

John Chamberlain ————— What's the CIA Moral?

WASHINGTON — Just what is the moral of the tale exposed by Ramparts Magazine, that the Central Intelligence Agency had been spending up to \$200,000 a year to support the international activities of the National Student Association, an organization with chapters on some 300 college campuses?

It can't be that it is wrong for the government to pass out



JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

money to the university world in ways that are supposed to strengthen the United States in its efforts to keep from being buried by the Communists. All sorts of subsidies are handed out to physicists, to political scientists, to heaven knows who for heaven knows what, in order to keep the U.S. a going concern. If it's the money that's an issue, the whole darned university world is bribed.

Could the moral be, then, that it is wrong to take money without disclosing the source? If this is the standard, why didn't the editors of Ramparts Magazine, an expensively gotten-out publication with little advertising and small circulation, come clean about their financial backing when they were challenged to do so on a recent Barry Gray radio show in New York City? Not that I would expect Ram-

parts to answer, for the issue is phony as long as no laws are being broken. But what goes for Ramparts' right to silence also goes for the CIA, which was legally set up by Congress to spend certain sums without accounting in fields where the safety of the nation was involved.

Is the moral that it is wrong for a nation to meet fire with fire? The Communists spend vast amounts of money to whomp up youth festivals in Helsinki and Vienna, with travel expenses guaranteed to anyone with a record of friendliness toward Communist purposes.

The figure for running a single Red youth festival has been set as high as \$100million by those who claim to know. But the Communists don't tell how the money is passed, or who decides upon the recipients. So, assuming that a democratic nation has a right to its own self-defense, what is wrong about the CIA subsidizing travelers to symbolize American standards before the world?

And why should the details be handed to Soviet correspondents for Tass? Gus Hall, the U.S. Communist mahout, doesn't itemize his bookkeeping.

It can't even be alleged with a straight face that the CIA was bribing American boys and girls to say what they didn't believe, for the NSA has practically nev-

er taken a pro-government position in international affairs.

If it is wrong for the CIA to support organizations that help the U.S. to offset Communist manipulation of international groups, a lot of anti-Communist editors, labor union officials, and radio and television station operators should be hanging their heads in shame. But most of them, looking back on 20 years of Cold War history during which we have miraculously remained alive, will have no shame at all.

The main criticism of the CIA, is not that it has spent money to defend the nation, but that it has not always spent the money wisely.

The truth would seem to be that it never got its money's worth out of the NSA. The boys and girls of YAF — or the Young Americans for Freedom — would have delivered more for considerably less cash.

What Ramparts Magazine has done is to make the CIA look foolish in the eyes of the world. The CIA has been made to look foolish before. But its present plight is comic opera compared to the figure it cut when the Bay of Pigs flopped or when the U-2 was knocked out of the sky over the Soviet Union.

If Ramparts' editors enjoy making their country look ridiculous, they have the right to do it. But somehow it seems like a mighty low and mean ambition.

(Dist. by King Features Syndicate)

the small society

by Brickman



S-D 2/22/67