

Agents' in Academia Are Recruiting Spies

By NICHOLAS M. HORROCK

WASHINGTON—In a brief and little noticed section of its final report, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence came up with a finding that is at the center of a growing controversy over the Central Intelligence Agency's intrusion into the United States academic community. "The Central Intelligence Agency," the report said, "is using several hundred academics, who in addition to providing leads and on occasion making introductions for intelligence purposes, occasionally write books and other ma-

terial to be used for propaganda purposes abroad . . . These academics are located at over 100 American colleges, universities and related institutions. At the majority of institutions, no one other than the individual is aware of the C.I.A. link."

Though the report was issued in the spring of 1976, the public debate over this sort of operation by the espionage service continues. Last week, a House subcommittee opened hearings on the agency's relationships with news organizations and publishing houses. Over the next few months, its involvement with the academic community, and even religious organizations will be explored as Congress

considers new rules and charters for intelligence gathering. What makes the Senate report's conclusions most intriguing is that they describe not only a covert operation still underway, but one purportedly so important that the intelligence agencies were able to persuade the Senate committee to withhold the details from the public. One of three Senators dissenting from that decision was Walter F. Mondale, who as Vice President presumably will have something to say about any controls the Administration might want to impose on the intelligence community.

The public has known for more than a decade about the Central Intelligence Agency's dabbling in the academic world. An article in Ramparts magazine in 1967 opened an investigation that established that the agency secretly had funded the National Student Association, research projects from anthropology to zoology at a dozen or more colleges, labor unions, farm organizations and such activities as police science training.

The Attorney General then, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, under orders from President Johnson, drew up rules to restrict the abuses. But while publicly abiding by these regulations, the agency was covertly shifting funding mechanisms and budget dates to keep priority operations going.

Eight years later, the intrusions into campus life were further curtailed after new disclosures emerged during the Senate investigation. In an executive order, President Ford placed extra restrictions on the agency's use of academics and members of religious institutions. There was one significant omission, however: the secret agents on some 100 campuses.

Worton Halperin, a former aide in the Nixon White House who had been a wiretapping target and who now is an official of the Center for National Security Studies, has worked for several months to piece together what the Senate did not tell the public about the campus operation. Generally, he said, the "agents" are professors, teaching graduate assistants or members of the university administrative staff, motivated by a sense of patriotism or a need for money. In some cases, according to an agency source, professors are hoping for access to information and contacts they otherwise might not have.

Their main function is to help the agency identify and recruit spies from among the thousands of foreign students who study in this country. "They have general instructions to look for foreign students who may want to work for our Government, but occasionally there are special assignments like finding Brazilian physicists," Mr. Halperin said. ^{by} These undercover men also recommend American stu-



Walter Groppe

agents to agency recruiters; prepare background reports on spy candidates, and obtain witting or unwitting help from other professors for propaganda writing and espionage at conferences. During the antiwar years, they reported in some instances on campus political atmosphere.

The Senate committee did not receive the names of individual agents but was provided a list of the schools involved. People who have seen the list have described the schools to Mr. Halperin as usually having large numbers of foreign students, extensive graduate programs and foreign-affairs studies that give the faculty international connections. Presumably, these are such large campuses as the University of Michigan, the University of California at Berkeley and Columbia University and other Ivy League schools.

The agency steadfastly has refused to identify the agents or even tell the universities that there are undercover operatives in their midst. John M. Ward, president of Amherst College, said in an interview that when he wrote to the agency and asked if there was a secret operative on campus (he didn't want the name), he was told the agency could not reply for "national security reasons." Mr. Ward said he has no evidence that Amherst is involved, but nonetheless he is preparing guidelines to be introduced before the faculty committee this spring that would require staff members to disclose if they secretly worked for central intelligence and also set standards for any other relationships with Government intelligence agencies.

Mr. Halperin says about 45 colleges and universities are contemplating some sort of action. Harvard University is the only school that has formal rules for relations with the intelligence gatherers. Last May, it adopted interim guidelines that permit research for the Central Intelligence Agency as long as the work is unclassified, the results are made public and the existence of the research and the subject matter is published. Daniel Steiner, Harvard's counsel, says a person may openly agree to do consulting or research for the agency if it is reported to the dean or university president. However, the guidelines prohibit involvement in espionage operations or covert recruiting on campus.

What might be wrong with a professor working secretly for the agency? One argument is that the atmosphere of "academic freedom" is destroyed. If a professor questions a student to find out his views as a potential espionage agent, it no longer is a "private academic discussion," the give and take is gone. Under the pressure of the antiwar movement, Mr. Halperin says, the simple recruiting of agents gave way to the agency's plan becoming a spy on campus. "That's not really a free academic atmosphere," he believes.

Nicholas M. Horrock is a reporter in the Washington Bureau of The New York Times.