

C.I.A. Disclosures May Damage

Project for India Foundation

By J. ANTHONY LUKAS

Special to The New York Times

NEW DELHI, May 6—Recent disclosures about the Central Intelligence Agency's use of American universities may have damaged President Johnson's proposal for an Indian-American foundation.

Opponents of the foundation, which would use rupees earned by the sale of American surplus food to assist Indian education and research, are warning that it might also serve as the cover for United States intelligence activities.

A left-wing weekly in Calcutta called *Now* recalls in its current issue the use the C.I.A., made of a Michigan State University project in South Vietnam.

In this light, the weekly asks, can Prime Minister Indira Gandhi "insure that, among the American scholars who would enter this country under the foundation's auspices, there will not be some whose mission would be to train local agents on how to liquidate the Prime Minister herself in case she fails to be subservient to the United States Government?"

Right-Wing Reds Comment

The *Age*, the official organ of the right-wing Communist party, takes up the same theme in its editorial this week entitled "Beware of the C.I.A."

The editorial, which quotes from the recent series of articles in *The New York Times* on the C.I.A., contends that much of the money earned from the sale of surplus food here is already used by the agency.

However, it warns that the Indian-American foundation would "further expand the field of the C.I.A. operation" in India.

Dr. S. C. Gupta, deputy director of the Agricultural Economic Research Center at Delhi University, warned in a recent speech that "the United States has been using university research projects as a cover for the Central Intelligence Agency to subvert governments in several countries."

"Why need we create dangers for ourselves?" he asks.

Such fears have been rebutted by some of India's leading newspapers and by some critics of the foundation proposal. However, the fears about the C.I.A.'s role in the project have added new fuel to the heavy opposition to the foundation.

Formally announced during Mrs. Gandhi's recent visit to the United States and already tentatively approved by both governments, the foundation is being attacked here on two fronts. The leftists are denouncing it

as a new sign of American "imperialism" while many Indian educators are genuinely concerned about the effects of foreign interference on educational policy.

In Parliament today, opponents of the proposal began pushing for a resolution that would formally express disapproval of the foundation.

H. N. Mukerjee, leader of the right-wing Communist group in Parliament, introduced the resolution. He said the foundation would be "another of those gold-plated grinding stones which we are importing from America to wear around our neck."

Mrs. Gandhi's strategy is two-pronged: meet the leftists head on by denying that the foundation would infringe India's sovereignty and at the same time seek a formula that would placate the serious academic critics.

At a recent news conference, she said she was sure that the Americans are "not trying to force anything down us" with the foundation.

However, she has now assigned the Minister of Education, M. C. Chagla, to meet with the university critics and try to find some new arrangement that would satisfy them.

The United States is unwilling to compromise on the three elements that it considers essential to the project: its non-governmental status, its "bi-national" character and its wide scope.

However, Washington is willing to compromise on details in order to help Mrs. Gandhi sell the project. Several possible compromises are under consideration.

One would be to give the Indians somewhat more administrative control than provided by the original draft agreement drawn up about 18 months ago.

Under that agreement, the foundation would be run by an 18-member board of directors — nine Indians and nine Americans. The two chief officers would be the board chairman and the executive officer.

The original agreement provided that the first chairman should be an Indian and the first executive officer an American and that they would alternate every five years. However, one possible compromise would now give India both posts for at least the first five years.