

Editor's Report

More on the CIA

By William Randolph Hearst Jr.
Editor-in-Chief, The Hearst Newspapers

NEW YORK — It is unusual for this column to dwell on the same news subject for two weeks in a row — in this case the CIA and its challenged role in Chile. Exception is being made because the left-leaning news media have been keeping the subject alive with a continuing barrage of poisonous and misleading attacks which disparage not only the CIA but Secretary of State Kissinger and even the President of the United States.



W. R. Hearst Jr.

the world.

It would be quite wrong to suggest that the newspaper columnists, TV commentators and lawmakers who keep hammering away at the CIA in self-righteous horror are

—Turn to Page B2, Col. 7

—From Page 1

communist sympathizers. The simple fact is that they and most other self-dubbed liberals have a curious and automatic hatred for anyone or anything committed to fighting communism. They are more anti anti-communists than anything else.

All the same, knowingly or not, they serve the purposes of our ideological enemies by consistently impugning the motives of this country and its leaders in the ceaseless global political struggle. The communists in the Kremlin have got to be delighted that the CIA-Chile affair has been getting so much domestic criticism — criticism which cannot help but weaken the future effectiveness of the chief U.S. agency which keeps a constant expert watch on them and so frequently helps to thwart their plots.

You naturally have heard very little about the communist plot to take over the Chilean government of self-styled "Marxist" President Salvador Allende. All our liberal press has been harping on is the disclosure — subsequently frankly confirmed by President Ford — that the CIA spent \$8 million in Chile between 1970 and 1973 to support legally organized groups opposed to the Allende regime. This action, which had been approved by Kissinger, is damned by the critics as somehow unAmerican, sneaky and disgraceful.

The fact is, contrary to the impression created by the critics, that the CIA and its expenditures had very little to do with the bloody coup which overthrew Allende a year ago, and in which he died. He was deposed by the present military junta, acting with majority public support, because the communists were on the verge of taking over a government which had become ever more oppressive and less democratic.

Last week, in this space, it was told how tons and tons of guns and ammunition had been smuggled into Chile by thousands of communist agents who infiltrated the country under Allende — some of whom became his closest advisers. Anyone who doubts what was being planned needs only to read the rash of articles by Soviet political and military experts which have been appearing in communist theoretical journals this summer explaining the major reasons for their setback in Chile.

The Kremlin-approved analysis, as reported by James Burnham in the Sept. 27 issue of *National Review*, boils down to six factors cited as errors to be avoided in future would-be seizures of power. Burnham sums them up as follows:

1. The counterrevolutionary (free) press was not quickly enough muzzled. Chile's influential conservative paper, *El Mercurio*, is cited for its role in wrecking the Allende regime.
 2. The Allende government moved too slowly on both the political and economic fronts, thus giving the counter-revolution time to prepare its forces.
 3. The Chilean communists failed to push Allende into speedy nationalization of private business without compensation.
 4. The Chilean communists did not go far and fast enough in creating grass roots organizations of workers and peasants under communist control which could act as an extralegal power apparatus.
 5. The adventurous and disorganized seizures of farms and some factories by ultraleft Maoists and Trotskyists antagonized potential sympathizers and aroused the reactionary elements.
 6. Communist penetration of the armed forces, though considerable, was not sufficient to deter the coup by the higher military echelons.
- Don't forget—all this is on record in the official Soviet press. So what the CIA did in Chile was virtually nothing compared with the other side. The upshot, unfortunately, was another dictatorship in our hemisphere, but at least it is not another communist tyranny.

★ ★ ★

A LARGE PART of the current anti-CIA criticism charges that the secret agency has become a kind of supra-government whose actions are directed by a handful of men without adequate control by Congress. In actuality it is simply a modern version of the intelligence apparatus which every sovereign nation since ancient Rome has had to maintain for its safety. Furthermore, every cent it spends has to be approved by Congress after recommendations of four of its committees.

These bodies are the Senate committees on foreign relations and military affairs, and their two counterparts in the House. Top members of each comprise what is badly named the Congressional Oversight Committee, a small group which reviews, studies and passes on the more delicate CIA activities.

Thus for Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright and senior member Frank Church to claim they didn't really know what went on in Chile was at best a political pose.

Sen. Church actually came up with this sanctimonious remark. "We now learn," the Idaho Democrat intoned, "that there is no difference between American and Soviet policy in subverting foreign governments. I had always thought the United States stood for different principles."

That was a lot of two-faced nonsense. He knew darned well what had happened in Chile, and if he somehow didn't he hadn't done his homework.

I don't mean to be too rough on the CIA critics. After all, there are two sides to any controversy and matters look different depending on where you sit. For example, it certainly is easy for me to understand and sympathize with fears that we may have created a kind of Gestapo or unlimited, self-directed Dirty Tricks Department. Nobody wants that.

But such is not the case. Unlike its communist counterparts, the CIA and its actions invariably become answerable to a public whose surrogates in Congress already have passed on them. If they have done so without fully understanding the facts, it is the fault of the lawmakers who hold the purse strings.

The basic explanation for the CIA-Chile hubbub, it seems to me, is the inability or refusal of the liberal critics to recognize communism as a deadly, continuing threat to this nation and its interests.

They view it instead with benevolence as a form of socialism, dedicated to the welfare of the people, and see any contrary view or activity as not only demeaning for noble-minded Americans but suggestive of Hitler and uniformed fascism. Nonuniformed Red fascism doesn't bother them.

That's their view, and they certainly are free to express it.

But I remember Czechoslovakia.