

its review of the voluminous correspondence which Senator Dodd has turned over to the Committee. In addition, various facts which were independently ascertained from records relating to Senator Dodd's activities were raised and will be pursued. . . . We are definitely making progress. . . ." What that progress is will not be known until the Committee gets around to scheduling open hearings.

Last week Dodd failed in his attempt to bar publication of pretrial statements by witnesses in his libel and conspiracy suit against Pearson and Anderson. In refusing Dodd's request for sealed depositions, Judge Alexander Holtzoff said: "I do not recall a single instance in years of even a request of this sort."

Checking on CIA *NR 5/28/66*

Senator Eugene McCarthy has made a modest proposal. But from some of the blasts shot off on the Senate floor last week, one would have thought he had called for the impeachment of Lyndon Johnson. Endorsed by the Foreign Relations Committee by a nonpartisan vote of 14-to-5, the McCarthy resolution would place the chairman of Foreign Relations and two other members appointed by him on the "watchdog" committee that keeps an eye on the Central Intelligence Agency. Senator Richard Russell was outraged: "Unless the [watchdog] committee of which I am chairman has been derelict in its duty, there is no justification whatever for any other committee 'muscling in'. . . ."

It *has* been derelict in its duty; that is why there is public uneasiness, why numerous editorial writers are asking whether CIA is under strict enough surveillance by officials who are themselves accountable to the voters. In the Senate debate, Senator Russell himself demonstrated that his "watchdogs" have not always been told what CIA is up to. He was questioned by Senator Ernest Gruening about the Agency's role in the "ghastly fiasco" of the Bay of Pigs. Russell replied: "The CIA made a mistake, in my opinion, in telling the President they thought this operation had a good chance of success. . . . I did not know the timing of the Bay of Pigs operation. . . . I only wish I had been consulted, because I would have strongly advised against this kind of operation if I had been." As chairman of the committee whose task it is to watch over CIA, why did he not know, especially since he claims that "the CIA undoubtedly spends more time with its legislative oversight committee than does any other government agency of which I have any knowledge."

Did Mr. Russell also not know of the CIA's concealed penetration of Michigan State University's program in Vietnam? Or was he not informed that a CIA employee, George A. Carver Jr., is the author of the

lead article on Vietnam that appeared in the April, 1966, *Foreign Affairs*? If he was so informed, did he raise an eyebrow? For, as Senator J. W. Fulbright remarked, it is "quite beyond the ordinary anticipated activities of a member of this Agency to write without identification for a distinguished domestic journal. I do not believe the Agency was created to influence surreptitiously, in a sense, the attitude and policies – the attitude particularly – of the people of this country." How much, in fact, do Senator Russell's "watchdogs" see, and do they ever bark?

What the argument against the McCarthy resolution comes down to is this: giving three members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the right to be informed about CIA would jeopardize our national security. "If that is the case," Senator McCarthy told his colleagues, "they [the Senate] should give thought to changing the membership of that committee so that it could carry out its responsibility." Senator Fulbright said that he does not believe the members of his committee "are any more prone to leak information than anyone else."

Russell and his allies will use whatever parliamentary devices they can find to prevent the McCarthy resolution from coming to the floor for debate and vote. They will hope to have it referred to the Armed Services Committee or to Rules where it can be buried. If, however, they should fail and the Senate considers and adopts the resolution, it will mean that henceforth, through the accident of Senator Fulbright's being chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Senator McCarthy's being the inquisitive and intelligent man that he is, some more pointed questions can be privately asked of the Director of CIA, a bit more scrutiny exercised, and three additional members of the United States Senate will be better informed than they can be today about what goes on behind this iron curtain. It is not so much the intelligence-gathering functions of the Agency which have given rise to public apprehension – and to Senator McCarthy's resolution – but its undercover political operations, the covert subsidies given to influence (perhaps even overthrow) foreign governments.

Quietly Dropped

When Abba Schwartz got wind of the plan to eliminate his job as administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and to scatter 27 members of his staff to other State Department posts, he quit. An able and respected man in international refugee resettlement affairs and an articulate voice for a liberalized immigration policy, Schwartz could not believe that there was nothing personal in the proposed reorganization and