

STUDENTS ACCUSE C.I.A. OF 'TRAPPING' SOME INTO SPYING

Say Agency Used 'Fantastic
Pressure' on Youths to
Keep Missions Secret

DISAVOW FURTHER TIES

National Association Aides
Deny They Will Dissolve
—Will Help Inquiries

18 FEB 1967

By BEN A. FRANKLIN
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17 —

Officers of the National Student Association accused the Central Intelligence Agency tonight of "trapping" American college students into roles as agents and placing them under "fantastic pressures" not to disclose their clandestine missions overseas.

The charge against the nation's civilian intelligence agency was made during a news conference in a hotel lobby by Sam Brown, a 23-year-old Harvard University divinity student who is the chairman of the 10-member national supervisory policy board of the student association.

Mr. Brown, before eight television newsreel cameras, disavowed any further association of the student organization with the intelligence agency.

He said the association would assist "any public investigation" of the agency's role on American college campuses with the testimony of student officers and a complete disclosure of records.

Dissolution Denied

Mr. Brown and Gene Groves, president of the student association, the largest in the United States, denied reports that it would be dissolved. Both described the day and night meetings here of top association officers since last Tuesday as a "purifying experience" that would give the organization new strength and "new freedom."

Mr. Brown said the week's intensive investigation by association board members had confirmed that, during some years since 1952, as much as 80 per cent of the student organization's annual budget was agency money, passed to the association by intermediary foundations and individuals.

He identified the intermediaries as the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, the Catherwood Foundation, the San Jacinto Foundation, the Independence Foundation, the Sidney and Esther Babb Charitable Foundation, a "Mr. R. E. Smith," otherwise unidentified, and "at least 15 other foundations and individuals."

Mr. Brown also told how the agency had been able to recruit association officers and staff members.

'People Were Duped'

"This is the part of the whole thing that I found to be most disgusting and horrible," Mr. Brown said. "People were duped into this relationship with the C.I.A., a relationship from which there then was no way out."

The association staff members and officers selected by the agency for overseas missions at international student gatherings were first given "a full security check, without their knowledge of it," Mr. Brown said. They were then interviewed

Continued on Page 14, Column 7

Continued From Page 1, Col. 1

either by association officers or staff members already recruited by the agency, or directly by agency employes.

"At that time," Mr. Brown said, "the pattern was that the person was told there were certain things about N.S.A. of which you are not aware. They said they had information that would help them in their work as student representatives, information from certain classified sources.

"Therefore they said, we must ask you to sign this security statement. Then they were told, 'You are employed by the C.I.A.' At that point they were trapped, having signed a statement not to divulge anything."

Mr. Brown continued:

"The fantastic pressures these people were under were simply incomprehensible to me until the last 72 hours. The agony of these people who were trapped and were unable to break this relationship was awful."

He said that the data compiled by the agency recruits included "dossiers on the personalities of foreign student leaders and written assessments of the policies and objectives of foreign student organizations.

"Some of this information apparently was passed directly to C.I.A. employes," he said, "and some of it, in the course of normal business, went into the files of the N.S.A."

The agency apparently had access to the files through its clandestine operatives within the association, he said.

"We are shocked at the ethical trap in which young men with the best of motives have been placed," Mr. Brown said.

He gave high praise to unnamed officers of the association, who, he said, began last August a "gradual withdrawal" from the long relationship with the intelligence agency.

"Even this cause was not entirely successful until now because of C.I.A. perseverance," he said.

Humphrey Is Cited

Mr. Brown confirmed earlier reports that, at one point, association officers had made an appeal to Vice President Humphrey for help in obtaining non-agency financial support that would free the group from dependence on agency money.

"The evidence we have is that he was told that we were trying to break the relationship," Mr. Brown said.

Mr. Brown said that this year the association's budget, which had been as large as \$800,000 in previous years, would include only "5 to 8 per cent C.I.A. money," or about \$26,000.

Asked if the association officers or staff members had been "intimidated by the C.I.A." in efforts to silence them, Mr. Brown said:

"There has been no physical intimidation, but it seems apparent that under the National Security Act—under the statements these people signed—there would be the probability of prosecution by the Government if they disclosed anything. If you interpret that as intimi-

dation or pressure, there was considerable pressure, yes."

Violations of the National Security Act are punishable by imprisonment of up to 20 years.

"A 20-year jail sentence to maintain your integrity is a very high price to pay," Mr. Brown said.

Mr. Brown was reminded by a newsman that association policy positions in recent years had sometimes differed from those of the State Department and was asked:

"Did it make the C.I.A. happy when you started to get out?"

Mr. Brown paused and then replied emphatically, "No."

He said that the withdrawal had been started by "N.S.A. members who knew about the relationship with the C.I.A. and could not sleep at night."

The policy board chairman also confirmed earlier reports that the agency had been "involved in" obtaining Selective Service deferments for association members in the agency's employ. He said the agency had intervened to obtain draft deferments of certain association officers and staff members "until January, 1966."

Denies Blame

"Do you accept the blame for this situation?" Mr. Brown was asked.

"No," he replied, "because we were not aware of it until the last two weeks."

He said current association officers had moved "courageously" to investigate and purge the organization of its agency relationship.

"We do not have the full truth yet," he said. "But we intend to get it."

To a reporter who wanted to know whether he regarded the dork of association members as "spying," Mr. Brown said:

"Well, they did, in fact, bring back information, some of them knowing it was going to the C.I.A., others believing it was going into the N.S.A. files."

Mr. Groves said association officers were "working hard" to find other sources of funds to continue the organization's program without "the subversion of students that we find unacceptable and inadmissible in an open, democratic society."

"We hope this experience will result in drastic changes in the operations of the C.I.A.," he said.

He also reported that association officers had received "many letters and telegrams and telephone calls of support for what we are doing from students and educators all over the country."

Mr. Brown said his policy board would urge President Johnson "to issue an Executive order to prevent the C.I.A. from infiltrating other youth groups."