

PURSUIT OF SPY CASE BY C.I.A. QUESTIONED

Agency Reportedly Knew Soviets
Had Secrets Before It Came
to Suspect Ex-Employee

By NICHOLAS M. HORROCK

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 5 — The Central Intelligence Agency learned that information on its highly secret KH-11 satellite reconnaissance system was in the hands of the Soviet Union more than two months before it came to suspect William P. Kampiles, the man charged with selling the secrets, according to senior intelligence sources.

The sources said in interviews that this fact severely complicated the espionage prosecution of Mr. Kampiles in two ways.

First, they said, the Government must consider dropping the case if the manner in which the C.I.A. received the information could come out in court proceedings.

Moreover, the sources said, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was already investigating the disclosure of information on the KH-11 system when its attention was drawn to Mr. Kampiles, a former C.I.A. clerical employee. There is some doubt whether F.B.I. agents who first contacted Mr. Kampiles in August told him that he was a suspect, and this could affect the Government's case against him.

Mr. Kampiles, 23 years old, goes on trial tomorrow in Hammond, Ind., on charges of selling a top-secret manual on the KH-11 system to a Soviet agent in Athens on March 2. He has pleaded not guilty.

Test on Prosecution

The trial is regarded as a crucial test of whether the Government can prosecute espionage cases without having additional national security matters exposed in the course of court proceedings.

In a perjury prosecution of an official of the International Telephone and Telegraph Company here, the Government this week is expected to ask an appeals court to order certain evidence and trial procedure changes to protect what it maintains is national security information. It is expected to take similar steps for the Kampiles case.

Michael D. Monico, a Chicago lawyer 135413 Blueberries D 08-11 00338 NO MORE change for \$3,100.

It was shortly after the second meeting that the C.I.A. learned that its system had been compromised, according to intelligence sources.

Wrote to C.I.A.

In May, Mr. Kampiles allegedly wrote to a former colleague at the C.I.A. and told how he had been in contact and had received money from a Soviet intelligence agent. Mr. Kampiles had worked for the C.I.A. as a "watch officer," a low-ranking clerical position, from March until November 1977.

He reportedly joined the agency in hopes of becoming an intelligence officer and resigned after he was told that the C.I.A. felt he did not have an aptitude for the job and would not put him into a training program as an operative.

He wrote the letter, one source suggested, in the hope that it would show his former employers that he had done intelligence work on his own and was now in a position to feed "disinformation" to the Soviet Union and thus become an intelligence operative.

The agency reported the letter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and F.B.I. agents allegedly met with Mr. Kampiles on two occasions. In the first session he reportedly gave them a statement admitting that he had taken the manual while he was at the C.I.A. and sold it to the Russians.

Question of Warnings

It is unclear from available information whether Mr. Kampiles was warned in that interview that he was a suspect and that he had the right to remain silent or to have a lawyer present. Mr. Kampiles's lawyer will say only that the first time his client was represented by counsel was after his arrest on Aug. 17.

The trial comes at a time of considerable debate on how to prevent disclosure of national security information. Admiral Stansfield Turner, the director of central intelligence, and William Webster, the director of the F.B.I., have said in recent speeches that this is possibly the most serious matter facing the United States intelligence apparatus.

Many civil libertarians, however, fear that the intelligence services are trying to build what one lawyer called a "scare case" as a basis to impose new information restrictions and to change the very nature of public trial in the United States.