

Officials Reportedly Asked for Authority to Destroy **Records on U.S. Citizens**

By SEYMOUR M. HERSH Special to The New York Times

2.800.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9-Officials of the Central Intelligence Agency's Counterintelligence Division unsuccessfully sought authority last fall to destroy illegal domestic files on nearly 10,000 American citizens because they feared the newly liberalized Freedom of Information Act, well-placed sources said today.

The sources said that the effort to gain official sanction for the destruction of the files was a direct result of Congress's amending the act to permit judicial review of secret documents.

Well-placed sources were quoted by The New York Times on Dec. 22 as reporting the existence of the illegal domestic files on nearly 10,000 American citizens. Today, The Washing-ton Post and Jack Anderson, the columnist, reported that the names of 9,000 Americans were submitted in 1970 to the C.I.A. by a Justice Department unit in an effort to coordinate overseas surveillance of these persons, a legal activity.

Justice Department officials 1 said this evening that they had been informed the C.I.A. had made no use, of the 1970 files and had destroyed them. The j Times's sources said that the Counter-intelligence C.I.A.'s Division had maintained its own it file system on American citizens separate from that of the Justice Department.

The sources said that the C.I.A. request for permission to destroy the documents was t made by a low-eschelon employee who had direct control over the domestic file system. The request was made to the C.I.A. legal office, the sources

Continued on Page 14, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 1 waid, which reviewed the mat-

er and determined that the Mes had to be maintained.

The person who initiated the equest did not do so on his wn, one well-informed source and

said, but had been told to find; ways to destroy the files.

No past or present C.I.A official could be found today who would dsicuss the concern within the agency last fall about its domestic files on Americans.

But a source close to James I. Angleton, the former chief of counterintelligence whose reirement became known on Dec. 23, saaid that the whole ques-tion of files was examined late ast year. This source said that concern about the files arose inside the counterintelligence Division because of the amendment to the Freedom of Information Act.

The legislation, first ap-proved in 1966, authorized persons to file a complaint in # Federal court to force a Govaround a gency to produce information that it was with-holding. Specifically exempted from the provisions, however, was any national security infor-

"Last Oct. 7, Congress ap-proved changes that, among other things, provided for judi-cial review of classified national security information to deter-mine whether it could be withheld. Both the Pentagon and the C.I.A. opposed the legisla-tion. The bill was vetoed Oct. 17 by President Ford, but the House and Senate overrode the veto a month later. The New York Times, quoting

well-placed Government sources, reported on Dec. 22 that the C.I.A. had maintained domestic intelligence files on nearly 10,-

000 American citizens. The sources were also quoted as saying that the files showed that domestic C.I.A. agents had been authorized to follow and photograph participants in antiwar and other demonstrations. At least one member of Con-

gress was placed under surveil-lance, the sources said. The sources also said that the domestic C.I.A. operation had been so secret that senior officials in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department had not known about the activity.

On Jan. 1, well-placed sources were quoted as saying that William E. Colby, Director of Cen-tral Intelligence, had confirmed in a report to President Ford that domestic files were maintained on more than 9,000 Amer-ican citizens. Mr. Colby's re-port, the sources said also con-firmed that the intelligence agency had conducted break-ins and wiretaps and surreptitiously opened mail as part of its illegal domestic activity.

The Washington Post and the columnist Jack Anderson re-ported today that the names of 9,000 Americans were submitted in 1970 to the C.I.A. by the Justice Department's civil disturbance unit. A computer printout, said to include the names of "antiwar agitators" and "ghetto militants," was turned over to the C.I.A.'s Counterintelligence Division in an effort to coordinate over-seas surveillance of the citizens, The Post and Mr. Anderson said.

James Devine, then head of the civil disturbance unit, was quoted as saying, "I hate to quoted as saying, "I hate to see the C.I.A. accused of de-veloping a list that we developed ourselves. It would be a bum ray." Both The Post article and

Mr. Anderson's column noted

the similarity between reports of 9,000 names turned over to the C.I.A. by the Justice De-partment in 1970 and nearly 10,000 names allegedly con-tained in the C.I.A.'s domestic intelligence files.

The Associated Press later quoted Mr. Devine, now the inspector general of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, as saying that he was reasonably sure that the Jus-tice Department's computer printout list was the same list referred to in The New York Times account.

Justice Department officials confirmed this evening that Mr. Devine had sent a computerized printout to the C.I.A. in 1970 but said the printout contained between 10,000 and 12,000

between 10,000 and 12,000 names. One official, saying that there was. "nothing illegal" in such transfers of information, later told The Times, "We've been advised that the CI.A. never put the tape to use, and it was destroyed." The destruc-tion apparently took place last tion apparently took place last

year, the official said. The official added that he had good reason to believe that the list supplied by the Justice Department in 1970 was not the same list that was being maintained amid great secrecy by the counterintelligence unit of the C.I.A. He would not elaborate, but said that the Justice Department might issue a formal statement tomorrow.

Another source with first-hand knowledge of the C.I.A.'s domestic files said in an inter-Department files and the Counto get rid of them, all it would have had to do was send them back.

In a telephone interview this afternoon, Mr. Devine acknowl-edged that he had no factual basis for assuming that the files he cost to the Cost files he sent to the C.I.A. in 1970 were the same files that have emerged as a focal point in the current dispute over de-mestic C.I.A. spying. "You

in the current dispute over de-mestic C.I.A. spying. "You know I don't have any knowl-edge, or I would say I had knowledge," he said. He added that he was sorry he had suggested that the C.I.A. might be receiving "a bum rap" because of its re-ceipt of the Justice Department files. "It's something that just slipped out," he said. "I'm sorry I said it." Additional sources with first-hand knowledge of the Colby

hand knowledge of the Colby report said that the C.I.A. di-

rector had not suggested in that document that the disputed files wer, in fact, a computer printouf list supplied by the Justice Department in 1970. These sources did say, how-ever, that the C.I.A.'s domestic

dossiers apparently included a number of F.B.I. reports and F.B.I. reports and documents from other domestic intelligence agencies. Some of the files, one source said, ap-parently has as many as 15 or more entries in them. "As with most things in the Colby report," the source added,

'it's not clear how much sur veillance was done by the C.I.A. and how much by the F.B.I. and other agencies." The source other agencies." The source cautioned, however, "it would be wrong to make an assump-tion" that the vast majority of the C.I.A. files reflect active surveillance by that agency. Under the 1947 National

Security Act setting up the agency, the C.I.A. is barred from any domestic police or internal security functions. A number of legal experts have said that even the maintenance of files by the agency—whether the information came from the C.I.A. or F.B.I.—would be illegal illegal.

one well-informed source ex-pressed concern, however, over what he described as an effort by defenders of the C.I.A. to invent justifications for the maintenance of the files maintenance of the files. The agency is not barred

from maintaining files on Amer-

ican citizens who have had contact with foreign agents or foreign intelligence officials. It was to determine whether a foreign connection existed, sources said, that the Justice Department supplied its computer printout in 1970. The problem, one source said,

is that it is possible to draw up a foreign connection for almost anyone. The source added that he

wash concerned because, he said, people are now saying that if there is even a remote foreign connection, it justifies the file.

In a related development, Senator John J. Sparkman, acting chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, announced today that the committee would question Richard Helms, former C.I.A. director who is now Ambassador to Iran, about the domestic spying allegations at a closed com-

mittee meeting on Jan. 22. It was during Mr. Helms's service as director from 1966 to 1973 that the bulk of the C.I.A.'s domestic spying and file-keeping took place, sources have said. 23