's Stones, is virtually the pivotal link in more than a million miles of microwave radio connections which have been installed in Britain.

It is linked to the NSA base by a high capacity underground cable which is capable, according to experts, of carrying over 32,000 calls simultaneously.

The NSA base commander, Albert D. Braeuninger, in an interview with the New Statesman, did not deny the link to the Post Office network. He said: "We pass information through the U.K. communications system. Our line is cable... It is purely a communications link. We only use the Hunter's Stones power as a customer of the Post Office."

A former British military officer who visited Menwith Hill is quoted as saying: "It intercepts telephone and other communications to and from the United States and Europe and files intelligence dossiers on European political and trades union leaders."

NSA surveillance of international telephone lines was admitted officially when CIA director William Colby appeared before the Pike committee on intelligence in 1975. No details of how, where or by whom this is done have ever been disclosed.

The NSA is under direct control of the United States Department of Defense and its role is described as the protection of US government communications abroad and the collection, decoding and analyzing of intelligence information. Distinct from the CIA, the NSA does not formulate policy or carry out operations.

STATINTL