

s
int"

The Ni

354

© 1971 The New York Times Company.

Helms Defends the C.I.A. As Vital to a Free Society



Associated Press
Richard Helms addresses
editors in Washington.

**Rare Speech Discloses
Some Russians Aided
U.S. in Cuban Crisis**

*Excerpts from Helms address
will be found on Page 30.*

By RICHARD HALLORAN
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 14 —
The Director of Central Intelligence, Richard Helms, vigorously defended his agency today as necessary to the survival of a democratic society and asked the nation to "take it on faith that we too are honorable men devoted to her service."

Mr. Helms asserted, in his first public address since becoming head of the Central Intelligence Agency in 1966, that "we propose to adapt intelligence work to American society, not vice versa."

He spoke with the specific approval of President Nixon before a luncheon meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In a footnote to history, Mr. Helms revealed that American intelligence in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis was aided by "a

Continued on Page 30, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 3
number of well-placed and courageous Russians."

He told reporters later that he was alluding not only to Col. Oleg V. Penkovsky, who was identified previously, but also to others who provided information on Soviet missile systems. When asked for their names, Mr. Helms laughed.

Colonel Penkovsky was a Soviet intelligence officer secretly working for the Americans in 1961 and 1962. He was detected in October, 1962, and executed in May, 1963. The publication of his alleged memoirs in the West in 1965 aroused considerable controversy over their authenticity.

Mr. Helms asserted today that United States intelligence would have "a major and vital role in any international agreement to limit strategic arms."

Noting that the Soviet Union had rejected proposals for inspections within its territory, Mr. Helms said the United States could undertake an agreement to limit such arms "only if it has adequate intelligence to assure itself that the Soviets are living up to their part."

China Held Police State

At a time when the visit of an American table tennis team to mainland China has generated official hopes for better relations with Peking, Mr. Helms told his audience that "some of our most important intelligence targets lie in totalitarian countries where collection is impeded by the security defenses of a police state—for example, Communist China."

Mr. Helms's rare public appearance today was initiated by Newbold Noyes, editor of The Washington Star and president of the society of editors. When Mr. Helms said he could speak only with the approval of the White House, Mr. Noyes wrote to Herbert G. Klein, the President's director of communications.

Mr. Klein said today that President Nixon had readily approved Mr. Helms's appearance. He said the Administration thought it a good time for the American public to have Mr. Helms explain the role of the C.I.A., since the agency was not under the kind of fire that had been directed toward it in the past.

Mr. Helms noted in his address that in Britain and other European democracies, "it would be unheard of for the

head of intelligence services to talk to a nongovernmental group as I am talking to you today."

Dulles Talks Recalled

A spokesman for the C.I.A., in response to an inquiry, said later that Allen Dulles, the Director of Central Intelligence from 1953 to 1961, spoke publicly about twice a year. But he could not recall an instance in which Mr. Dulles's successors, John A. McCone and Adm. William R. Raborn, delivered public addresses. Thus, Mr. Helms's speech was probably the first from an intelligence director in 10 years.

Mr. Helms, who has a reputation as a skilled administrator, said, "There is a persistent and growing body of criticism which questions the need and the propriety for a democratic society to have a Central Intelligence Agency."

"It is difficult for me to agree with this view," he said, "but I respect it. It is quite another matter when some of our critics, taking advantage of the traditional silence of those engaged in intelligence, say things that are either vicious, or just plain silly."

No Domestic Functions

Mr. Helms emphasized that the agency had no domestic security functions and had never sought any.

"In short," he said, "we do not target on American citizens."

The agency was discovered in 1967 to have financed several international activities of the National Student Association and to have given subsidies to unions, foundations and publications.

More recently, the agency was implicated in the Government's surveillance of political dissidents in the United States by the testimony of former military intelligence agents given before a Senate subcommittee.

Mr. Helms asserted that the agency had no stake in policy debates.

'Must Not Take Sides'

"We can not and must not take sides," he said. "When there is debate over alternative policy options in the National Security Council, to which he is an adviser, 'I do not and must not line up with either side.'"

If he recommended one solution to a problem, those recommending another would suspect "that the intelligence presentation has been stacked to support my position, and the credibility of C.I.A. goes out the window," he said.

Mr. Helms, after asking that

the nation believe that the agency's operations were compatible with democratic principles, said "I can assure you that what I have asked you to take on faith, the elected officials of the United States Government watch over extensively, intensively, and continuously."

He said the National Security Council, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the

Office of Management and Budget and four committees of Congress regularly reviewed the agency's operations, plans and organization.

Reporting Called Lazy

WASHINGTON, April 14 (AP)—Mr. Noyes, in his State of the Press address, told the convention that American newspapers were guilty of lazy and superficial reporting.

"No doubt the Pentagon easily makes suckers of the press, but no more easily than the New Left does," he said. He encouraged efforts to gain

"a more sophisticated, a more serious perspective on our jobs."

In another development, members approved having the society "lead a move to secure a national shield law for newsmen," as a protection for the anonymity of news sources.

By voice vote, with a few scattered dissents, the convention went on record "protesting vigorously the treatment of C.B.S." by a Congressional subcommittee that issued a subpoena in connection with the controversy over the network's documentary on "The Selling of the Pentagon."

His Mission Is Facts

Richard McGarrah Helms

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 14—In early 1969, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the Soviet Union was "going for a first-strike capability" in building new intercontinental missiles. At about the same time, the committee heard Richard McGarrah Helms, Director of Central Intelligence, give a professional estimate that the Soviet Union was concentrating on defensive missiles. Later, on June 23, shortly before the Senate began a debate on an antiballistic-missile system, both men appeared at the same closed session of the committee to resolve the apparent difference.

According to reports from some of those who attended the session, Mr. Laird retreated partly from his original position, while Mr. Helms deferred to the Administration's view without changing his earlier testimony.

Respected Figure

This ability to keep intact his reputation as a speaker of facts, while avoiding the political fights that emerge around them, makes the 58-year-old, tall and dark Mr. Helms one of the most respected men in Washington.

"Helms is great with Congress," a Senate staff official said recently. "He admits when he doesn't know something. He never lies."

President Nixon went out of his way last May in a television news conference to emphasize that "Director Helms" played a key role in the Administration as one of his advisers.

And today, many members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors appeared to consider it a greater coup that Mr. Helms gave at their convention his first public speech since becoming intelligence director in 1966 than that Mr. Nixon is scheduled to address the meeting later this week.

Reared in Jersey

Mr. Helms was born March 30, 1913, in St. David's, Pa., and reared in South Orange, N.J. He spent two high school years in Switzerland and Germany, learning French and German as well as social graces.

He graduated from Williams College in 1935 with an outstanding record as a Phi Beta

Kappa, class president, school newspaper editor and year-book editor. His classmates voted him "most likely to succeed," "most respected," "the one who had done the most for Williams" and "class politician."

He went to Europe as a cub reporter with United Press and soon made a name for himself by getting an exclusive interview with Hitler.

Financial and personal problems cut short his career as a foreign correspondent, however, and he returned to the United States in 1937 as national advertising manager of The Indianapolis Times.

War a Turning Point

World War II was a turning point for Mr. Helms. He was assigned to the Office of Strategic Services because of his linguistic and other talents and has done nothing but intelligence work since.

After the war, he began to move up the ranks of the newly created Central Intelligence Agency. Associates say it was his capacity for work, his patience, his knowledge and understanding of government and his "professionalism"—traits they say they still admire in him—that brought him quickly to a top position in the agency in the early nineteen-fifties.

He stayed near the top for nearly 15 years under such men as Allen Dulles, Richard M. Bissell, John A. McCone and Vice Adm. William F. Raborn.

Then, in 1966, President Johnson named Richard Helms—he prefers his middle name not be used—as Director of Central Intelligence. Besides the role of senior intelligence adviser to the President and Congress, the job entails being chairman of the United States Intelligence Board and head of the C.I.A.

Mr. Helms was married several years ago to Cynthia McKelvie, 47. It is the second marriage for both. Mr. Helms has a son, Dennis, who is a Washington lawyer, and Mrs. Helms has four children by her previous marriage.

The Helmses are frequently seen on the Washington social scene, at small embassy dinners and on the tennis courts.

Mrs. Helms once told a reporter that she and her husband liked to relax by reading spy stories to each other for entertainment.

"They often are a bit far out, aren't they," she said with a smile.

Man
in the
News

Excerpts From Speech by Helms to Society of Newspaper Editors

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 14—
Following are excerpts from an address by Richard Helms, Director of Central Intelligence, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

I welcome this opportunity to speak to you today about the place of an intelligence service in a democratic government.

In doing so, I recognize that there is a paradox which I hope can be dispelled:

On the one hand, I can assure you that the quality of foreign intelligence available to the United States Government in 1971 is better than it has ever been before.

On the other hand, at a time when it seems to me to be self-evident that our Government must be kept fully informed on foreign developments, there is a persistent and growing body of criticism which questions the need and the propriety for a democratic society to have a Central Intelligence Agency.

I am referring to the assertions that the Central Intelligence Agency is an "invisible government," a law unto itself, engaged in provocative covert activities relevant to a democratic society and subject to no controls.

This is an outgrowth, I suppose, of an inherent American distaste for the peacetime gathering of intelligence. Our mission, in the eyes of many thoughtful Americans, may appear to be in conflict with some of the traditions and ideals of our free society.

May I emphasize at this point that the statute [National Security Act of 1947] specifically forbids the Central Intelligence Agency to have any police, subpoena or law-enforcement powers, or any domestic security functions. I can assure you that except for the normal responsibilities for protecting the physical security of our own personnel, our facilities, and our classified information, we do not have any such powers and functions; we have never sought any; we do not exercise any. In short, we do not target on American citizens.

In matters directly affecting the security of the United States, the President and his National Security Council want what we call "national" intelligence—evaluations which reflect the considered and agreed judgment of all of the intelligence components of the United States Government. The production and dissemination of this national intelligence is the responsibility and the primary function of the Central Intelligence Agency.

We not only have no stake in policy debates, but we can not and must not take sides. The role of intelligence in policy formulation is limited to providing facts—the agreed facts—and the whole known range of facts—relevant to the problem under consideration. Our role extends to the estimate function—the projection of likely developments from the facts—but not to advocacy.

Ironically, our efforts to obtain foreign intelligence in this country have generated some of the more virulent criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is a fact that we have, as I said, no domestic security role, but if there is a chance that a private American citizen traveling abroad has acquired foreign information that can be useful to the American policy-maker, we are certainly going to try to interview him.

If there is a competent young graduate student who is interested in working for the United States Government, we may well try to hire him.

The trouble is that to those who insist on seeing us as a pernicious and pervasive secret government, our words "interview" and "hire" translate into suborn, subvert and seduce, or something worse.

We use no compulsion. If a possible source of information does not want to talk to us, we go away quietly. If some student groups object to our recruiting on campus, we fall back to the nearest Federal office building.

Similarly, we welcome the opportunity to place research contracts with the universities, but again, these are strictly voluntary.

And so I come to the fundamental question of reconciling the security needs of an intelligence service with the basic principles of our democratic society. At the root of the problem is secrecy, because it is axiomatic that an intelligence service—whatever type of government it serves—must wrap itself in as much secrecy as possible in order to operate effectively.

If we disclose how much we know, the opposition is handed on a platter highly damaging indications of how and where we obtained the information, in what way his security is vulnerable, and who may have helped us. He can seal off the breach in his defenses, roll up the agents, and shut off the flow of information.

I cannot give you an easy answer to the objections raised by those who consider intelligence work incompatible with democratic principles. The nation must to a degree take it on faith that we too are honorable men devoted to her service. I can assure you that we are, but I am precluded from demonstrating it to the public.

I can assure you that what I have asked you to take on faith, the elected officials of the United States Government watch over extensively, intensively and continuously.

Starting with the executive branch, the Central Intelligence Agency operates under the constant supervision and direction of the National Security Council. No significant foreign program of any kind is undertaken without the prior approval of an N.S.C. subcommittee which includes representatives of the President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

In addition, we report periodically and in detail on the whole range of foreign intelligence activities to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, a group of men who have distinguished themselves in Government, industry, education and the professions.

Our budget is gone over line for line by the Office of Management and Budget and by the appropriate committees of the Congress as well.

There are elements of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees in both the Senate and the House which—like the President's board—are told more about our activities and our operations than is known to most of the personnel in our highly compartmented agency. But how, in the end, we are to be supervised is for Congress itself to decide.

In short, the Central Intelligence Agency is not and cannot be its own master. The same objectivity which makes us useful to our Government and our country leaves us uncomfortably aware of our ambiguous place in it. We may chafe under the criticism we do not answer, but we understand as well as anyone the difficulties and the contradictions of conducting foreign intelligence operations on behalf of a free society.

We are, after all, a part of this democracy, and we believe in it. We would not want to see our work distort its values and its principles. We propose to adapt intelligence to American society, not vice versa.

We believe, and I say this solemnly, that our work is necessary to permit this country to grow on in a free world and to find its way into a better and more peaceful one.