

CIA

THE UNITED STATES has consistently denied using the CIA to fight leftist Salvador Allende in Chile. Yet, it now turns out, CIA director William E. Colby told a House committee last April that: The CIA gave \$3 million to the Allende political opposition in 1964 and \$500,000 more to "anti-Allende forces" in 1969. It authorized \$350,000 to bribe the Chilean congress against him in 1970, the year he won. It contributed \$5 million for "more destabilization efforts" in 1971-73 and \$1.5 million in by-elections in 1973. In August of that year, it authorized \$1 million for "further political destabilization activities." A coup ousted him, and he was killed, a year ago today.

The Colby revelations do not answer once and for all the question of whether, as the Latin left already believes, the United States destroyed Allende; some part of his difficulties were of his own making. Nor do the revelations demonstrate that the CIA had a direct-hand in the coup. They prove beyond dispute, however, that the United States acted in a way to aggravate Mr. Allende's problems, and played into the hands of those who made the coup. We did so, moreover, deliberately: According to Mr. Colby, the anti-Allende acts were not the work of a mindless uncontrolled agency but of a CIA operating at the instructions of the appropriate White House review panel, the "Forty Committee," headed by Henry Kissinger.

Dr. Kissinger and President Nixon, one gathers, had decided there were to be "no more Cubas": no more Marxist states in the western hemisphere. Any means, apparently, would do. Would it not be better, Dr. Kissin-

ger was asked at his confirmation hearing as Secretary of State a year ago, to take the CIA out of such clandestine efforts as overturning Latin governments? "There are certain types of these activities, difficult to describe here," the Secretary-designate replied, "that it would be dangerous to abolish."

This information comes to light now through the surfacing of a confidential letter from Rep. Michael Harrington (D-Mass.) to House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas E. Morgan (D-Pa.), in which Mr. Harrington asks for a deeper investigation. Dr. Morgan, like his Senate counterpart, J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), has been reluctant to press such a probe. But it is laughable for Congress to assert a larger foreign-policy role if it is to shy away from this outrageous instance of hemispheric realpolitik. Last year, for instance, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's subcommittee on multinational corporations investigated charges that in 1970 ITT had sought to induce the CIA to block Allende. The subcommittee found that the CIA had not followed ITT's bidding. But now it turns out that—before, during and after the ITT episode—the CIA was intervening in Chilean politics.

Since the 1960s, the United States has used its influence to keep Cuba a hemispheric pariah. And why? A principal stated reason has been Cuba's ostensible support of subversion in Latin America: putting guerrillas ashore here and there, sounding the revolutionary trumpet, and the like. But whatever Cuba has allegedly done in the past is peanuts next to what the United States has admittedly done in Chile. To bar Cuba from hemispheric society on the basis of a test we fail ourselves is absurd.