

Bad fellows make Strange Politics

If not through connections with "The Mexican Connection," the CIA was, to Nixon's and his henchmen's knowledge, vulnerable to other pressures because it had broken the law for him with and through Hunt prior to the break-in, the first arrests and the ensuing consternation throughout the government.

Ehrlichman's cited testimony is far from all the so-called investigations, all of which were whitewashes, which is expectable given the sacred cow status of the CIA in the Congress.

How little interested the Congress is in watching the CIA, even when it crosses over into publicized criminal activity and the supposedly precluded domestic-intelligence ~~are~~ ^{Democratic} is shown by the statement of a spokesman for Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, who is hardly anti-Establishmentarian and is not of his party's liberal wing. ~~The Senator was going to~~ "is going to take the matter up with the CIA," this spokesman said of reports of this domestic intelligence activity.

What would one expect it to say or do?

In The Washington Post of May 3, 1973, this quotation is followed by the ~~comment~~ observation, "The oversight committee has not met since Senator Russell's death."

Richard B. Russell gave up his oversight responsibilities long before his death, but as of the time of the story he had been dead almost two and a half years.

The only public testimony was taken by the Senate Watergate committee. The other committees of both House, that had any kind of jurisdiction held their hearings in secret. Had they not ~~the history of~~ and had they not held of - after all, inferences of CIA involvement were in the very earliest stories - the history of The Watergate if not of the country might have been different.

Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee got into the act. In secret, of course, when it considered the nominations of Helms to be ambassador to Iran.

When he appeared
first public (The first of his three appearances) before this committee, on February 5, 1973, ^{it} was his public appearance before any Congressional committee. ^{years} He had then been in CIA for 26, ^{all} all (until the last six and a half, when he was Director, in dirty-works) (which he bossed prior *cp*)

Thus

to becoming boss of the whole thing. (Phila Inq 2/6/73)

How much more secret, non-public, can the head of any federal agency be? How much farther removed from any supervision?

The truth is Nixon fired him, under the most exceptional of circumstance - and months only before his mandatory retirement, which is vindictive, even for Nixon. The ashes of history's most corrupted election had not yet cooled before he did it, beginning with what he so protests when he doesn't like them: leaks. They were hardly separated from Nixon when, like the UPI story from Key Biscayne on December 3, 1972, beginning "Richard Helms will soon leave his post", attributed to "Administration sources." (NYTimes 12/4/72)

Other people, like Robert Mullen, have Key Biscayne homes, but can "Administration sources" from Key Biscayne be any other than Nixon's personal staff?

Then there were leaks that Atomic Energy Commission Chairman James R. Schlesinger would replace Helms. December 17 he said the job had not been offered to him. (Post 12/18/72) Four days later his appointment was announced, by Mullen's neighbor in Key Biscayne. (Post 12/22.72)

There is an irony in sending ^{Helms} him off to Iran. In 1953 the CIA had overthrown the emotional and independent Mossadegh government, ^{this is} considered one of ^{its} the real coups, equal to or great than ⁱⁿ Guatemala, inside the dirty trickery. (One of the better accounts of this ~~in~~ operation is in Wise and Ross' The Invisible Government.)

Countless commentaries are available to argue that Nixon had other than indulging vindictiveness in mind by ousting Helms under such extraordinary circumstances, as soon as the election was over and so close to mandatory retirement. ^{publicly known} But the give-aways are the brevity of Schlesinger's stay as Director, Central Intelligence (he was soon made Secretary of Defense), ^{Helms} and the closeness to retirement and the fact that the United States Ambassador in Iran was acceptable to Nixon and had hardly adjusted to the desert sands and the stench of oil before he was replaced. *Other reasons are less visible.*

late

^{one} The factor other than Watergate was "reorganization" of the CIA. In fact it was evisceration, ending the only independent intelligence analysis of any major consequence other than that by those departments most involved, the military and the ^{diplomatic} diplomat.

In early 1973 the think-pieces started rolling off the presses. But the real consequence

of this vengeance against Helms is that there would be no check on the military's version of military intelligence or the ~~State Department~~ Henry Kissinger's estimates and understandings of what was going on in the world.

only their analyses were figure in decision making.

add citations numbers

In the beginning it was explained as an "economy" measure, easing out about a thousand employees who were getting along in years, ~~not generally regarded as compassionate.~~ But when the personification of all the military errors of the age, General Daniel O. Graham, a military intelligence man, published an article in Army magazine ~~for~~ just before Schlesinger picked him for membership in the Intelligence Resources Advisory Board and that article argued that the Pentagon should have exclusive jurisdiction in analyzing strategic military intelligence, the real purpose was hardly hidden.

Helms' firing was accompanied by a drastic reorganization of intelligence back to its major defect that caused ~~the~~ ^{*O.S.S. The first*} creation of an independent, civilian intelligence agency. ~~save for the cost,~~ ^{*intelligence costs, secret and hidden in the budget,*} (estimated at a total of over six and up to eight billions of dollars a year. (Times 4/30/73)

There was no way! Saving it

When the military starts criticizing the judgement of the military and the diplomats that of the diplomats, ~~that will be news.~~ ^{*and each starts taking responsibility for its errors, the revolution will have come.*}

~~But~~ getting the CIA pretty much out of this kind of intelligence and analysis was a nice bribe to the military, not a short-ranged gesture by a President ^{*fac mg*} ~~about to be~~ ^{*ment.*} impeached, ~~as conditions then were.~~

It was also to add emphasis to the least necessary and most undesirable function of any spookery, clandestine operations, or dirty tricks.

As Jack Anderson pointed out in his March 8, 1973 column, in the "Cuban exile community" alone there is "a pool of ^{*talent*} ~~talent~~ which was trained by the CIA and is available for 'dirty tricks.' This talent has been used at one time or another by a number of federal agencies for missions of questionable legality, inside and outside the United States."

The folks who gave us Watergate and many other Nixon operations not investigated.

more photos

The extent to which federal agencies train and equip all sorts of anti-social elements for their special needs of any whim and then turn them loose, too often equipped to wreak havoc on people, property and political affairs, is not well known. It is fact.

If the FBI has done more than any agency should, the CIA is supposed not to have any domestic functions of this character. Its lack of a fig-leaf it overcomes by raw power and fear of criminalizing it. That is a political liability.

on 5) Frank Fiorini/Sturgis is a long-time Anderson informant. Anderson appealed and appeared on his behalf when it came time for bail.

Large quantities of death-dealing materials intended for but not used in the Bay of Pigs are still around to deal death.

Thanks to the folks who gave us the Bay of Pigs, from Nixon to Hunt.

"Bullets used to ~~kill~~ Nashville liquor store ~~operator~~ operator Lavorte Clay Smith, 28, were ^wmanufactured originally to be used in the abortive Bay of Pigs..." the Nashville papers reported on April 15, 1953, telling of the police investigation that proved the bullets were "manufactured for CIA-controlled businesses."

"Explosives used in five bombings in Los Angeles last July 19 came originally from the Central Intelligence Agency, ~~xxxxxx~~...two FBI agents testified" in a case of "15 ~~charges of~~ counts of illegally possessing and ~~dis~~ discharging explosives," the Associated Press reported December 30, 1968. One of the two men charged reported accurately to the police "that after the Bay of Pigs invasion, explosives could be found anywhere in the Miami area." (T-P 12/31/68)

These five bombings in three hours are a minor sample of the death and destruction caused by the CIA-trained and-provided for, from coast to coast. The best-known cases are of those calling themselves "Cuban Power." It was no big deal for them to attack a ship in an American port. Perhaps the best-known case is the shelling of the United Nations building.

+1 from 5 -
"CIA May Scrap Airline It Doesn't Need; Plan to Sell Southern Air Transport Stirs Controversy," is the headline on one of a series of late August and early September, 1973 stories in The Washington Post and The New York Times. The CIA has domestic airlines of its own, tax-payer financed.

Beginning with a New York Times December 17, 1972 story headed "14 City Policemen Got C.I.A. Training" it came out that the CIA had actually been training city police departments in its arcane skills. To believe the CIA explanation is to believe that without it police

could not keep records. And for what is there the FBI ~~Academy~~ Academy? From one ^{detective} (who took that training I know the explanations) is false, a cover for still another form of CIA intrusion into domestic life.

tr to 4 Philadelphia was shocked to find that the home of () Fassnacht was bulging with the widest assortment of automatic weapons and explosives. He was CIA, then engaged in clandestine activities overseas, under cover, as the story unfolded first in the newspapers and then in court.

The slander case filed by Eeril Heine in 1964 came to trial in ~~June 1969~~ federal district court in Baltimore in June, 1969. The court held that the CIA has the right to order agents in the United States to slander others. (Post 6/9/69). The Supreme Court upheld the decision. The Washington Post's May 20, 1971 account begins, "The Supreme Court refused to review a lower court's decision that immunized a Central Intelligence Agency operative from a law-suit for slander uttered 'in the line of duty.'" AP

There are countless cases similar to the foregoing. The spooks are part of our life and there seems to be nothing we can do about their ^{domestic} dirty tricks. These people do what the CIA tells them to do and on their own they do what the CIA taught them to do, sometimes with what the CIA gave them.

When this is so well known in the Cuban community and when Nixon through Hunt drew not only on this Cuban community but on those who had for years been performing precisely these "duties" for the CIA, the claim of the arrested Cubans that they believed they were serving the Government on urgent "national security" matters is not without credibility, especially when the political beliefs of these revanchists are understood. Barker told the Watergate committee that Hunt told him the assignment was above CIA, that important. (1H357ff) There is no doubt in my mind that not only the Cubans but the entire crew believed this fascist doctrine, as did those for whom they did their dirty tricks, all of which have not been exposed and most of which have been deliberately avoided in the "investigations."

Even those confessed!
so-called

Of all the investigations of the CIA's role ~~with the review~~ in the activities of those charged after the first of the alleged-known charged break-ins, only that of the Watergate committee was.

public. It took the testimony of Helms, Cushman and Walters August 2 and 3, 1974. (8H3232ff; ~~and~~ 9H3403ff.) This testimony fell roughly into two parts, the CIA's assistance to Hunt in his White House operations and White House pressure on CIA to deter the FBI investigation and then to accept blame for the burglary.

The original request for this illicit CIA help in illicit White House acts was Cushman ^{to} in a "call on July 7, 1971 from Mr. Ehrlichman who said that Howard Hunt had been hired ...on security matters, that he would be coming to see me, and could I lend him a hand, or words to that effect." (8H3290ff). ^{Two} ~~an~~ internal CIA memo; here ^{officially} "sanitized" to remove well-known names, expresses the concern felt inside the agency as Hunt made increasing demands upon it: (get Ex 127)

3392

EXHIBIT NO. 127

MEMORANDUM FOR: General Cushman

Attached is the report on Howard Hunt's latest requests for TSD support.

There are two problems:

1. Hunt has brought a stranger into the picture who is now proxy to TSD's role in this affair. The White House should have cleared this with us and we must be told who the fellow is. He could embarrass us later.
2. Hunt's use of unique clandestine equipment in domestic activity of an uncertain nature also has potential for trouble. The Agency could suffer if its clandestine gear were discovered to be used in domestic secret operations.

I will instruct TSD to clear all of Hunt's requests with this office. Also, it would be desirable to obtain Mr. Hunt's assurance that Hunt's latest caper is OK. Even then, this does not relieve the Agency from its vulnerability if associated with domestic clandestine operations against Americans.

27/8/71

(DATE)

3393

26 August 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: TSD Request for Guidance on Extent of Assistance to Mr. Howard Hunt

1. Mr. [redacted], Deputy Chief, TSD, called to express concern about the extent of support being requested by Mr. Howard Hunt, former Agency officer who is a White House consultant.
2. Mr. Hunt's original request in July was for assistance in obtaining a physical disguise and false documentation which would permit him to interview people under pseudonym without risk of being recognized later. He was also provided with a tape recorder concealed in a battered typewriter case. Mr. Hunt said that the technical support was needed in connection with an extremely sensitive White House project. He insisted that those who provided him with support not be aware of his identity. His contacts with TSD officers were conducted in pseudonym. Mr. Hunt said that this request for Agency support had been cleared with Mr. Ehrlichman of the White House staff. General Cushman discussed Mr. Hunt's request with the Director and received his permission to authorize TSD to provide assistance.
3. Mr. [redacted] said that Mr. Hunt had requested additional support since the initial project. He asked TSD to furnish a disguise and documentation to a colleague whom he identified only by pseudonym. Mr. Hunt has been given two sets of false teeth, one of which changes his pattern of speech, one with a missing tooth. On 25 August he asked for and received training in clandestine photography and was given a concealed camera in order to photograph an individual in a poorly lighted corridor. According to Mr. Mr. Hunt said that he needed the camera in connection with a "new assignment". Mr. [redacted] noted that Mr. Hunt now possessed a considerable amount of special materials. The clandestine camera is particularly sensitive since it could plausibly be associated with the Agency. I noted that there was also the question of its use in domestic clandestine activity and told Mr. [redacted] that I would report his call promptly and obtain guidance.

EA/DDCI

"TSD" is technical services. *The technician is Cleo Gephart.*

This admitted help in "national security" matters was described by Cushman as no more than the Hunt representation that "he had been charged with a highly sensitive missionan interview of a person whose ideology he was not certain of, and that he felt he had to disguise himself to conduct this interview, and requested that the Agency provide him with the materials to establish that alias...I considered it a one-time interview, as he stated it, was perfectly OK." (8H3292)

One violation of the law, one intelligence intrusion into domestic affairs that is illegal, "was perfectly OK."

The "technical" equipment provided Hunt exceeded what this "interview" required and the CIA knew it. Perhaps this explains Nixon's selection of Cushman, his old friend, as second man at CIA and his replacement by another old friend, Walters. *Nixon* had his men where he wanted them and these two acted as his men, not as public servants, in the entire affair.

7A *this*
That "highly sensitive mission" that Nixon called top "national security" was many missions, none involving ~~any~~ any rational concept of national security. Besides, this is not a dictatorship and, were the "national security" claim legitimate, there are agencies trained to perform these functions. Does anyone doubt the ability of the FBI to do this kind of duty? *charged to do the duty and work?*

The publicized "national security" cases were ~~the~~ most "highly sensitive" because they were all illegal, ~~and~~ all political. The best publicized was the burglary of the psychiatrist to whom Daniel Ellsberg had gone. Ehrlichman, Egil Krogh, Liddy and some of the Cuban gang were indicted for it first in Los Angeles and later in a Washington indictment of March 7, 1974, when the Los Angeles case was dismissed except for a charge of perjuring himself before the Los Angeles grand jury by Ehrlichman. This is sufficient answer to the Nixon false pretense. It was common crime for political purposes, as was the other charged break-in, of the Democrats' headquarters.

Of all the other "highly sensitive missions" of utmost "national security" need, those that were acknowledged in one way or another and never really investigated are the Bennett Hughes and De Motte endeavors (De Motte was to produce what could defame

on 7 (A)

Ehrlichman, who sought to isolate himself from his pressures on the CIA, told Dean ^{remind} to ~~tell~~ Nixon's crony-generals how they got where they are. (H). This was putting it bluntly enough, with the inher^Nent threat that their careers could end fast.

Cushman and Ehrlichman were friends going back more than a decade, to 1960, which is eight years before Nixon took over the White House. When Hunt appeared in Cushman's office, Cushman sent a personal greeting back to his old friend Ehrlichman.

Senator Edward ^M "Teddy" Kennedy) and a Hunt "interview" with Dita Beard, the ITT lobbyist who put it in writing that ITT had bought Nixon administration help in an anti-trust case in return for a gift of up to \$400,000 to the reelection convention.

When Jack Anderson broke the story, Mrs. Beard disappeared. There is the uninvestigated story that Liddy spirited her out of town. Hunt's "interview" was to get her to disavow her memo and to give a different story. He succeeded.

In addition to these there were a whole series of what are called "bag jobs" similar to the two break-ins that resulted in indictments and convictions. If all of them were not reported, many were and none was investigated by the Watergate committee. Putting the Nixon/Hunt gang at the scene of the crimes was child's play from expense accounts, and if the committee did not have them it did not want them. They were available under subpoena. The Department of Justice did get them and did place no charges, not even when it had witnesses, not even after confessions began.

There were also a whole series of urgent "national defense" concerns revolving around interferences with the conventions of both parties, to defame the Democrats and create pandemonium and, of course, to spy ^{on them} and to build sympathy for Nixon with phoney "hippies" and "left-wing" demonstrations against him.

^{Watergate} The committee had the responsibility, stated in the title it printed on its hearings, to investigate and report on all "presidential Campaign Activities of 1972" and the Department of Justice had the duty to enforce the laws, not just those it and Nixon wanted enforced ~~and~~ including those Nixon violated.

Paralleling the Nixon/Hunt gang operation and coinciding with the earlier work of the Nixon so-called "Special Investigations Unit" which called itself "The Plumbers" was another dirty-works operation under Ehrlichman by a couple of former New York City "red squad" veterans, Jack ^(H) Caulfield and ^(H) ^(Anthony) Ulasewicz. Caulfield was pushed high in the

government and Ulasewicz did most of the ^{confessed} spying. He was also ~~involved in~~ paying off the defendants ^{in collaboration with} Herbert ^(H) Kalmbach. ^(H) Ulasewicz's real

work was the dirtiest, looking for what Nixon could use to defame his enemies, particularly

Teddy Kennedy over the Chappaquiddick incident but not it alone. He was there immediately and asked the dirtiest leading questions while posing as a reporter and paid by ^{money} tax money.

under the direction of Nixon's personal lawyer

as dirt

Ulasewicz

money

(Kalmbach copped a plea. He was sentenced to a soft-touch ^{six to 18} ~~months~~ ^{and \$10,000} ~~to~~ ^(Post 6/18/74) ~~years~~
 by "Maximum John" Sirica, the original judge in the original case. Compared to the original
 sentences, over six years for Liddy and eight for Hunt, "Maximum John", like Judge Hart
 with Kleindienst, minimized more the closer ^{well} those he sentenced ~~were~~ to Nixon and the White
 House. Hart praised the felon former Attorney General and saw to it that Kleindienst
 of the ~~only~~ 30 to which he sentenced him
 served not a day/and paid not a cent of his insignificant \$100 fine. All the lawyers, all
 close to Nixon and all the non-operating types of "white collar" crime who did go to jail
 were sent ~~not~~ to the tough and rough ones but to the softer-life "minimum security"
 institutions, some even with golf courses and no fences.)

as Caulfield was in such other "national security" matters as breaking into the home of respected syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft to bug him, a project already taken care of by the FBI and requiring a second second-story job to remove the bug.

The CIA's defense ~~against the charges~~ of its criminal activities approved by all its top people in its ^{Mixon} Hunt assistance is that once it caught on it stopped. This is false and I ^{believe this} think that the defense itself crossed over into the criminal more than once.

John Dean did try to get it to accept responsibility for the raid on the Democrats' headquarters by bribing the Cubans. The CIA's defense is that it refused. This also is false and there is enough evidence in suppressed documentary form and suppressed secret testimony to take to a grand jury, and I believe to court.

The CIA's testimony on these matters is contained in the inadequate questioning of its top three of the period, ~~Cushman, Wal~~ Helms, Cushman and Walters.

^{They} It did admit to creating a ~~fa~~ false identity and false documentation for Liddy, as "George Leonard." Liddy did use these in criminal activity, of which the Ellsberg ^{Hunt and} job ~~is an~~ admitted one. It did process pictures Hunt took on that job, but it and the FBI both pretended that with all the intensive investigation of the leaking of the ~~the~~ information from ^{raids on the Democrats and the} of Los Angeles, Pentagon papers and the great efforts made to get/Dr. Lewis Fielding/~~szfzszszszszsz~~ ^{are} ~~Los Angeles~~ the pictures, of which both agencies had copies, meant nothing to either when they showed his offices, his parking lot with his name on it and a car licensed to him - and secret investigation ^{and officially} had established the owner of the car. (H)
Publicly, this story was actually swallowed, so great was the desire to cover the CIA and the FBI for their transgressions. This, too, is traditional with the Congress and with much of the press.

When witnesses talking openly and answering questions fully, like McCord, were on the stand the committee avoided asking the obvious questions. The fact is that ^{Hunt had two and} all the Cubans were provided with false identifications. McCord spelled this out in his book (p.31), "The men were carrying false identifications, apparently from earlier plumbers' operations..."
This isn't even the tip of the iceberg.

The federal intelligence and investigative agencies know they can depend on protection from the Congress but they also know they have to make it possible. One of the means of

Making this traditional protection-racket possible is having covers and cover stories.

The CIA, which could not do any business without being expert in ^{both,} cover stories, did much less than an expert job but it was enough because there seems to be no limit to what the Congress ^{can accept,} (cannot hold down in the name of "national security," which here translates into covering for the illegalities and inproprieties of the spooks and means an American fascism.



Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, former Secretary for Air, is chairman of the "Military committee's CIA "oversight" committee and fourth-ranking member of the majority on the Foreign Relations committee. Amplifying his intercessions and speeches on behalf of Helms personally and the CIA in general, hardly a critical participation or examination or investigation, when Helms made his three appearances before the Foreign Relations committee, fingers the pulse of this Congressional defense of CIA improprieties when "oversight" was to prevent these proscribed activities: Lil- listed pages, parts marked in green, separate by asterisks.

The Chairman. Mr. Helms, personally I regret seeing you leave the CIA because I believe in seniority and experience, I think it has some value. I have a feeling that you know more about the CIA than you do Iran. Do you think that is a fair statement?

Mr. Helms. I think that is a fair statement, Mr. Chairman. *what is up*

(Hearings, p.2)

* * * * *

Senator Symington. Mr. Chairman, I would first say I have been around this town a long time, and believe Director Helms has established a reputation which may well have saved the Central Intelligence Agency from a good deal of additional criticism because of the respect of all of us for him as a person and the way he has operated.

(p.3)

* * * * *

Senator Symington. May I congratulate you in at least one instance where it was handled. (p.4)

Sen. Duffell: ... could have ... assassinated the President ...
 ... had ...
 ...
 ...

Mr. ...

Sen. ...

...

...

...

...

Sen. Cooper: Yes.

...

...

Sen. Cooper: ...

...

Senator John Sherman Cooper's apprehension about the certainty the FBI would know it was being investigated and what it would then do is as relevant in 1974 as it was in 1964.

Later

The later Congressman Hale Bogg asked about this in a different ~~way~~
way: ~~512~~ 152 fols, beginning "So I will ask you to end Russell on 155

The kinds of people used, according to Dulles, are "terribly bad" and they are used.

Can they be worse than the respect^{able ones} who lied to the people or the respect^{able} officials

who lie under oath?

Can it be worse when it is not secret to the Congress and the Congress goes along with it or, as happened with the CIA, its top officials and The Watergate, helped them lie and helped them get away with lying?

Did nothing about it when, if the foregoing is not enough proof, there is much more?

At least two ~~and xxxzwxzxxxxx already xxxz in reality xxx of the xxx connected xxx~~
of those directly involved in the caught crime had CIA relationships as of the time, one officially; and as we have seen, there are other Watergate characters who also had CIA connections not only at the time of the crime but continuing thereafter.

Yet from ~~the~~ the very first word it ~~gave~~ gave in secret, the CIA lied.

It could have been involved involuntarily.

But if it were, why lie about it?

If involvement was involuntary, one possible explanation is that telling the truth would lead to more damaging disclosures.

The entire account of The Watergate, from Nixon down, was from the first characterized by lying. Yet even the respected Chairman Ervin, the quoted of the bible and the indignant quoter of the violated Constitution, did not declare when he wobbled those expressive brows ~~in~~ the nation's TV tubes that they had lied, for example in saying that Hunt was not a White House employee when he was caught and when he committed all his crimes.

Nor did he declare that Helms and those under him lied.

He knew of other lies, too. And asked no question. In fact, suppressed the proof.

The Commissioners are so explicit their verbatim words need no explanations. And can there be better authority? Could anyone know better than the head of the CIA whose assistant Hunt had been?

what harm would there be in talking to Hoover without waiving my right to make any investigation in the public?

Mr. McCloy. This is going to build up. In New York I am already beginning to hear about it. I got a call from Time-Life about it. Maybe it is prompted by this letter with these 12 perplexing questions -- no, it wasn't because it came before that. "What is there to this story?"

Mr. Dulles. There is a terribly hard thing to disprove, you know. How do you disprove a fellow was not your agent. How do you disprove it.

Rep. Eggs. You could disprove it, couldn't you?

Mr. Dulles. No.

Rep. Eggs. I know, ask questions about something --

Mr. Dulles. I never knew how to disprove it.

Rep. Eggs. So I will ask you. Did you have agents about whom you had no record whatsoever?

Mr. Dulles. The record might not be on paper. But on paper would have hieroglyphics that only two people knew what they meant, and nobody outside of the agency would know and you could say this meant the agent and somebody else could say it meant another agent.

Rep. Eggs. Let's take a specific case, that fellow Powers was one of our men.

Mr. Dulles. Oh, yes, he was not an agent. He was an

~~TOP SECRET~~

Rep. Boggs. There was no problem in proving he was employed by the CIA.

Mr. Dulles. No. We had a signed contract.

Rep. Boggs. Let's say Powers did not have a signed contract but he was recruited by someone in CIA. The man who recruited him would know, wouldn't he?

Mr. Dulles. Yes, but he wouldn't tell.

The Chairman. Wouldn't tell it under oath?

Mr. Dulles. I wouldn't think he would tell it under oath, no.

The Chairman. Why?

Mr. Dulles. He ought not tell it under oath. Maybe not tell it to his own government but wouldn't tell it any other way.

Mr. McCloy. Wouldn't he tell it to his own chief?

Mr. Dulles. He might or might not. If he was a bad one then he wouldn't.

Rep. Boggs. What you do is you make out a problem if this be true, make our problem utterly impossible because you say this rumor can't be dissipated under any circumstances.

Mr. Dulles. I don't think it can unless you believe Mr. Hoover, and so forth and so on, which probably most of the people will.

Mr. McCloy. Allen, suppose somebody when you were head of the CIA came to you, another government agency and said specifically, "If you will tell us", suppose the President of the United

~~TOP SECRET~~

States comes to you and says, "Will you tell me, Mr. Dulles?"

Mr. Dulles. I would tell the President of the United States anything, yes, I am under his control. He is my boss. I wouldn't necessarily tell anybody else, unless the President authorized me to do it. We had that come up at times.

Mr. McCloy. You wouldn't tell the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. Dulles. Well, it depends a little bit on the circumstances. If it was within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, but otherwise I would go to the President, and I do on some cases.

Mr. Rankin. If that is all that is necessary, I think we could get the President to direct anybody working for the government to answer this question. If we have to we would get that direction.

Mr. Dulles. What I was getting at, I think under any circumstances, I think Mr. Hoover would say certainly he didn't have anything to do with this fellow.

Mr. McCloy. Mr. Hoover didn't have anything to do with him but his agent. Did you directly or indirectly employ him.

Mr. Dulles. But if he says no, I didn't have anything to do with it. You can't prove what the facts are. There are no external evidences. I would believe Mr. Hoover. Some people might not. I don't think there is any external evidence other than the person's word that he did or did not employ a particular man as a secret agent. No matter what.

~~TOP SECRET~~

133

17

Mr. McCloy. If we got a statement from the Department that the Attorney General and perhaps from Mr. Hoover or from Mr. Hoover which said, "I am telling you that this man was not in any way employed by the FBI", or in the case of John McCloy or the CIA, I think that probably stops us, unless we run into something --

Mr. Dulles. That would be all right with me. Whether it meets with the others --

Mr. McCloy. Now there is put in our hand a document that shows he was paid a certain amount of money. Maybe we would have to go further than that but I think it would be almost incumbent upon us to ask the head of the agencies whether or not this man was an employee.

Rep. Doggs. Just to examine a little further your statement, I would believe that could establish whether or not this fellow got \$200 a month, almost certainly establish it.

Mr. Dulles. How could you? He is dead and you haven't got his bank account or anything of that kind.

Sen. Russell. The only trouble is these undercover agents they don't keep one line of writing, not one word anywhere.

Mr. Dulles. Sometimes you very often, in the Soviet, they did it all the time. They wanted to compromise a person and they