

Note that there is no referenc
to revelations at this time w
2 weeks old of the involvement
of the CIA in the Garrison
investigation, hence the ass-
assination. This is consis-
tent with the Post's attitude
toward the assassination.
Just two days ago I phoned Lar
Larry Stern with some informa-
tion on this folowing disclos-
ure that Garrison had cracked
an Oswald notebook code and
becuse I knew what was to
follow. I referred him to
WWII, ch 7 and told him name
CIA WW, etc.

Damage Held Incalculable

Outraged Officials Fear CIA Is Compromised

By Richard Harwood
Washington Post Staff Writer

1/15/67

The word "treason" fell into disuse in Washington with the passing of Sen. Joseph McCarthy. Now it is heard again in secret offices of the Government and in private clubrooms where men of the intelligence community assemble to damn the fate that has overtaken the CIA.

"Treason" is a strong word, to be sure, but no stronger than the feelings that have arisen within the Government over the wounds inflicted on the agency in recent months.

"This," one official has said, "has been a greater disaster for that agency and has done more damage to the interests of the United States than the Bay of Pigs."

Starting with an article in Ramparts magazine in February, disclosure has piled on disclosure of how and through whom the CIA has conducted covert operations all over the world.

Its infiltration of dozens of private organizations, its use of impeccable private foundations as financial conduits, its alliances with foreign and domestic labor organizations, student groups, intellectual and academic societies have been revealed in pitiless detail.

Hardly a day passes that some new tidbit fails to surface: the use of CIA funds to subsidize French newspapers in the 1950s; the agency's clandestine support of the international literary society, PEN; the flow of CIA funds into foreign countries to influence elections.

The most recent and most deeply resented blow was a Saturday Evening Post article written by Thomas W. Braden, the California publisher who served in the agency in the early 1950s and was personally involved

See CIA, A7, Col. 1

THE WASHINGTON POST Monday, May 15, 1967

in its secret subsidy program. The article was written as an ostensible defense of the CIA but it disclosed new secrets, named new names and reopened the damaging controversy over the agency's role in American life.

Cool Facade

The official reaction to all this has been bland enough. The public posture of CIA is that nothing has happened that requires a public explanation; it admits nothing and denies nothing. The President some weeks ago took the refuge Presidents often take when overwhelmed by events: He appointed a committee to study the problem.

Behind this cool facade, however, the Government is seething. Something akin to panic has spread through the intelligence community as it waits for other shoes to drop and other secrets to be unmasked.

Robert Amory Jr., deputy director of intelligence in the CIA a few years ago, expressed the ultimate fear in a television interview on Feb. 26:

"It seems to me this is like the famous old figure of speech: It is a strand in

a sweater; it is unravelling. If it unravels the whole thing . . . it will be nothing but a pile of yarn on the floor, and this will be a disaster. I think the gentlemen of the Fourth Estate . . . who are pursuing this all the way, might just as well be in the business of scuttling carriers in the Tonkin Gulf. They are destroying an important part of the Nation's national security fabric."

Amory has since taken a less cataclysmic view of the problem but men still in the Government have not.

"I think what the press has done," a disturbed official remarked last week, "is very close to treason. I want to be specific. The Washington Post, The New York Times and CBS have done the most damage. You (The Washington Post) published a chart (of CIA conduits) which the Communists would have paid millions to get. You gave it to them free. I sometimes wonder what people are thinking when they damage their country in this way."

(The chart to which he referred was a visual representation of material that had already been published in news media.)

What, precisely, has the damage been?

The first and most obvious reply evoked by a questions of that kind is that the pride, the morale and the "image" of the great bureaucracy that occupies the enormous CIA building at Langley, Va., have been badly bruised.

CIA alumnus Braden, who has contributed to the problem, unwittingly perhaps, put it this way last week:

"I have been making speeches all over California on a variety of subjects, not including the CIA. But whenever the agency is mentioned there are boos and hoots in the audiences. And these are not left-wing audiences. They are middle-class people—businessmen's clubs and so on. I think that's a hell of a thing in 1967 to hear a fine agency of the government booted.

Began in 1961

The agency's image problems did not begin, of course, with the Ramparts expose and subsequent disclosures. Its miscalculations at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 destroyed whatever aura of infallibility may have surrounded the CIA in the past. No one was more disillusioned or more critical of

the agency than President Kennedy. He brought in a board of outside overseers—now headed by Washington lawyer Clark Clifford—to find out what was wrong. The Clifford panel uncovered dozens of problems, none of which has been publicized. Events of the last few weeks have, in any case, merely reinforced the view that the agency is as capable of blundering and is as susceptible to ineptness as, say, NASA, or the Department of State.

Overseas an image problem of a different kind has arisen. The Communist propaganda network has been able to depict the agency, not as a Keystone Cop operation, but as a sinister force for the corruption of governments and private organizations. And it is not only the Communists who have taken that line. In Spain last week, a Madrid newspaper accused the CIA of financing an anti-Franco political movement between 1950 and 1956. The Pakistan Press Agency charged that the International Press Institute has been transformed into "an official spy organization" by the CIA. There have been repercussions in India, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa.

The ability of private American organizations and foundations to carry on international programs has been gravely compromised, in the judgment of people both in and out of the government.

The American Friends of the Middle East, a private

research and development group that received CIA funds, has been virtually destroyed in terms of future effectiveness. The educational and charitable works of the Asia Foundation of San Francisco have become suspect even though its CIA connections are speculative at best.

"Private organizations," a student of intelligence activities reported, "will be paying a heavy price for years. They are all suspect now, all over the world; even missionaries are going to have serious problems. I think a lot of these organizations are going to have to fold up or withdraw from places like Africa and Latin America. That will leave the field open to the other side."

Amory fears that people in foreign countries who have cooperated with U.S. organizations in the past may be in danger of arrest, harassment, or worse.

Other Problems Raised

Braden's article in the Saturday Evening Post is said to have raised other problems: "Do you think people in other countries, including government officials, are going to work with us now, as they have in the past, knowing that some CIA man may one day jeopardize them by telling everything he knows in a book or a magazine article? The State Department has the same problem, now that Bill Atwood (of Look Magazine) has told all he knows."

He was referring to Atwood's book, "The Reds and The Blacks," which recounts his diplomatic experiences

as an Ambassador to Guinea and Kenya.

Government men who live by secrecy very often tend to value secrecy for its own sake and to have exaggerated reactions to its loss. To some extent that is the case in Washington today in lamentations over the plight of the CIA. The talk of "treason" is a case in point. Another was the CIA's attempt a few years ago to prevent publication of "The Invisible Government" by David Wise and Thomas Ross, a book that told more about the agency than had been told before.

In calmer moments, however, politicians and civil servants concerned with "security" and "secrecy" are drawing lessons from the CIA's experience. They concede that in an open society total secrecy is not possible, even if it could be shown to be desirable. They have found that the CIA's shadow existence can be penetrated through the process of inquiry which the CIA itself relies upon for most of its information. They have found that the oath of secrecy that CIA officers and contractors are required to take is no guarantee against disclosure. Former CIA Director Allen Dulles has himself published a book and articles on his experiences in the agency.

They have also found that the agency's techniques often leave much to be desired. Its use of private foundations to covertly subsidize private organizations, for example, was a perilous device. Once the method of subsidy was uncovered, it was a simple matter for the

press, as Amory has said, to "peel off the layers of the onion."

Finally, there is now going on in the Government a re-evaluation of the agency's premises. Was it ever a good idea to use private organizations for governmental purposes? "What these disclosures have cost us," an official has said, "is probably greater than any-

thing the CIA got for its money."

The agency, in any case, is expected to weather the storm, with its budget, its labor force, and its privileged relationships with Congress and the White House preserved. How long it will take to restore its self-confidence is a question neither man nor computer can answer.
