

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1975

NYTimes NOV 19 1975

Letters to the Editor

C.I.A.: The Case for George Bush

To the Editor:

The C.I.A. has been under attack for allegedly violating its charter, which restricts it to foreign intelligence operations, for alleged assassination plots against foreign heads of state and for other peccadillos. Senator Frank Church, Idaho Democrat, heads one committee which is investigating the C.I.A. President Ford has nominated George Bush as the new director of the C.I.A. The Times, The Baltimore Sun, Senator Church and Senator Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, have indicated premature opposition to Bush even before he has testified. Let us look at the record.

If confirmed, Bush will bring a Phi Beta Kappa from Yale, considerable experience as an administrator in the business world, experience as a naval aviator in World War II, experience as a two-term Congressman and experience gained in two most delicate, sensitive and high positions in diplomacy, chief of the U.S. mission to mainland China and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. In other words, he brings intelligence, proven executive capacity and a thorough grounding in foreign affairs. The objections to him are that he also served as chairman of the Republican National Committee and that he is not a professional spook and is an "outsider" to the intelligence community.

Consider that the C.I.A. is under attack for acts allegedly performed

under the direction of "insiders," or professionals. Do we, at this time, want another "insider" or do we want a fresh, inquisitive "outsider"? Is Bush the first "outsider"? No, John McCone served as C.I.A. director. He was not a professional spook. More recently, James R. Schlesinger served as C.I.A. director. What were Schlesinger's credentials? He came from the academic world in 1969 to serve first as an assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget and then as head of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1971 to 1972, when he became C.I.A. director. Not a professional and not an "insider."

J.F.K. selected brother Bobby Kennedy to be Attorney General of the United States. R.F.K. had no previous experience as a prosecutor but did have terrific partisan experience as J.F.K.'s campaign manager. The Attorney General is over the F.B.I., the domestic intelligence gathering agency in this country. Did Senators Church and Proxmire vote to confirm partisan, nonprofessional "outsider" R.F.K. to that sensitive job? Did The Times and The Sun approve? Some say R.F.K. worked out well. Does Bush deserve the same opportunity? Can confirmation and approval of Bobby Kennedy, McCone and Schlesinger square with the *a priori* attempted knifing of George Bush? I think not.

ANTHONY J. P. FARRIS
Houston, Nov. 11, 1975