

Look, in a Signed Editorial, Supports C.I.A.

By HENRY RAYMONT

In its first signed editorial, Look magazine has defended the financial support by the Central Intelligence Agency of student organizations here and abroad and urged that it be carried on openly by the State Department.

The magazine moved into the national debate over the recent disclosures of covert aid to the National Student Association with a two-page article in its April 18 issue, which went on sale yesterday. The article, by William Attwood, Look's editor in chief, was the first signed statement of editorial opinion

published by the magazine in its 30 years of existence.

Deploring the acute distrust expressed for some of the intelligence agency's activities, Mr. Attwood wrote:

"Just about everybody, from the California New Left to the Arizona Old Right, has been taking potshots at one agency of our Government that can't talk back . . . It's the silent service that is never able to brag about its frequent successes nor confess its occasional failures."

Mr. Attwood's chief target was Ramparts, the San Francisco-based magazine that exposed the C.I.A. subsidies to or-

ganizations that supposedly were financed only by private foundations.

"For the expose in Ramparts magazine," he charged, "has succeeded in doing what Communist propagandists have tried for years and years, in vain, to accomplish: the slandering of American students and scholars abroad and the discrediting of much of the good work done by our private foundations."

The Look editorial drew an angry reply from Robert Scheer, managing editor of Ramparts. Reached by telephone in Buffalo where he gave a talk sponsored by the National Student Asso-

ciation at the University of Buffalo last night, he said:

"The fact is that the C.I.A. discredited our students and our professors who had no idea what was going on. If anybody has to bear the responsibility it seems to me it is the C.I.A. and not Ramparts."

"The argument advanced in the Look editorial seems to contradict our constitutional right to print what we think to be true. And to impugn our motives and deny us that right by suggesting we are giving comfort to the enemy seems to be setting a very dangerous precedent."

Mr. Attwood's article, "A Few

C

17

Subsidies for Students' Organizations

Kind Words for the CIA," emphasized the need for a continued American challenge to Communist proselytizing of youth groups. It was based, the author said, on his own experiences as an Ambassador in Africa from 1961 to 1966.

"I have seen at firsthand and close range in Africa," he wrote, "How much effort and money is spent by our adversaries to bribe, deceive, subvert and undermine the potential leaders of these new young nations."

"And I have been gratified, as an American, that we have been able to alert our friends and help protect African independence and non-alignment

—thanks in part to the C.I.A.," he said.

As he had in "The Reds and the Blacks," which was recently published by Harper & Row, Mr. Attwood contended that between 60 and 70 per cent of all Soviet-bloc diplomatic personnel in Asia and Africa were intelligence agents. By contrast, he said, "our mission in these countries is not to subvert but to help prevent subversion."

The Look editor in chief deplored the estimate that the Soviet Union alone was spending \$10-million a year "in recruiting and proselytizing" youth groups, while C.I.A. subsidies since the early 1950's

amounted to no more than one-third that sum.

One reason for the present controversy, he maintained, is that the C.I.A. "has both an undeservedly sinister reputation and the wrong kind of name to be in the business of supporting activities that are peripheral to its intelligence-gathering mission."

Calling on Congress to appropriate more funds to finance the cultural cold war, Mr. Attwood proposed that an expanded program be handled by the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.