

## Identification Form

## Agency Information

AGENCY : SSCIA  
RECORD NUMBER : 157-10014-10125  
RECORD SERIES : MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS OF THE CHURCH COMMITTEE  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 07-M-31

## Document Information

ORIGINATOR : SSCIA  
FROM :  
TO :  
TITLE :  
DATE : 03/10/1976  
PAGES : 78  
SUBJECTS :  
SSCSGO, METHODOLOGY  
COMMITTEE BUSINESS  
DOCUMENT TYPE : TRANSCRIPT  
CLASSIFICATION : Declassified  
RESTRICTIONS : 1B; 1C  
CURRENT STATUS : Redact  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 03/22/2000  
OPENING CRITERIA :  
COMMENTS : CCBOX 324

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM  
IDENTIFICATION FORM

---

AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : SSCIA  
RECORD NUMBER : 157-10014-10125  
RECORDS SERIES : MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS OF THE CHURCH COMMITTEE  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 07-M-31

---

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR : SSCIA  
FROM :  
TO :  
TITLE :  
DATE : 03/10/76  
PAGES : 78  
SUBJECTS : SSCSGO, METHODOLOGY

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOCUMENT TYPE : TRANSCRIPT  
CLASSIFICATION : TOP SECRET  
RESTRICTIONS : REFERRED  
CURRENT STATUS : POSTPONED IN FULL  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 01/05/99  
OPENING CRITERIA :  
COMMENTS : CCBOX 324

---

[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED

**TOP SECRET**

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION  
Unauthorized Disclosure Subject  
to Criminal Sanctions

Vol. 2 OF 3

R2829

**The United States Senate**

**Report of Proceedings**

**Hearing held before**

Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental  
Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities

Wednesday, March 10, 1976

Washington, D. C.

(Stenotype Tape and Waste turned over  
to the Committee for destruction)

**WARD & PAUL**

410 FIRST STREET, S. E.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

(202) 544-6000

**TOP SECRET**

SECRET

## 1 FOREIGN AND MILITARY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

2

- - -

3

Wednesday, March 10, 1976

4

- - -

5

United States Senate,

6

Select Committee to Study Governmental

7

Operations with Respect to

8

Intelligence Activities,

9

Washington, D. C.

10

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:45 o'clock

11

p.m., in Room S-407, the Capitol, the Honorable Walter D.

12

Huddleston presiding.

13

Present: Senators Huddleston (presiding), Hart of

14

Colorado and Mathias.

15

Staff: William G. Miller, Staff Director, and David

16

Aaron, Joseph diGenova, Lynn Davis, William Bader, Elizabeth

17

Culbreath, Charles Kirbow, Rick Inderfurth, Pat Shea, Elliot

18

Maxwell and Al Quanbeck, Professional Staff Members,

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1           And then the question is whether or not there is a prohi-  
2           bition on printing in the English language.

3           Mr. Bader. And as I heard the consensus this morning,  
4           we would not move to that recommendation for a prohibition.  
5           I did not hear whether on the distribution this would be by  
6           law, though I took it it was to be by law, though I can be  
7           corrected on that. I don't think we addressed that this morning.

8           Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, on these that we considered  
9           to be rather -- that we have a fairly light record on or that  
10          we are not too sure what the future holds, one of the members  
11          that I rode over with on the car suggested that perhaps in those  
12          instances we could recommend fairly strongly whatever we want  
13          the followon people to do to ensure that the recommendation  
14          does not create havoc within the Agency or does not leave the  
15          rights of citizens unprotected.

16          But that is not a cop out. It is something that you  
17          frequently do, say, let us reserve this for the permanent  
18          oversight committee or for whatever other group. We may have  
19          all the information we need.

20          Senator Huddleston. Let them make the determination whether  
21          or not it should be a statute.

22          Mr. Kirbow. Determine whether in the law whether it is  
23          working all right under the set of regulations.

24          Mr. Bader. Mr. Chairman, may I say in this instance in  
25          the publishing trade there is no lack of record? The evidence

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

Senator Huddleston. I call the Committee to order.

Mr. Aaron. I believe Bill Bader had the temerity to summarize where we stand.

Mr. Bader. Mr. Chairman, where I think we are at the moment is taking the three major issues before the Subcommittee in the order they were presented, and discussed this morning, the first being the academic issue, and as I heard the Subcommittee this morning, then I will have another go at the options, give enough options in the option paper and bring it back before the Committee for a further look before we go on.

Senator Huddleston. By Friday.

Mr. Bader. By Friday, without question.

I think by this time we will all have -- we will try to include a positive option, that is to say, to approve if not applaud the expanded efforts of ERD to undertake these activities, or at least to endorse them.

Now, going to the second was the covert use of books and publishing houses. We discussed two recommendations: one which I believe here the Committee has agreed to, and that is a prohibition on the distribution or subsidy of any books, magazines or other publications not attributed to the CIA inside the United States.

Senator Huddleston. I think we can all accept that, can't we.

1 and inquiry into it has been thorough, and I think we know this  
2 well. There is no dispute from the Agency.

3 Senator Huddleston. Well, is the law inconsistent with  
4 the statute on the information service?

5 Mr. Bader. It is the same thing. I would recommend,  
6 Mr. Chairman, that this would be by law, by statute.

7 Senator Huddleston. On the publication.

8 Mr. Bader. On the publication.

9 Senator Mathias. I would support that.

10 Senator Huddleston. I think Gary Hart would also, so I  
11 think we will make that recommendation, that this one on the  
12 academics is the one we are not sure of.

13 Mr. Bader. That's the one we would go forward with, and  
14 now we are moving to -- I would also reiterate that in our  
15 session the other night, I took it as agreement that the  
16 recommendation by statute the CIA should be prohibited from  
17 making operational use of all educational and cultural  
18 grantees of all U.S. Government sponsored programs, this was the  
19 issue which was raised of government funded programs such as  
20 the Fulbright program.

21 Senator Huddleston. And that's either already a regulation  
22 or a directive or something to that effect.

23 Mr. Aaron. Certain categories.

24 Mr. Bader. Certain categories.

25 Mr. Kirbow. That is brand new ground.

1 Mr. diGenova. The John McCloy exceptions to that rule, they  
2 are the only ones that are protected.

3 Mr. Aaron. That justifies Charles' view that there are  
4 some similarities between Ford Foundation and Government  
5 sponsored activities.

6 Mr. Bader. Where our discussion was left before lunch  
7 was on the question of the covert use of U.S. journalists and  
8 media institutions, and as it was laid out, it was indicated  
9 that the CIA's intended internal prohibition on the use of the  
10 media extended to the internal prohibitions on the use, opera-  
11 tional use of individuals, American and foreign, who were  
12 accredited to American media organizations.

13 As I heard it this morning, what we were discussing and  
14 moving to was to extend that prohibition to cover all American  
15 individuals and media organizations, and that the question then  
16 was whether this would be recommended to be something done in  
17 law or a recommendation, or an insistence, if you will, to the  
18 Agency that it further amend its internal directives, its  
19 50-10, to put all media personnel, American media personnel on  
20 the prohibited list, and that is I think where we were.

21 Senator Huddleston. I think that's an accurate statement.  
22 That's where we were.

23 I had expressed a thought that I thought that it ought to  
24 be expanded to include all, but we should hold off on the  
25 statute business for the time being.



1           Senator Mathias. My role here seems to be the Devil's  
2 advocate.

3           Senator Huddleston. Good.

4           Senator Mathias. There is no question about the writing  
5 American press or the value in print domestically. Maybe the  
6 role, any legitimate role that news men could, journalists,  
7 writers could fulfill is available through the information  
8 agencies, USIA and groups of that sort.

9           So does anybody know whether there is any real need  
10 for allowing some latitude, which is not covered by situations  
11 that can be envisioned under USIA or other programs?

12          Mr. Kirbow. Well, Senator, the one that I discussed earlier  
13 that I probably didn't make my point well because no one  
14 seemed to have picked it up, is we do, by the words here, if I  
15 understand Mr. Bader, prohibit an American citizen living in  
16 Brussels and working for a local newspaper there from having  
17 anything to do with the CIA.

18          Senator Huddleston. No we don't, do we?

19          You mean by his extension?

20          Mr. Kirbow. Yes, sir.

21          Senator Huddleston. But not by --

22          Mr. Kirbow. But wasn't that what you wanted to put in  
23 the law, that you didn't know if you wanted --

24          Senator Mathias. This is the point I wanted to raise  
25 here.

1           Mr. Kirbow. That kind of relationship is something that  
2 we should stay away from because I don't see any harm in it,  
3 nor do I think the record demonstrates any harm in it. I don't  
4 see -- I don't know how in the world this person doing that  
5 taints the minds of the American reading public, which is  
6 apparently what you are trying -- you're not trying to protect  
7 the newsman. You are trying to protect the reader who doesn't  
8 know that what he's getting is being spoonfed to him from the  
9 CIA, and I don't know why we would be so concerned about  
10 protecting newsmen from working, or prohibiting them from  
11 working, because I think they have a right to do that as  
12 American citizens, just as they do to work with the Department  
13 of Defense or any other agency.

14           Mr. Bader. You would then rescind the Agency's standing  
15 prohibition?

16           Mr. Kirbow. I just don't think you ever prohibit it in  
17 law.

18           Mr. diGenova. Are you talking about an affiliated,  
19 accredited journalist, because that's what the Agency regulation  
20 deals with. It doesn't deal with an American citizen. It  
21 deals with an accredited person, whether he is a foreign  
22 national or an American.

23           Mr. Bader. To an American media organization.

24           Mr. diGenova. But that's not the example Charles gave  
25 you.

1 Mr. Kirbow. Well, perhaps I misunderstand the extension  
2 that you, your full recommendation.

3 Do you want to go beyond where the administration is in  
4 their position?

5 Mr. Bader. I am recommending to go beyond where the  
6 Administration is at this stage, to extend the operational  
7 prohibition on the part of CIA to use American -- Americans in  
8 the media --

9 Mr. Kirbow. Wherever located.

10 Mr. Bader. Where they are using them undercover, at this  
11 stage, to the extent that it is a cover proposition.

12 Senator Huddleston. Even if they are in foreign media?

13 Mr. Bader. Yes, sir.

14 Senator Huddleston. And even though all of their  
15 activities are related to foreign; they are not writing for  
16 American news services.

17 Mr. Bader. Alternately, they could be with American  
18 media organizations.

19 Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is a single  
20 shred of evidence on our record that that is in any way wrong-  
21 doing or in any way adversely affects the rights of American  
22 citizens. Clearly it will prohibit or could prohibit in the  
23 future the proper use of an individual that could be essential  
24 to the intelligence collection processes of the CIA, and it  
25 singles out a specific agency which is not doing any harm to

1 the American citizenry, and says no, you cannot do this because  
2 you happen to be a secret organization.

3 Senator Mathias. If I wanted to do it, Charlie, I think  
4 I could work out a scheme. I would hire a prominent American  
5 columnist to go and live in Paris, as Art Buchwald did, for  
6 example.

7 Mr. Kirbow. And to pick off his columns and run them  
8 in the New York Times.

9 Senator Mathias. And run them in the Paris Trib first,  
10 and then let the domestic press pick him up.

11 Mr. Kirbow. But if he's in the Paris Trib, that's an  
12 affiliated U.S. --

13 Mr. Aaron. Well, suppose he writes for the Financial  
14 Times?

15 Senator Mathias. Well, you could work out an echo program  
16 if you wanted.

17 Senator Huddleston. Well, the basic point, instead  
18 of picking instances, it seems to me, is whether or not as an  
19 official policy of the United States Government we want an  
20 institution such as the press with all it means and all it is  
21 supposed to be in American with its constitutional provisions and  
22 whatever, to be subverted to the secret, clandestine operation  
23 that it can; Anytime we put any prohibition anywhere, we are  
24 eliminating somebody as a potential agent. You can't use  
25 that as a guideline.

1 Mr. Kirbow. These people are not necessarily subverted.  
2 Senator Huddleston. I'm talking about the institution of  
3 the free press being subverted, not the individual.

4 Mr. Kirbow. I'll extend that one further. I don't see  
5 how using them for cover, which has no direct effect, like the  
6 example I guess you gave, Senator, of a vice president of a  
7 bureau of some sort who has nothing to do with the writing or  
8 editing or anything; he is the business head of the operation  
9 just like any other corporation. This thing extends to that.

10 Senator Huddleston. He may have something do with the  
11 selection of the people who do write.

12 Mr. Kirbow. Well, if you could give us an abuse that we  
13 are trying to correct, or some reason for it?

14 Mr. Bader. It's not a question of abuse, it's a question  
15 of the use, the operational use of an institution such as  
16 the press for operational purposes.

17 Mr. Kirbow. Well, explain then, and perhaps I'm going --  
18 explain the sanctity of the press if it is not to protect an  
19 uninformed reader from having his mind tainted by the relation-  
20 ship. What is the sanctity of the press as an organization?

21 It is not sanctity like the church and state. I just don't  
22 see the record for this.

23 Senator Huddleston. Well, the clergy and the press I think  
24 are institutions.

25 Mr. Kirbow. Well, I think the clergy and maybe the

1 academic, like you say, that teaches the student directly,  
2 but a businessman who happens to have elected going into the  
3 business of running a newspaper or a magazine, to be singled  
4 out and say you as a patriotic American are proscribed against  
5 doing any business, and if you are going to do it with an agency,  
6 you should do it with the whole United States Government. I  
7 don't see how we can single out the CIA and not single out  
8 military or FBI.

9 Mr. Aaron. Well, I think the domestic group will have --  
10 may well have some recommendations regarding the FBI's covert  
11 use of American media.

12 Mr. Kirbow. Well, domestic media, obviously.

13 Mr. Aaron. I would like to say, to take Charles'  
14 example of an American working for a foreign press, and what  
15 the problem is. I think the problem is that you have two  
16 kinds of problems with the press. One is the fact, if it is  
17 operating domestically, if it is working for American media  
18 institutions, it is clear that they are subject to some  
19 manipulation or at least questionable manipulation, and there  
20 are issues in people's minds as to its integrity.

21 Now, the question goes beyond that to what about people  
22 who might be working for some foreign -- American journalists,  
23 American writers or what have you, working for foreign media  
24 institutions. There you have a somewhat more extended  
25 situation. But it seems to me that what you have is the

1 possibility of the American press getting discredited, having  
2 problems of being able to perform its normal functions in the  
3 world and performing in the United States because it is part  
4 of a clandestine intelligence organization.

5 Mr. Kirbow. Don't you think that's an individual right  
6 that a person has the right to exercise both ways, instead of  
7 one way?

8 Mr. Aaron. Charles, what I think I have told the  
9 Committee, I have a real problem with the concept of the  
10 American people having the right to spy, somehow, and these  
11 prohibitions don't go to what people are allowed to do on  
12 the outset. They go to what the Government is allowed to do.

13 Mr. Maxwell. Well, let's take a different kind of  
14 example.

15 What would happen if in some way -- and it's not, I think,  
16 impossible to imagine -- an American citizen was writing full  
17 time for the Communist Party paper in Italy or Portugal or  
18 France.

19 Now, that obviously would be covered by the example that  
20 Bill has provided as a prohibition.

21 There are two questions. One is whether the person has  
22 any real operational use that you want to preserve, and second,  
23 whether it goes to the question that David presents, which is  
24 the possible contamination of the American press, which seems  
25 a difficult extension in that example, as well as the possibility

1 of distortion, the flowback problem in America.

2 And the second problem seems to be, with an example like  
3 that, is that it seems to -- there is very little stock in the  
4 argument, because the argument about distortion of what goes  
5 on in foreign countries and people's perceptions is at the heart  
6 of the question of whether the CIA or any government agency  
7 should be engaged in- propaganda, because it is quite possible  
8 the propaganda gets picked up in the same way, and the question  
9 is obviously of line drawing: how do you want to draw the  
10 line.

11 It strikes me that there may be better ways to draw the  
12 line than the suggested prohibition that Bill has for any  
13 American, regardless of status, or who they write for or what  
14 they are doing.

15 Mr. Kirbow. By having citizenship as an American --

16 Mr. Bader. Well, you misunderstood me. I was putting out  
17 the various possibilities.

18 Let's turn to the text for just a moment and maybe that  
19 will help.

20 First turn to 61. Let's try to get some idea of what the  
21 problem is before we get to the semantics of it. All right,  
22 just let me go through this, then we'll see what is actually  
23 being recommended here.

24 I have confused you, obviously, by giving a series of  
25 possibilities, not what the recommendations are.



1 "Ten U.S. news organizations and five U.S. publishing  
2 houses provide cover for CIA agents abroad. Four of the  
3 organizations do not know that they provide this cover."

4 Then there are some examples.

5 Mr. Kirbow. Meaning management or individual?

6 Mr. Bader. Management.

7 Mr. Kirbow. At any level.

8 Mr. Bader. At any level.

9 Mr. Kirbow. All right.

10 Mr. Bader. Then there are some examples of the kinds of  
11 relationships that the CIA officer engages in intelligence  
12 collection under cover as a roving international news corres-  
13 pondent, a CIA officer under cover as a European representative  
14 of an American company while working as a stringer for a  
15 United States publication engages in intelligence collection  
16 and covert action. In this case the company is aware of the  
17 CIA relationship while the publication is not. Bona fide  
18 journalists who regularly provide the CIA with intelligence,  
19 ~~some~~ are paid regularly while others are not. In one case  
20 the journalist is apparently not aware that the U.S. embassy  
21 official to whom he is providing information is actually a  
22 CIA officer.

23 Now, what the recommendation here on 64, or the bracketed  
24 recommendations -- and I'm sorry I created this situation  
25 by giving various options -- by statute the CIA should be

1 prohibited from using American media organizations for  
2 cover. That is the extent of it.

3 What is the trouble, Joe?

4 Mr. diGenova. That seems to be somewhat -- that seems  
5 to be a back-off from what the Agency prohibits as well. I mean  
6 do you want to make a recommendation saying that the Agency's  
7 prohibition against using Americans who are accredited --

8 Mr. Bader. No.

9 This is the additive. The recommendation here is to  
10 take the Agency's prohibitions which go to the question of,  
11 American and foreign journalists, accredited to American  
12 media organizations, and extend it to what is not covered under  
13 those prohibitions, which is the use of these American media  
14 organizations for cover purposes.

15 Mr. Maxwell. Is it clear that people who are in media  
16 organizations are not accredited to those organizations?

17 Mr. Aaron. If they were, then they would be covered.  
18 If they are accredited journalists, then they would not.

19 Mr. Maxwell. So the issue is whether individuals who  
20 don't write --

21 Mr. Aaron. But may edit.

22 Mr. Maxwell. But may edit.

23 Ms. Culbreath. Or may type it up.

24 Mr. Aaron. Or may type it up.

25 Mr. Kirbow. Well, is this the same point that we're

1 talking about less than 25 people, where you are going to make  
2 a statutory prohibition against use of all people in that  
3 category because on page 61 it says, "of the 65 Americans  
4 employed by the CIA in the media field, only a little over  
5 one third are journalists; another third are CIA agents operat-  
6 ing under media cover, and the remaining individuals are either  
7 employed as CIA media proprietaries abroad or are propaganda  
8 writers and consultants."

9 So we are really talking about making a major prohibition  
10 against a segment of our society where at the present time there  
11 is less than 25 people who have any direct contact with the  
12 reading mind, apparently.

13 Senator Hart of Colorado. I think, Charlie, it's called  
14 a principle. If it was only one person, you've still got the  
15 problem. I don't think it is the quantity.

16 Ms. Davis. Bill, in your examples on 61, the first one  
17 at the bottom, would that now be covered under your prohibition?  
18 CIA officer engages in intelligence collection under cover as a  
19 roving international news correspondent?

20 Mr. Bader. I can't remember from the text here whether  
21 the man is accredited or not.

22 If he is accredited, it would be covered.

23 Ms. Davis. If not, he is not additionally covered by your  
24 prohibition.

25 Senator Huddleston. This does not extend to the example

1 that you gave, Charlie.

2 Mr. Kirbow. No, sir, it doesn't here.

3 Mr. Bader. Only if he is affiliated with that group.

4 Mr. Kirbow. His affiliation covers anybody who is an  
5 American citizen is forever and hereafter would be prohibited, if  
6 it goes into the statute, from dealing.

7 Mr. diGenova. That's only one of the possibilities.

8 Mr. Kirbow. That's one of those recommendations based  
9 on investigation.

10 Mr. Bader. I wasn't recommending that. I was saying that  
11 was one of the possibilities of the whole list.

12 Senator Huddleston. But the recommendation at the top  
13 of 64 doesn't cover an American citizen who is using the  
14 foreign media as cover.

15 Mr. Bader. This would not cover an American citizen who  
16 is, let's say, is working for Stompe, or Le Monde, and who is  
17 not accredited, and at the same time is not accredited to  
18 an American media organization.

19 It does not cover an American citizen who is a stringer to  
20 a Latin American newspaper unless he is accredited to an American  
21 media organization.

22 Mr. Kirbow. Let me try one more time, then, to state the  
23 position of not Senator Tower in this case, but another Senator,  
24 as I indicated, spoke to me on this very subject, and indicate  
25 to you that we not do to harm or to prevent the use by the

1 agency of certain people unless in some way that use affects  
2 the rights and/or in some vague way affects the mental processes  
3 to the detriment of the American citizenry, that we don't  
4 concern ourselves with passing laws to protect the person who  
5 reads something that these people do. If you do this, you open  
6 that can of worms which gets you into a prohibition against any  
7 work in the press or elsewhere in a propaganda fashion.

8 Now, the Committee may decide that propaganda is in fact  
9 something that we should prohibit by law, but doing this  
10 piecemeal like this, it does just exactly that. I see nothing  
11 in our record that indicates that the use of certain of these  
12 people overseas or for cover in any way -- there is not  
13 any evidence that it has adversely affected the rights of the  
14 citizens of the United States. There is a potential for  
15 abuse in practically anything secret and covert.

16 Senator Huddleston. I don't believe the recommendation  
17 at the top of page 64 violates what you have just said.

18 Mr. Maxwell. I would not think that --

19 Mr. Kirbow.. Well, it says, Mr. Chairman, that by statute,  
20 by statute, which means by law, the CIA should be prohibited  
21 from using American media organizations for cover. We apparently  
22 have 65 people, a portion of which are being used for cover,  
23 and apparently they consider them to be an essential asset, or  
24 they wouldn't be using them.

25 Is that correct, Mr. Bader?

1 Mr. Bader. The CIA?

2 Mr. Kirbow. Yes.

3 Mr. Bader. I would assume that they would have extended  
4 their prohibition to this, or on the other hand one could argue  
5 I don't know what their motives were. It could have been they  
6 felt that this, the first step they took was the one that was  
7 dealing with what the public was demanding.

8 Mr. Kirbow. Well, I really don't see anything in our  
9 record or any evidence that they have given us or anything  
10 other than a staff position on this which we are trying to  
11 sell the Committee that this is a harmful procedure.

12 Senator Huddleston. What this does is extends beyond  
13 the practice of journalists to any other person, be it an  
14 executive or clerk or typist or whatever, on the assumption  
15 that you can't be a little bit pregnant. If the agency is  
16 going to be subverted anywhere, not the agency, if the insti-  
17 tution of the press is, that it is going to be subverted.

18 Mr. Bader. Mr. Chairman, the Agency has accepted the  
19 basic principle, because it has removed from its list of  
20 operational assets a rather larger number than this would  
21 call for.

22 Mr. Kirbow. But if I hear correctly what you are saying  
23 then, we are out to protect the American media from being made  
24 pregnant by the CIA and not worrying at all about the reading  
25 public or the other, but just the media.

1           Senator Huddleston. The assumption is if the media of  
2 the press is subverted, that it will affect the citizens, or  
3 they will suffer.

4           Senator Hart of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, in the interest  
5 of expedition, I move the passage of these three recommendations.

6           Senator Huddleston. All right. Let's see what the three  
7 are.

8           Mr. Aaron. Well, let me summarize the first one. I think  
9 we have agreed the first is that the prohibition on distribu-  
10 tion of CIA funded, supported, subsidized and so forth, that  
11 that be prohibited within the United States.

12           Mr. Inderfurth. Printed.

13           Mr. Kirbow. Excuse me. Not printed.

14           Mr. Aaron. The word "printed" dropped out for the following  
15 reason. One, it makes it easier to prohibit the distribution  
16 if you don't identify where the printing is taking place, and  
17 secondly, while there is no printing going on here, the  
18 question really goes to distribution. I think that was the  
19 concurrence of the Committee.

20           The second point is that the prohibitions of -- that the  
21 Agency now has upon itself, be made law.

22           Mr. diGenova. On the use of media personnel and  
23 institutions?

24           Mr. Aaron. On the use of media personnel and institutions,  
25 and the third point is that it be extended to say by statute

1 the CIA should be prohibited from using American media organiza-  
2 tions for cover.

3 Senator Huddleston. Well, the style of this ought to  
4 be changed, it seems to me, because one of the recommendations,  
5 instead of listed under recommendations, is the last paragraph  
6 on 63, is that correct?

7 Mr. Aaron. Yes, that would be picked up as a recommenda-  
8 tion, that is correct.

9 Mr. diGenova. Plus the other one, which is not on 64.

10 Mr. Aaron. Well, the one on 64, the bottom one comes out.

11 Senator Huddleston. Right.

12 Senator Mathias. Before you leave that, as a matter of  
13 record, I am requested to note an exception on behalf of  
14 minority.

15 Mr. Aaron. The second section was the covert use of  
16 American clergy and laity. This is on Page 64.

17 Senator Huddleston. Was that included in your motion?

18 Senator Hart of Colorado. No.

19 Mr. Aaron. I think that covers the recommendation.

20 Mr. Maxwell. They hadn't discussed whether it  
21 should be made public.

22 Senator Huddleston. Well, if it becomes a statute, it  
23 becomes public .

24 Mr. Inderfurth. But the statute will remain secret.

25 Mr. Aaron. No, we are ready to move on it, to covert

end la  
begin lb



1 use of American clergy and laity.

2 Senator Huddleston. Well, the covert action is  
3 with the noted exception, those recommendations go before  
4 the Committee.

5 Senator Hart of Colorado. Just for clarification, Mac, is  
6 that the entire minority or what?

7 Senator Mathias. No, it's only one member.

8 Senator Huddleston. Now we are ready to deal with the  
9 clergy.

10 Mr. Aaron. The point here is, I think, the CIA takes  
11 the position that it has no covert arrangements with American  
12 clergy and laity, and that this will continue as policy, but  
13 they have relationship of a clandestine character which don't  
14 involve remuneration.

15 Senator Huddleston. Incidentally, is that a new policy?

16 Mr. Bader. Yes, as of February 10, 1976.

17 Mr. Aaron. It's pretty short. This is the sum total of  
18 our findings, and it explains it better than I can.

19 Mr. Bader. This has not been, obviously you can see,  
20 Senator and members of the Committee, from the text that the  
21 Committee has found the CIA has a total of 14 covert arrangements  
22 involving direct operational use of 21, that should be religious  
23 persons, and I found it very difficult in this to properly or  
24 respectively address the category here, whether they are American  
25 clergy, religious persons, or what. It is a term of art I

1 really haven't quite been able to deal with.

2 As of February 10th, the CIA announced that the CIA has  
3 not secret paid or contractual relationships with an American  
4 clergyman or missionary. This practice will be continued as a  
5 matter of policy.

6 Senator Huddleston. I think we ought to clarify that  
7 religious persons. That would include Chuck Colson.

8 Mr. Bader. The issue here is, we are saying in the first  
9 instance, we welcome this policy which they intend to put into  
10 their operational prohibitions, and the recommendation that  
11 we bring to you is a very simple one, in addition to that, is  
12 that it be extended from contractual to all operational relation-  
13 ships, paid and unpaid.

14 Senator Huddleston. By statute.

15 Mr. Bader. By statute.

16 Mr. Inderfurth. May I ask a question here?

17 How does this conform to Senator Hatfield's bill on this?

18 Mr. Bader. I don't know.

19 Mr. Inderfurth. I don't know. I'll get a copy of it,  
20 but I think to the degree possible, if the committee  
21 recommends by statute a prohibition, it should be made to conform  
22 to that because he has put in a great deal of work on that, or  
23 without knowing the facts, I might add.

24 Mr. Kirbow. The other thing is the Committee may want  
25 to support legislation that is already pending.

1 Mr. Maxwell. What is the nature of the covert relationship  
2 with religious persons now in effect?

3 Senator Mathias. A few patriotic volunteers.

4 Mr. Bader. Patriotic volunteers, at least one of them,  
5 from the operational records.

6 I think, too, they have what is called a memorandum of  
7 agreement which is not contractual in the sense that it  
8 involves paid or unpaid.

9 Mr. Maxwell. What are they doing?

10 Mr. Bader. They collect intelligence information.

11 Mr. Kirbow. What is a religious person, Mr. Bader, as they  
12 use it or as you use it here?

13 Would that mean the organ player that is a civilian who  
14 travels with a preacher and plays the organ?

15 Mr. Bader. No. It is intended to be the American clergy,  
16 although I certainly would lean on whoever can tell me what a  
17 proper term is to define American clergy.

18 Senator Mathias. What about this fellow around, Maharaja  
19 Rani?

20 Senator Huddleston. I'll think on your definition.

21 Mr. Bader. I think we'll have to have a footnote as to  
22 what American clergy may be.

23 Mr. diGenova. American clergy or missionaries, certainly.

24 Senator Huddleston. Well, missionary gets a little  
25 fuzzy.

1 Mr. Bader. The Agency uses "American clergy or missionary."  
2 Senator Huddleston. It has to be a person whose primary  
3 occupation is for a religious order or sect or something, it  
4 seems to me.

5 Mr. Kirbow. How about the Mormon youth who do their things  
6 overseas?

7 Would this take care of them and prevent them from getting  
8 gobbled up?

9 Senator Huddleston. I think that's a good question. They  
10 receive no pay.

11 Mr. Kirbow. They are not church people, per se. It is  
12 part of their religion, doing the service. You see, this gets  
13 to be a rather broad extension, or you leave out certain  
14 things if you are not careful with your definition.

15 Senator Huddleston. I think there may be somewhere in our  
16 litany a definition. I am not sure.

17 Mr. Inderfurth. I would imagine that Senator Hatfield's  
18 bill, a definition of what clergy -- that would be spelled out.  
19 There are copies coming over now.

20 Mr. Bader. Well, I think maybe we will get a copy of the  
21 definition of clergy or missionary. Maybe that will clear  
22 that up.

23 Senator Huddleston. Well, I think, you know, some  
24 churches send people over for a very short period of time. They  
25 are lay people, really, but while they are there, they are

1 there more or less under the auspices of the church group.

2 Mr. Kirbow. At least a local church frequently sponsored  
3 them.

4 Senator Huddleston. I don't think you can prohibit all  
5 those kinds of people. I think some kind of definition should  
6 include the primary occupation of clergy, clergy itself.

7 Senator Mathias. Well, why don't we commit to staff for  
8 the moment the question of definition?

9 Senator Huddleston. I think we will have to do that.

10 Okay. Are we ready to move on that?

11 Mr. Aaron. The recommendation is that whomever or however  
12 we define them -- and that's obviously an important question,  
13 that they either be prohibited by statute. The other alternative  
14 is to simply prohibit any further or recommend the prohibition  
15 of any further CIA recruitment in this field.

16 Ms. Culbreath. The way this is worded, this would get  
17 anybody who is a lay member of a church. You have got recruit-  
18 ments of American clergy or laity.

19 If I am a member of the Methodist church, I am in the  
20 laity of the church.

21 Mr. Miller. You have raised a question. There are people  
22 who are not priests in the religious hierarchy in a particular  
23 sect who may devote their entire lives to that particular  
24 church.

25 Senator Mathias. Well, I think the word "a religious" --

1 I'm serious here -- should be considered.

2 Mr. Aaron. "A religious?"

3 Mr. Bader. We'll have to obviously work on that. Laity  
4 was not meant here to be a member of a church, for technical  
5 terms, the technical terms Mr. Miller mentioned.

6 Mr. Miller. As distinct from the congregation, it was  
7 meant to deal with the administrators in a religious order.

8 Senator Huddleston. Well, some sects have lay preachers and  
9 lay clergy.

10 Mr. Kirbow. Senator Hart, do you want each of these  
11 categories like this examined in the light of the constitutional  
12 question that you raised earlier?

13 Senator Hart of Colorado. I just raised the issue where  
14 the academics were concerned to resolve it, so I'm sure it  
15 should be raised by somebody.

16 Senator Huddleston. Are you ready to go on the religious  
17 insofar as what is the definition? Then that will be --

18 Senator Hart of Colorado. Yes, sir.

19 Senator Huddleston. Then that will be moved up, I assume,  
20 with exceptions noted?

21 Mr. Kirbow. I don't have any exception to that one, sir.

22 Mr. Inderfurth. That is by statute, right?

23 Senator Huddleston. Pardon?

24 Mr. Inderfurth. Is that by statute?

25 Senator Huddleston. Right.

1 Mr. Maxwell. There may be a First Amendment argument  
2 here, particularly in fundamentalist groups whose religious  
3 beliefs are committed, are directed toward opposition toward  
4 Godless atheism.

5 Mr. diGenova. Except that the control of religious organi-  
6 zation has historically been subject to governmental regulation  
7 in this sense: the Supreme Court in light of Senator Hart's  
8 question last night, I did a little bit of research. The  
9 example, the prime example of regulation doesn't deal so  
10 much with prohibition of the Government dealing with someone,  
11 although there are vast areas where the government is not  
12 permitted to get into. The question is, for years the Supreme  
13 Court has ruled that there are certain health regulations of  
14 states that religious sects must comply with, and they have  
15 to comply with it even if it conflicts with their basic religious  
16 belief, that they have to comply with it, like quarantines  
17 or things of that nature.

18 So there is clearly an area where the First Amendment of  
19 religious freedom concept falls in the face of a greater good,  
20 the need of the general public, and that has generally been  
21 in the health area, where there is some practice of the  
22 religion which conflicts with some standard which has been  
23 set in the community at large, and that generally has dealt  
24 with health.

25 Mr. Kirbow. Maybe the HEW Act can bring the CIA under one

1 of these health threats.

2 Mr. diGenova. Self-immolation.

3 Senator Huddleston. The snake acts and inoculations.

4 Mr. diGenova. That's exactly right.

5 Mr. Maxwell. The problem is that's not quite applicable  
6 to this, and one has to argue in the past the Court has ruled  
7 on things that are found to be a threat to the personal liveli-  
8 hood or health of the individual rather than something that  
9 could be construed in a fundamentalist sense.

10 Senator Huddleston. This doesn't preclude a sect that  
11 may be anti-atheist and as such anti-Communist from pursuing  
12 its principles, but the restriction would be pursuing them through  
13 a government agency, which happens to be the CIA, or any other  
14 methods.

15 Ms. Culbreath. Would this prohibit, then, somebody who was  
16 a member of one of these sects that was in an area where they  
17 gained information that would be helpful from them being sources?

18 Senator Huddleston. I wouldn't think so if they wanted  
19 to write letters to the CIA.

20 Ms. Culbreath. Well, just in terms of the debriefing kind  
21 of thing, or contact.

22 Ms. Davis. We are talking about operational, not coming  
23 in to the Domestic Contact Service.

24 Mr. diGenova. It is not very clear on this.

25 Mr. Maxwell. The problem in part goes back to the difficult:



1 we had with the Domestic Contact Division in trying to determine  
2 what was operational support, if operational support would be  
3 what did you learn about individuals there who might be  
4 receptive to American approaches. Then the clergy would be  
5 prohibited from providing that kind of information if that  
6 is operational support.

7 Senator Mathias. Well, it seems to me if the religious  
8 came in and said I was at a meeting of the Holy Rollers last night  
9 and we all went down on the mourner's bench, and I heard the  
10 most remarkable things, and this is what I heard, there would  
11 be no prohibition against listening. Now, if you say, go back  
12 to the Holy Rollers tonight --

13 Mr. Kirbow. And listen again.

14 Senator Mathias. Then you've got a question.

15 Senator Huddleston. Then it is operational.

16 I don't think there's a need to write in that it doesn't  
17 pertain to the voluntary furnishing of information. I don't  
18 know.

19 Mr. Aaron. I don't think -- no, that's really not an  
20 operational use, quite frankly. It's very similar to the DCD  
21 which takes information from lots of people, including people  
22 who are and have been for some time proscribed by CIA's own --

23 Senator Huddleston. Well, anyway, that would be worked  
24 out in the statute itself.

25 Mr. Aaron. We are spared the problem.

1 Senator Huddleston. We ought to move on.

2 Mr. Aaron. The next section is proprietaries and cover.

3 Senator Huddleston. I just wonder if in presenting this,  
4 these three, these four, now, that we have just approved, it  
5 would be of any value to assert in our report that we recognize  
6 that the Agency has to find proper cover for its agents, that  
7 restricting that cover is a matter of some importance, but there  
8 are certain institutions that the Committee feels because of  
9 their nature and because of their standing in the country, and  
10 because of the need for the public to have confidence in them,  
11 that they should be, in effect, off limits, and because of that  
12 we recommend that these four recommendations be brought. I  
13 don't know whether you want to make it sound any better or  
14 not.

15 Senator Hart of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, does the absence  
16 of brackets on the next set of recommendations mean that they  
17 are non-controversial?

18 Senator Huddleston. On the proprietaries?

19 Senator Hart of Colorado. Yes.

20 Mr. Aaron. That is correct.

21 Senator Huddleston. The gentleman did such a great job  
22 that nobody can question them.

23 Mr. Aaron. I think there is only one set of brackets, and  
24 the next section is on page 67 in which it says that --

25 Mr. diGenova. Oh, yes, there is something.

1 Mr. Kirbow. What page are you on?

2 Mr. diGenova. 67.

3 At the bottom of page 67 is a bracketed quote about  
4 Admiral Raborn, a former Director of Central Intelligence.

5 Now, if my memory serves me correctly -- now, first of all,  
6 this is the first time that anyone is mentioned by name in the  
7 findings.

8 Senator Huddleston. And the total findings are in that  
9 section.

10 Mr. Kirbow. The findings are this foreign and military.

11 Senator Huddleston. We referred to Helms and Laird, but  
12 I think we decided we could write around that.

13 Mr. diGenova. Well, here's what happened here. This  
14 paragraph deals with the fact that when the Agency disposes or  
15 dissolves a proprietary, it tries to avoid conflicts of interest.

16 However, when noted that sometimes pressures were brought  
17 to bear on the Agency to dispose of the entity as a favor to  
18 someone, so that it would benefit someone else.

19 Now, the most glaring example of this was this activity  
20 of the former Director, Admiral Raborn, who actually became  
21 involved in negotiations on behalf of a client, Overseas  
22 National Airways, which he represented, and he wanted the sale  
23 of Southern Air Transport, which was a CIA proprietary, large  
24 assets and large property, to Overseas National Airways, which  
25 of course would have acquired Southern Air Transport's lucrative

1 routes.

2 Now, the way I originally had it written was "A former  
3 Director of the Central Intelligence Agency sought unsuccess-  
4 fully to influence the sale." However, if it was left that way,  
5 people would have to guess at which one of these guys did this  
6 and it would unfairly impugn all of the directors. The name  
7 was inserted. Therefore, the question now becomes whether it  
8 should be left in at all since the name is inserted, and since  
9 the name is mentioned in the report, and whether or not the  
10 whole sentence--

11 Senator Hart of Colorado. Well, what if we just said "A  
12 former Director"?

13 Mr. diGenova. Well, the problem there, Senator, is then  
14 people say, which one was it?

15 Senator Hart of Colorado. Good.

16 Mr. diGenova. Oh, all right.

17 Mr. Inderfurth. I think the assumption would be Richard  
18 Helms.

19 Mr. diGenova. McCone more than Helms.

20 Senator Hart of Colorado. Well, we ran into this last  
21 summer with the Exener matter and all like that.

22 Ms. Culbreath. A former person.

23 Mr. diGenova. The Agency itself cited this as the most  
24 flagrant example of intercession on behalf of anyone. As a  
25 matter of fact, the memorandums on this refer to dozens of

1 phone calls and overtures, and it is a former Director trying to  
2 gain a benefit. It is an unseemly situation, and they labeled  
3 it as a conflict of interest which they sought to avoid, and  
4 in fact they did, and they are praised for it in the report  
5 because they were really under tremendous pressure.

6 So I have no feeling one way or the other. I think to  
7 leave out his name unfairly impugns the other. To leave it in,  
8 also, is only the second time in the whole findings and conclusion  
9 that we mention anybody's name, so I don't care.

10 Senator Huddleston. And you've got one, Recommendation  
11 No. 5, related to the disposal of the proprietaries, that the  
12 Justice Department approve?

13 Mr. diGenova. Be consulted on the disposition.

14 Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, can I be heard on that?

15 Senator Huddleston. Yes, sir.

16 Mr. Kirbow. Senator Hart, in this regard we have consistently  
17 attempted by most every reasonable means to not use the names  
18 of people unless they had committed something illegal.

19 Senator Hart of Colorado. Well, don't side with me. I'm  
20 not taking a position.

21 Mr. Kirbow. But the Exener thing was a big example, but  
22 we must have had 20 other names that we went through on that  
23 assassination, and we wrote around them.

24 Senator Hart of Colorado. But a number of people argued  
25 strongly that we ought to name her and go into details, so I

1 suppose the same arguments could be used here on this matter.

2 Mr. Kirbow. But the point I raised at the staff meeting  
3 just before the Committee came back, when the subject was  
4 raised, was did Admiral Raborn, as a retired military officer,  
5 currently in a civilian status, although he was former -- break  
6 any American law, or had they sold it to this, would it have  
7 been a violation of the law, and the answer was no.

8 If he was involved -- or they knew of no law that he  
9 had violated, and none is apparently cited in the record.  
10 Pressure was brought to bear, there is no doubt about it, by  
11 Admiral Raborn. I think there's another example. I'm not  
12 sure whether Joe described it to me or someone else, of a  
13 very senior official out there dealing back with the Agency.

14 Now, the military, as Senator Hart knows, is prohibited  
15 from this by regulations and I think by law. I know that as a  
16 regular military officer, you are not allowed to do contractual  
17 business with your agency forever, but with the other military  
18 departments and the Department of Defense, I think you have to  
19 have a cleansing period of five to seven years.

20 I don't believe there is any such provision in the Act  
21 that applies to former Directors, and probably what the Committee  
22 should do is consider this action without necessarily naming  
23 him unless he was in violation of some really serious  
24 wrongdoing, and make a prohibition, drawn similarly, with what  
25 now applies to senior officials going back and kind of exerting

1 undue influence on those people.

2 Senator Huddleston. Joe, is it accurate to say that  
3 pressures were often brought to bear?

4 Mr. diGenova. We changed that to say sometimes. This is  
5 a rewrite. Someone else wrote this after I had submitted it,  
6 and we had a meeting today, and we changed several things in  
7 there.

8 So I leave it up to the Committee. This was a matter that  
9 I -- I wanted to flag it and leave it there. The explanation  
10 is as clear as I can give it.

11 Mr. Inderfurth. This is the first time he is mentioned  
12 in the entire paper.

13 Mr. diGenova. That's right.

14 Senator Huddleston. Why don't we delete that sentence and  
15 keep it in our full report, our big report.

16 Mr. Kirbow. There is a major classified report on  
17 this that would contain all the facts.

18 Senator Huddleston. I am concerned now whether any other  
19 instances of someone may be, of similar standing as Admiral  
20 Raborn.

21 Mr. diGenova. Yes. There are instances in the record  
22 which do not deal with proprietaries, of John McCone interceding  
23 on behalf of Pan American directly with the Director of  
24 Central Intelligence, and it is not mentioned in the report,  
25 and it should be, and it is a problem that we have had, Mr.

1 Chairman, has been that the work involving the relationship of  
2 the Central Intelligence Agency with American business companies  
3 was severed off from the proprietary work for the simple  
4 reason that they are not the same thing.

5 That work has been done. It has not been pursued vigorous-  
6 ly, not because the individual who was responsible for it  
7 didn't want to.

8 Senator Huddleston. That happened after he left.

9 Mr. diGenova. That's right, after Mr. McCone left the  
10 DCI, he had frequent contacts, according to the records, with  
11 the Agency, with high level Agency personnel, and in one instance  
12 he interceded personally with the Director of Central Intelli-  
13 gence to avoid actions which would be taken by another govern-  
14 ment and its airline which would adversely affect Pan American  
15 World Airways.

16 Senator Huddleston. It is hard to separate a man from his  
17 past totally.

18 Mr. diGenova. It seems particularly hard with DCIs.

19 Mr. Kirbow. Well, not only here, this is not with the  
20 Agency, but it came up in my experience with the Armed Services  
21 Committee involving Continental Airlines.

22 Senator Mathias. This sentence.

23 Senator Huddleston. Just the sentence in brackets.

24 Senator Mathias. Well, I think if you've got a Raborn Case  
25 a McCone Case and whatnot, that you can't make fish of one and



1 fowl of the other.

2 Senator Huddleston. I think we've already said that  
3 pressures sometimes were brought to bear and we make recommenda-  
4 tions to correct that.

5 Ms. Culbreath. Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that maybe if  
6 we do delete that, that we perhaps redo that previous sentence  
7 to make it a little stronger, and perhaps in some way  
8 indicate that these were serious pressures, and they were, I  
9 think, hard pressures to withstand when somebody in that kind  
10 of position --

11 Senator Huddleston. They were withstood, though.

12 Mr. Maxwell. They would get lost the way the sentence is  
13 cut.

14 Mr. diGenova. I think what we will do is David and I  
15 will get together, and Elizabeth, and we will change this  
16 "however" sentence, the sentence that precedes the one that  
17 has just been deleted, and we will expand that sentence to  
18 more accurately explain that the pressures came from high sources  
19 sometimes. Some of them may have been maybe former Agency  
20 directors.

21 Senator Huddleston. I think we should make the point that  
22 it was former.

23 Senator Mathias. Well, if they were former directors,  
24 then you may as well leave in the last sentence.

25 Mr. diGenova. Maybe.

1 Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that maybe  
2 perhaps we use this type of part of the investigation and what  
3 we know from certain of the other files to prohibit this type  
4 of conduct by law in the future in our general recommendations?

5 Senator Huddleston. And make it similar to --

6 Mr. Kirbow. Similar. I think you would have to look at  
7 something from the staff.

8 Mr. diGenova. I didn't have that recommendation in there,  
9 but I think the record indicates it ought to be there.

10 Mr. Kirbow. It wouldn't be proper, necessarily, to put it  
11 right here under proprietaries, but let's put it in the  
12 general recommendations.

13 Mr. diGenova. David, did you get that?

14 Mr. Aaron. I'm sorry.

15 There's a recommendation that --

16 Mr. diGenova. That Agency personnel --

17 Mr. Kirbow. Senior officials.

18 Senator Huddleston.. Similar to what applies now for  
19 military.

20 Mr. Maxwell. Well, perhaps the statute, perhaps we could  
21 recommend a statute similar to that governing the Department of  
22 Defense.

23 Mr. Kirbow. Be enacted by the next Committee, similar  
24 in effect to.

25 Senator Huddleston. And find a proper place to put it in

1 our recommendations.

2 Mr. Aaron. Okay.

3 Mr. Maxwell. Well, Charlie, correct me. I think the  
4 proprietary section would be the appropriate section because  
5 that would be where it came up most, unless there is another  
6 one that you see more readily.

7 Mr. diGenova. We can work that out. I don't think  
8 that's terribly --

9 Mr. Kirbow. I think there have been two or three sug-  
10 gestions made here that will result in general recommendations  
11 on a page that isn't necessarily supported by findings, but you  
12 come to this overally conclusion based upon your total concept  
13 of the Agency and its procedures and everything else in view  
14 of the findings.

15 Mr. diGenova. The only thing I want to do is -- David,  
16 I know you have gone through this, but the Senators may want to  
17 look at page 68 through 70, which deal with cover, and particu-  
18 larly with Mr. Welch.

19 Ms. Culbreath. I had a point I wanted to raise on that.

20 Mr. diGenova. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Senators  
21 want to read this.

22 Ms. Culbreath. Why don't we let them look through it.

23 (Pause.)

24 Senator Huddleston. Let's go back on the record.

25 Mr. diGenova. I do know the Agency is going to come in

1 tomorrow to review the cover paper from which this summary is  
2 drawn. I know Eric has some problems with the cover paper, both  
3 editorially, because they view it as overly simplistic and  
4 harsh because it reflects all of the Inspector General's  
5 judgments, but they have some problems with cover in general,  
6 but I don't think this is going to be part of that problem.

7 Senator Huddleston. I have some problem with this page  
8 70 relating to Welch because it seems the whole implication of  
9 that is that he was murdered because his cover was blown, and  
10 so far there has been no evidence that that is the case. It  
11 highlights the argument, I think, correctly, but it seems to me  
12 it leaves the impression that here is a case where a fellow's  
13 cover or lack of cover resulted in his death.

14 I think the Agency people have specifically said to us  
15 so far that they have no reason at this point yet to expect  
16 that that was the reason he got killed.

17 Mr. Maxwell. In regard to the specific quote, I think  
18 we have to be very careful as to getting involved in an argument  
19 which would imply that anything that we possibly did had an  
20 effect on it, and also, that it seems to point to Mr. Welch  
21 and say, well, it is all his fault.

22 Senator Huddleston. He didn't protect his cover, he  
23 didn't do what they advised him to do, and you see down here  
24 we have another quote which says, referring to international  
25 terrorism and incitement for these kind of people to take the

1 kind of action which unfortunately led to the death of Dick  
2 Welch. There again we are ascribing something to the death of  
3 Dick Welch which nobody knows yet, you know, what terrorists  
4 killed him or why; at least our record doesn't show.

5 Mr. diGenova. These statements here, Senator, this is a  
6 direct quote from Eric Eisenstead's memo. Do you think that  
7 we should maybe in the findings and recommendations shorten  
8 this and maybe --

9 Mr. Kirbow. I think the part of the record which is an  
10 unknown fact is why Dick Welch was killed, and we should stay  
11 away from any quotes or other pronouncements in our paper which  
12 attribute his death to any particular thing unless we know  
13 something.

14 Mr. Aaron. I think that is a good point. We might put  
15 in here a statement which says the Committee has no information  
16 as to the reasons, purposes or cause, specific cause, of his  
17 death. The point is to get at the question of cover, to  
18 step out to the question of cover in the report, as we do, I  
19 think, appropriately, but not have talked about the one case  
20 where this all came out in public, rightly or wrongly.

21 Mr. Kirbow. Why don't we use the cover for the gentleman  
22 in London, then, where as the tour buses go by, of course, you  
23 know this is the home of the CIA chief, and he hasn't been  
24 killed yet or anything like that. If we want to use that  
25 kind instead of using this death example, which, by the way,

1 has brought some thousands of letters from the constituency of  
2 certain southern Senators who shall remain unnamed or near-  
3 Southern Senators, because it kind of was a catalytic agent  
4 in getting a lot of complaints on the Committee and everything  
5 else, and this pointing out or explaining Welch's death goes  
6 back to it.

7 Senator Huddleston. I'm sort of southern.

8 Mr. Kirbow. And you've got a lot of them.

9 Senator Huddleston. Of course, it was used for that  
10 purpose by certain high officials for that.

11 Mr. Kirbow. The very highest, including attending the  
12 funeral.

13 Mr. diGenova. Well, I think one of the things we wanted  
14 to pinpoint here, and first of all, I think we can summarize the  
15 Agency's testimony a little better. The Agency said, nothing  
16 this Committee did, first of all, had anything to do with his  
17 death, as far as they know.

18 Ms. Culbreath. But they don't know.

19 Mr. diGenova. As far as they know, they don't know one  
20 way or another, but the impression that was created in the  
21 press was, and was pandered to by the DCI and the President,  
22 was that the general actions of exposure of Agency operations  
23 were responsible for the death of Mr. Welch, and they pandered  
24 that by inviting Committee members to the funeral as if they  
25 bore some responsibility.

1 Now, the obvious public relations value of Mr. Welch's  
2 death, the first time in history the DDO and the DCI go to  
3 a funeral in public, they never did that, and there is no doubt  
4 that they tried to make political hay out of his death. I  
5 think it is only fair that the Committee ultimately say --

6 Senator Huddleston. Right, but I think you've got two  
7 different problems. You've got a problem with whether the  
8 Committee wants to present its case and exonerate itself on the  
9 basis of everything that is known about the death of Welch,  
10 and whether that is pertinent to the problem of cover.

11 Now, we make a recommendation that the CIA shall make an  
12 effort to place a greater proportion of its officer abroad  
13 under nonofficial cover. It seems like what we need, there's  
14 a statement here is that official cover has not proved to be  
15 effective, and if we mention Welsh at all, I think the point we  
16 mention there is that his name was carried, that while he was  
17 there supposedly under cover, his name was in fact carried in a  
18 newspaper, the name of his newspaper had been carried in a  
19 foreign newspaper, and he was living in a house that was known  
20 to be the house.

21 Mr. Kirbow. His true identity was widely known.

22 Senator Huddleston. We can cite him as an example without  
23 indicating why he had been killed, of here is a case that  
24 everybody knows about, so-called official cover was not in  
25 fact very deep cover. There may be other instances that we

1 want to refer to, but if we get into his death at all, I think  
2 we have got to present the case, that blowing his cover is not  
3 necessarily what killed him. Nobody knows that as of now, so  
4 far as I know. Nobody knows it wasn't just a street gang or an  
5 idiot.

6 Mr. Kirbow. It could have been like the Senator John  
7 Stennis case, where they buttonholed him in front of his  
8 house and killed him for robbery purposes.

9 Senator Huddleston. We've asked them two or three times  
10 here, have we not?

11 Mr. diGenova. Yes, we have. In fact they don't know.

12 Senator Huddleston. In fact, the last time Nelson was  
13 here we asked him.

14 Mr. Aaron. Can I try a fix on this, turning to page 70,  
15 instead of saying "the career and tragic death of the station  
16 chief," let's just say the "situation of the station chief in  
17 Athens illustrates the tension. As the Chief of the Cover  
18 Staff stated, by the time a person becomes a chief of  
19 station, there is not a great deal of cover left," leaving in  
20 the rest of that sentence, and then add in here, as you did,  
21 "Mr. Welch and his predecessor were both identified and named  
22 in the local press. Further, Mr. Welch occupied the same  
23 house."

24 Senator Huddleston. Which presumably was known to be  
25 the house of the station chief.



1 Mr. diGenova. In fact, the station chief's name and  
2 address in Athens had been presented, so when he was in there  
3 the address had already been printed previously.

4 Mr. Aaron. Which was also known.

5 Senator Huddleston. Now, if we want to say something about  
6 an added dimension to the seriousness on blowing cover or  
7 cover being diminished, is the situation in the world with  
8 terrorism or the vulnerability it makes of people --

9 Mr. Kirbow. To the unstable.

10 Mr. Aaron. Well, the point in the testimony is that  
11 this was an added danger, but because they've got a job to  
12 do, they're not going to really do too much about it. It's  
13 a real risk they are just going to have to bear.

14 Senator Huddleston. That's an occupational hazard, but we  
15 are talking about how to protect their cover, and our recommen-  
16 dation is that they use -- have an official cover.

17 Mr. Kirbow. Well, can the staff change the language,  
18 because we know exactly what you want to do, and without  
19 taking further time, why don't we just change it.

20 Mr. Maxwell. I would just hope that the two quotes after  
21 the one that David cited, the quote, he, Welch, was asked, the  
22 last quote, we could make the point in a different way because  
23 the impact of the first quote, I think, is this guy was stupid  
24 and irresponsible, and I don't think we need to have any  
25 implication like that in the report, and the second one, I

1 think we can make the point that terrorism may constitute a  
2 greater threat now.

3 Senator Huddleston. I think that quote ought to go entirely  
4 because it does leave the implication that there was a direct  
5 link to losing his cover and his assassination.

6 Now, we don't know that.

7 Mr. Aaron. So just take out the last one.

8 Mr. diGenova. But still speak about the added danger of  
9 international terrorism. Just stop at the word "international  
10 terrorism."

11 Senator Huddleston. Down in the recommendations I've been  
12 talking to Joe about defining the small business, and I think  
13 we fairly well understand what the concern is, or do we, Joe?

14 Mr. diGenova. Senator, I was going to suggest, if you  
15 look at Recommendation No. 3, while it doesn't define what a  
16 large proprietary is, the Senator was concerned about what  
17 was meant by "should be kept small," and I tried to indicate  
18 really we are talking about Air America where you had 8000  
19 employees of the CIA, both in Langley and abroad, and then  
20 another 8000 employees of the Air America complex. That is  
21 big.

22 But I think what we should say is, organizationally small,  
23 and organizationally and numerically small, because what we are  
24 really talking about is when they get big, whether it is in  
25 numbers or finances, and larger in terms of people usually means

1 larger in terms of finances, also. Then you have both of the  
2 problems we addressed in the paper, which was the risk of  
3 unfair competition with private enterprise, and the risk of  
4 blowing cover, of compromising security.

5 So I think that --

6 Senator Huddleston. I was wondering if it could be  
7 designed in such a way as care should be taken that it not be  
8 any larger than necessary to achieve the objective for which  
9 it was established.

10 Mr. Kirbow. Excuse me, Senator. It would not get the  
11 Air America thing because at the time they needed one twice  
12 that size.

13 Senator Huddleston. They needed it that big, that's  
14 right.

15 Mr. diGenova. The reason this language is in here is that  
16 the Agency officials themselves who testified, all of them,  
17 including the DDO, said they would like to have small ones, in  
18 other words, a small number of employees, small operation.

19 Senator Huddleston. What about their insurance business?

20 Mr. diGenova. That's kind of an exception, although  
21 actually that is an example of a lot of money with only a few  
22 employees. There are only a couple of people that run that  
23 whole thing, Isenstead and a couple of -- one investor,  
24 Istenstead, and an auditor. There are three men that run that  
25  complex. So that is a different animal, really.

1           Senator Huddleston. So if you are going to use the term  
2 "small," you've got to say it from the standpoint of employees  
3 or resources.

4           Ms. Culbreath. I was just going to suggest that, since  
5 another of our recommendations suggests annual review of all  
6 of these criteria, and since their budgets are going to have to  
7 be included for the oversight committee with review for the  
8 others, and we have got a proposal that the Committee also  
9 establish guidelines for the approval of the creation of large  
10 proprietaries, should these become necessary.

11           Perhaps the better thing to do, since these proprietaries  
12 are for a specific need at a specific time, and since we have  
13 got the review procedure, is sort of trust it to the oversight  
14 committee to see to it that they don't get too big, whatever  
15 that may be, and leave it to them, maybe just delete that  
16 second sentence.

17           Mr. Kirbow. Well, that's certainly a workable way.

18           Senator Huddleston. I don't see how you are going to keep  
19 that sentence in there without having it.

20           Mr. Aaron. I would also suggest that perhaps in the  
21 section on proprietaries, where we make a comment about how  
22 large proprietaries run risks in blowing their cover, we might  
23 would it be possible, do you think, to make a finding or make  
24 an example in regard to Air America?

25           Mr. diGenova. Absolutely, because they have conceded

1 that's the one that ran all of the problems.

2 Senator Huddleston. You do mention that somewhere, don't  
3 you?

4 Mr. Aaron. It's not mentioned specifically, but it might  
5 be possible to say, you know, maybe you can put a footnote on  
6 the first paragraph which simply said --

7 Mr. diGenova. You mean on the findings of page 66 that  
8 "too often large proprietaries have created unfair" --

9 Mr. Aaron. "Unwarranted risks of unfair competition with  
10 with private business in compromising their cover." You should  
11 say, "for example," "Air America, for example, which had 8,000  
12 employees," and so forth, ran into both of these problems.

13 Senator Huddleston. I think that would be all right.

14 Mr. Aaron. And then you would have at least some reference  
15 to what "large" was.

16 Senator Huddleston. Then you've got the review and the  
17 oversight.

18 Mr. Inderfurth. So the idea here in the recommendation was  
19 to take out the second sentence.

20 Mr. diGenova. Yes.

21 Mr. Inderfurth. Why not take out the first as well and  
22 just go to Recommendation No. 2 as No. 1?

23 Mr. diGenova. Well, I think -- can I just say this -- that  
24 by indirection, approving of an activity is, I suppose, one  
25 way of doing it. I don't see anything wrong with stepping up

1 and saying we examined proprietaries, we found them to be --  
2 they had problems but basically they were all right.

3 Mr. Inderfurth. Couldn't that be in the body as well?

4 Mr. Kirbow. The one thing we have failed to do on this  
5 Committee is where we are strongly in favor of, is to speak  
6 out in a manner supporting an agency under otherwise violent  
7 attack from many sources, and I think --

8 Mr. Inderfurth. I think that is not true, Charlie. I  
9 think you will find, if you read the findings of Bill Miller  
10 and others wrote in the first part, it says very strongly,  
11 intelligence is necessary; we need it.

12 Mr. Kirbow. I'm saying up until now it has been an agency  
13 under attack. I think this whole section on foreign and  
14 military has been to make a balance between past wrongdoing  
15 and current operations.

16 The Chairman. There can't be anything wrong with leaving  
17 the sentence in there.

18 Mr. Maxwell. May I raise a question to the second  
19 recommendation, as to the reason why by statute there would be  
20 an annual review rather than recommending that to Congressional  
21 Committees.

22 The second part of that is, my understanding of a number  
23 of the proprietaries is that they are not operating, and to  
24 require GAO audit of a whole group of in a sense notional  
25 organizations may be preempting the kind of review that the

1 oversight committee should be doing rather than setting it out  
2 here. It's just a question.

3 Mr. diGenova. This is a rewrite of my original recommen-  
4 dation, and it is a good point. It may very well be that that  
5 is superfluous, if you are considering oversight by a committee.

6 Senator Huddleston. The Committee cannot conduct an audit,  
7 though.

8 Mr. diGenova. And that was the purpose for the Committee  
9 taking on board independent GAO auditors.

10 Mr. Maxwell. The Committee can request GAO auditors.

11 Mr. Kirbow. Anything that appears to be on an audit  
12 calls for an audit.

13 Senator Huddleston. Calls for a GAO audit or gives the  
14 Committee authority to call for one.

15 Mr. diGenova. I don't think we need a statute. We can  
16 talk about it as part of Congressional oversight. As part of  
17 the Congressional oversight function, the oversight committee  
18 should review proprietaries annually and where necessary  
19 conduct audits with the assistance of the General Accounting  
20 Office.

21 Mr. Kirbow. Here, Mr. Chairman, I think again the point we  
22 made yesterday, that we should say at least annually, so that  
23 they don't put you in a box if you want one every two months  
24 because of circumstances, "at least annually."

25 Senator Huddleston. You could add in Section 3, at least

1 there, giving the Committee authority to establish guidelines,  
2 to establish for large proprietaries, should they become  
3 necessary.

4 You could also make the statement there that the Committee  
5 may call for a GAO audit periodically.

6 Mr. diGenova. So we will rewrite 2 to eliminate the statute  
7 Senator Huddleston. Independent GAO audit.

8 Mr. Aaron. No. 2 is rewritten so it is not required by  
9 statute that there be an audit, internal audit?

10 Mr. Kirbow. No GAO audit.

11 Senator Huddleston. The only thing I had in mind of  
12 taking out of 2 was just the independent GAO audit being  
13 required by statute, and leave that to the discretion of  
14 the Committee, but leave the rest of the review, right?

15 Mr. Maxwell. You amend it by statute that an annual  
16 review of all proprietaries?

17 Senator Huddleston. An internal CIA audit.

18 Mr. Maxwell. Or would it recommend that, I'm not sure  
19 which.

20 Mr. diGenova. I'm wondering whether it should be done  
21 by statute. Maybe we should recommend to the oversight  
22 committee that there should be an annual review consisting of  
23 internal CIA audit.

24 Mr. Maxwell. An annual report to the oversight committee  
25 and such GAO audits as the Committee --



1 Mr. diGenova. May deem necessary.

2 Senator Huddleston. That's all right.

3 Mr. diGenova. And then we could add, as part of its  
4 annual report, the GAO should record all of its intercessions.  
5 That should be "report." They record all of them, so change  
6 "record" to "report".

7 We can rewrite that.

8 Senator Huddleston. Make that a little stronger.

9 Mr. diGenova. Must report?

10 Senator Huddleston. Shall be required to report.

11 Mr. Aaron. I'm sorry.

12 Could we now have a recapitulation by whomever thinks they  
13 followed this?

14 Mr. diGenova. Elliot?

15 I defer.

16 Mr. Maxwell. "There should be an annual review"--

17 Mr. Aaron. There is no longer a statute. The Committee  
18 recommends that there be, right?

19 Mr. Maxwell. -- "a review, at least annually, of all  
20 CIA proprietaries."

21 Mr. Aaron. By whom?

22 Ms. Culbreath. By the oversight committee.

23 Senator Huddleston. By the oversight committee.

24 Mr. Maxwell. Well, you're defining what the review is  
25 in the next part. "consisting of an internal CIA audit and a

1 report to the oversight committee as well as such independent  
2 GAO audits as the committee shall direct. As part of its  
3 annual report to the oversight Committee" --- "As part of its  
4 report to the oversight Committee, the CIA shall report," and  
5 then the rest of the sentence, "all its intercessions on  
6 behalf of its proprietaries."

7 Mr. Aaron. May I just make a quick editorial fix? "The  
8 Committee recommends the oversight Committee conduct an annual  
9 review of all proprietaries consisting of an internal CIA  
10 audit and report to the oversight Committee."

11 Mr. Kirbow. No, the Committee cannot conduct a GAO  
12 audit. They can insist that that's part of the report that is  
13 presented to it.

14 Mr. Aaron. That's it, consisting of a report to the over-  
15 sight Committee of an internal CIA audit, is that right?

16 Mr. Kirbow. What you are trying to do is to require  
17 the CIA to reveiw it, to conduct a CIA audit, and to report  
18 fully all of the review entailed.

19 Mr. diGenova. Not just the audit themselves. There are  
20 certain operational details you are going to want to know about  
21 also, not just financial security.

22 Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, let us rewrite that one. We  
23 will include it.

24 Senator Huddleston. Well, you see, you could combine  
25 1 and 2 together, since we are just going to use one sentence,

1 the first sentence in No. 1, and after we say the external  
2 and internal controls, the oversight committee should require an  
3 annual report of all proprietaries by the CIA, including an  
4 internal CIA audit and all intercessions that the CIA may have  
5 made on behalf of proprietaries.

6 Mr. diGenova! That's it, that's all in one sentence. We  
7 can fix that.

8 Mr. Aaron. All right. We'll take Joe's fix.

9 Mr. Kirbow. In three I am not sure what you mean, "In the  
10 DCI's budget presentation." That almost has a word of art  
11 connotation in the Senate. A budget presentation is that  
12 thing which the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the  
13 CIA makes to the Appropriations Committee.

14 Mr. diGenova. We are talking about an authorization,  
15 aren't we, an annual authorization here?

16 Mr. Inderfurth. Look on page 26 and you'll see the  
17 definition of that under (b). The DCI shall have responsibility  
18 for preparing the budget of the national intelligence program  
19 for presentation to the President and the Congress. This  
20 is the budget presentation that's being referred to under  
21 this.

22 Mr. Kirbow. Well, now you come to the real question,  
23 proprietaries being listed in the DCI's budget presentation.  
24 Most of his proprietaries neither use any money up nor make  
25 any money or anything. They are just shelf items.

1 Here again you come to the notional.

2 Mr. diGenova. No, no, Charles, because the point they  
3 made during our review out there was that never have the  
4 proprietaries appeared in the budget presentation. They have  
5 been hidden, and the object is to identify them in the budget  
6 as a line item, for example.

7 Mr. Maxwell. One suggestion might be, be listed, that  
8 implies a list of proprietaries.

9 Senator Huddleston. Where does this list go?

10 Mr. Kirbow. What you want to do is to require them to  
11 include a discussion of the proprietaries in his annual report  
12 to the oversight committee is what you want to do, isn't  
13 it, because they don't have that now. They don't report to  
14 the Armed Services Committee. They only report to Appropriations

15 Senator Huddleston. How would it be listed in the budget  
16 under your proposition here, Joe?

17 Mr. diGenova. Well, I'm just assuming -- well, I am  
18 assuming in terms of oversight the Committee is going to want  
19 to know, even though this is not going to be published, where  
20 this money is going and what it is going to be used for,  
21 if they are going to authorize it.

22 Mr. Aaron. I think the term really should be --

23 Mr. Kirbow. I think it ought to be more than in the  
24 budget.

25 Mr. diGenova. I know that's not just what they are going

1 to be asking, but the thrust of this was to make sure that  
2 proprietaries found their way into the budget, and that Senators  
3 knew what they were authorizing when they authorized the budget.

4 Now, how it gets in there, I am not a budget expert.

5 Mr. Kirbow. That is what I am trying to supply here because  
6 in this process there is a procedure that when you say there shall  
7 be authorizing legislation, where the line items are discussed  
8 before the authorizing committee and not before the budget  
9 committee, which is the appropriations committee, and if you  
10 require that he discuss or report the annual operation of the  
11 proprietaries in his annual report to the oversight committee,  
12 you will accomplish what you are trying to do, and not exclude  
13 it only for the presentation before the Appropriations Committee.

14 Mr. Maxwell. Could I try a fix on this?

15 Mr. diGenova. You are invited.

16 Mr. Maxwell. The oversight committee should require that  
17 the DCI's budget presentation to the Appropriations Committee  
18 and the oversight committee include a specific discussion of  
19 the financial aspects of CIA proprietaries. I mean, we are  
20 trying to bring them out and see what the impact is on the  
21 budget, where do they fit in.

22 Senator Huddleston. Can they do that, though, without  
23 identifying the proprietary and where it is located and whatever.

24 Mr. diGenova. They have indicated they could.

25 Mr. Aaron. Jim, Taylor, when he was here talking to the

1 Committee, talked about how they are beginning to -- drawing a  
2 way to work in the proprietaries so that they can both identify  
3 them and indicate their cash flow implications for the budget,  
4 and in effect --

5 Senator Huddleston. What would you have proprietaries --

6 Mr. Aaron. Proprietaries, income and outgo.

7 Mr. Kirbow. But that would never be published, Senator.

8 If you want to accomplish what you are suggesting here,  
9 that they report the cash status or the financial status, you  
10 add that additional sentence to this combined 1 and 2 up here  
11 that the Senator just proposed a minute ago, and indicate that  
12 that report should also include the financial status or the --

13 Senator Huddleston. But you do that with the audit, don't  
14 you, the internal audit?

15 Mr. Kirbow. Well, in fact you do, in fact you do.

16 Mr. Aaron. Well, I think the point -- maybe I'm not  
17 captioning this properly, Joe, but I think the point here is  
18 that proprietaries either earn money or cost money, sometimes  
19 a little of both, and it has an impact, therefore, on the  
20 overall CIA budget, particularly in the past when income from  
21 the proprietaries could be placed in either the contingency  
22 reserve or used to finance, in effect, operational purposes  
23 of the proprietary. In other words, Air America was earning  
24 money on its operations, and yet it was costing them more  
25 because they were engaged in certain risky operations. In

1 In effect, the proprietary was earning money which was  
2 financing the proprietary organization.

3 Mr. Kirbow. But they can no longer do that. What they  
4 earn now must go into the general Treasury.

5 Mr. Aaron. No, gross earnings do not go into the general  
6 Treasury. Their net, and part of the cost of doing business  
7 would include the cost of some of their operational purposes.

8 I think the point of this inclusion here was to see if  
9 one could require in connection with the budget, not just in  
10 general, with an audit of what it does specifically, but in  
11 terms of the entire activity of the CIA, to get a spelling out  
12 of its sort of macrobudget implications in terms of up or down,  
13 and secondly, its budget implications for the certain categories  
14 of operations which were involved, such as, if you are talking  
15 about the conduct of the support for the activities in Laos.

16 Mr. diGenova. Paramilitary operations.

17 Mr. Kirbow. Well, leave it like it is if that is what you  
18 are trying to do, because they will be sure to report it to  
19 the Appropriations Committee in excruciating detail, but they  
20 won't report it to the authorization committee unless they  
21 require it to get money.

22 So if you want to leave it a detailed budget, their  
23 presentation to the budget committee, this language will get  
24 that done.

25 Senator Huddleston. Well, what if you said something like

1 this, furthermore, or adding to that, the fiscal impact or  
2 the budgetary impact of the proprietaries should be included  
3 or defined in the DCI's budget presentation.

4 Mr. Maxwell. Specifically discussed?

5 Mr. diGenova. That language would mean it's included in  
6 his presentation in some way because the allusion that David  
7 made to Jim Taylor is that they are beginning to put it into  
8 their budget presentation. I know that is a term of art.

9 Senator Huddleston. That eliminates any idea of listing  
10 them.

11 Mr. diGenova. Elliot's point also about the authorization  
12 committee should be added in there.

13 Senator Huddleston. We've got so much money invested,  
14 and 33 money made money and 40 made money for a net gain of  
15 so and so.

16 Mr. Maxwell. And you should have some notion of that  
17 and the problem was that you weren't able to get ahold of it.

18 Senator Huddleston. And we sold two or three of them for  
19 this amount.

20 Mr. diGenova. That is the whole issue of their visibility  
21 in the budget, the whole question.

22 Senator Huddleston. Well, where does that visibility  
23 disappear?

24 Mr. diGenova. Well, before they never showed up.

25 Mr. Maxwell. Before you had the covert action.



1           Senator Huddleston. Well, where will it disappear  
2 now? It won't come to the authorization committee and the  
3 appropriations committee. I mean, it won't be a line item.

4           Mr. Aaron. Proprietaries as a category?

5           Mr. Maxwell. I would assume it is going to be a subsection  
6 of operational support in covert action.

7           Mr. Aaron. Not necessarily. I think they are struggling  
8 with that at this point trying to define it properly and how  
9 it should be presented. I mean, I really don't think we know.  
10 They have an intention to do it because they recognize that  
11 potentially it is a source of real question as to how much  
12 money is being spent on clandestine activities that is self-  
13 generated by the Agency because of its proprietary  
14 activities.

15           Mr. diGenova. The impact, Senator, was also to show that  
16 the Committee had looked at this broadly, was aware of possible  
17 budget and authorization implications of various entities,  
18 including proprietaries, and that it wanted to say something  
19 about that. It was not necessarily anything dramatic.

20           Senator Huddleston. Well, I will agree with that. I am  
21 just worried about if you say you expose proprietaries too much,  
22 you are exposing cover.

23           Mr. Aaron. Well, this is internal. This is classified.

24           Mr. diGenova. This is not public.

25           Mr. Maxwell. Well, I think the language the Senator

1 suggested got to that.

2 Mr. Aaron. Well, let me see if I can read out what I would  
3 propose along the lines I think we discussed.

4 The oversight committee should require that the fiscal  
5 impact of proprietaries be made clear in the DCI's budget  
6 presentation to the oversight committee. If you want to add  
7 the appropriations committee, you can, but I think the point is  
8 that that happens.

9 Mr. Kirbow. If you'll listen just one minute, Mr. Miller  
10 knows and I believe the Senator knows that "in the Senate there  
11 is a formal budget presentation" made to the Appropriations  
12 Committees." They are not made elsewysere. Reports are made  
13 to oversight committees on the status and all of these other  
14 things, and if they request any money for those proprietaries,  
15 they would request that before the authorizing committee. If  
16 you are just trying to accomplish getting it made known to the  
17 oversight committee, drop the word "budget presentation" and  
18 adopt the common usage of the annual report of the Agency or  
19 of the DCI.

20 But that is kind of a word of art. Those are words of  
21 art in the Senate, and they will seize on it because today  
22 they don't do it for anybody else but the Appropriations  
23 Committee.

24 Senator Huddleston. I think that's reasonable enough.  
25 It ought to be clear.

1 Mr. Aaron. Let me try another fix here because I'm  
2 not too sure.

3 The oversight committee shall require the fiscal impact of  
4 proprietaries in the CIA's budget be made clear in the Director's  
5 authorization presentation, or what phrase is that? In the  
6 Director's what?

7 Mr. Kirbow. The DCI's annual report to the appropriate  
8 oversight committee.

9 Senator Huddleston. The DCI's annual report.

10 Mr. Kirbow. The Agency would not report separately. They  
11 should make their presentation a part of the DCI's report  
12 to the appropriate oversight committee.

13 Mr. Maxwell. While we are on that, could I, on No. 6, we  
14 have already, I thought, by statute prevented any covert action  
15 being funded other than by (a) appropriation to a covert action  
16 budget, or (b) the contingency reserve.

17 Mr. diGenova. That's right.

18 Mr. Maxwell. Does that make No. 6 redundant?

19 Mr. Kirbow. Yes.

20 Senator Huddleston. The only comment I would make is  
21 that the other is not an accomplished fact yet. This might  
22 be accepted and that might not.

23 Mr. Maxwell. Well, the reason I say that is that the  
24 way this reads, I would have or would be opposed to it because  
25 it provides an exception with the approval of the oversight

1 committees, when we want, I think, to be able to go to the  
2 Congress and say, we recommend most strenuously that only these  
3 two methods be used for funding, rather than providing a third  
4 method and someone says, well, maybe we should have a fourth  
5 method, and I would like to go with the strongest possible  
6 recommendation in regard to the earlier statutory requirement  
7 that it only be by specific appropriation to covert action and  
8 the contingency reserve fund.

9 Mr. Kirbow. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we will stand a  
10 chance of getting the other amended, to allow the oversight  
11 committee to allow it.

12 Mr. diGenova. Why don't we say this by statute, and then  
13 have the rest of the sentence an addendum which would just  
14 allude to the fact that funding is to be accomplished to the  
15 method we set out if you want to eliminate it.

16 Well, this was the problem that was raised, or an issue  
17 that was raised during the study, and this is set in here  
18 for that reason. It can easily be removed if it is inconsistent  
19 with another recommendation of the Committee.

20 Mr. Aaron. Well, we have two or three different earlier  
21 provisions that relate to this. The first is that re-  
22 programming authority, defining reprogramming authority, the  
23 possibility that something used for a program covert action X  
24 which involves a proprietary that generates a certain amount  
25 of money, can be used for program Y.

1           The second issue is we have proposed that covert actions  
2 be funded either by line item or by the contingency reserve.

3           The third thing we proposed is that the contingency reserve  
4 be replenished, if I am correct, only by appropriation, concur-  
5 rence of the oversight Committee.

6           Now, what this in effect does, I think the question that  
7 he's driving at is, what do you do with the profits of a  
8 proprietary organization? Can you put it in the contingency  
9 reserve?

10          If so, our other recommendation would pick up the notion  
11 that it can only be done with the concurrence of the Committee.

12          Is there some other purpose, direct transfer? Well,  
13 presumably one of the limitations on reprogramming -- and this  
14 would be a fair point to make here, as part of its definition  
15 of limitations on reprogramming, it is recommended that the  
16 oversight committee proscribe the allocation of profits from  
17 any proprietary to a covert operation without their express  
18 consent. And this is really kind of -- if it doesn't go through  
19 the contingency reserve, it really goes to the question of  
20 reprogramming.

21          Now, I realize that we have said that our other recommen-  
22 dation by implication would prohibit this, but it is only by  
23 implication, I would think.

24          Mr. Maxwell. My sense is that by providing this --

25          Mr. Aaron. You kind of create a channel.

1           Mr. Maxwell. It's not that you create a channel, but you  
2 aid the, increase the temptation for the proprietaries to try  
3 to generate funds, and secondly, I think it is the easiest way  
4 for the oversight committee to have a handle on covert action,  
5 and particularly its funding, is to say there are two ways you  
6 can do it. You can do it either by the regular appropriation  
7 process, or you can do it through the contingency reserve fund.  
8 But if you start to build in the ways that the contingency  
9 reserve fund can be replenished, I think people -- I think there  
10 may be a loss of control.

11           Mr. Aaron. Well, this is a way it can be replenished,  
12 and this is not prohibited by anything we have recommended  
13 yet.

14           Mr. Maxwell. I understand that, but I guess I was trying  
15 to clean up the organizational structure.

16           Mr. Kirbow. I think this is the problem with recommending  
17 the legislation piecemeal, is that the insurance company out  
18 there is a covert operation. It is a secret operation at the  
19 agency conducted in that manner, and if you allow only  
20 covert operation to be funded only from the contingency  
21 reserve, whatever monies they generate will have to go back into  
22 the general treasury because they cannot be used to either  
23 replenish the contingency reserve or to operate a covert or  
24 to perform a covert function or operation.

25           So they are not even -- they can't not only use the profits

1 to do that, they cannot use the general monies that they  
2 generate from that to conduct. They will have to fund that  
3 insurance program in the contingency reserve.

4 Mr. diGenova. No, not at all, because it is not a covert  
5 operation. That is not being use to fund a covert operation.  
6 It has been used to pay pensions and annuities to foreign  
7 agents. It's not a covert operation.

8 Senator Huddleston. Agents are covert. If you restrict  
9 it to use of funds, if it is not already done, no funds  
10 derived from the operations of proprietaries shall be used for  
11 any other purpose except the operation of the proprietary and  
12 any profits shall be returned to the general treasury.

13 It precludes it, doesn't it?

14 Mr. Aaron. That would solve the problem, yes.

15 Mr. Kirbow. And that's what they are doing today by  
16 regulation.

17 Senator Huddleston. Can we say that?

18 Mr. Aaron. I don't see why not.

19 Mr. diGenova. Well, we say that in our recommendation No. 4.

20 Mr. Aaron. Well, this says --

21 Mr. diGenova. That deals with terminations and liqui-  
22 dations.

23 Mr. Aaron. This is liquidations, and terminations. This  
24 is not just operations.

25 Mr. Maxwell. There is one problem, a slight problem. That

1 is that some of the profits are reinvested. It is not that they  
2 take everything over or break even.

3 Senator Huddleston. Well, I didn't say that. I said all  
4 funds not needed in the operation.

5 Mr. Bader. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you could amend No. 4  
6 to all returns of funds or profits not needed for the operation.

7 Mr. diGenova. There you go, whether from liquidations,  
8 terminations or profits exceed for the needs of the operation  
9 of the individual proprietaries should be remitted to the U.S.  
10 Treasury.

11 Senator Huddleston. You can work that out so that it would  
12 be understood that there is a need to keep a certain reserve  
13 back.

14 Mr. diGenova. We will unite 4 and 6.

15 Senator Huddleston. That's all but 5.

16 Mr. diGenova. 5 is only about the Department of Justice  
17 being notified as to the disposition.

18 Mr. Aaron. Now, we have two recommendations with respect  
19 to cover. The first is just to recommend that the Department of  
20 State stop publishing data which makes it possible to identify  
21 people under cover.

22 Mr. Kirbow. Well, just a minute. On No. 5 I do have  
23 a question here.

24 The Agency doesn't sign off on any other disposal of  
25 United States properties and military bases or major edifices or



1 anything like that.

2 Mr. diGenova. And the reason for that is every other  
3 government agency is subject to the rules and statutes of the  
4 Federal Disposal of Property Act, and the CIA isn't.

5 Mr. Kirbow. Do you see this could be an abuse area?

6 Mr. diGenova. I could see the Attorney General, if he  
7 knew that Admiral Raborn or some other Director is putting  
8 pressure on the CIA to dispose of a piece of property, would  
9 want to know about that, since they are not subject to the  
10 Federal Disposal of Property Act like every other government  
11 agency is.

12 I don't think -- I think the record clearly shows, and  
13 the General Counsel indicated that he was not opposed to having  
14 outside review of their disposals, provided it was classified  
15 or done in a classified way since they have never had any  
16 problem.

17 Mr. Kirbow. What you are doing here, approving the final  
18 disposition of disposal, if you are intending that he review  
19 the disposal process or participate in it, he wouldn't have known  
20 about Raborn. He wouldn't have known about Raborn at all  
21 because he didn't dispose of it to his client, and this would  
22 not pick up that kind of abuse that you have discussed here.

23 Mr. diGenova. Suppose it had been disposed of to Admiral  
24 Raborn, and they knew about it, and the AG said, why is this  
25 being done? It would raise a red flag which would not otherwise

1 be raised since the Federal Disposal of Property Act would not  
2 have applied which would have flagged that legally to any other  
3 agency.

4 Mr. Aaron. It would also strengthen the Agency's hand to  
5 resist those purposes, to just simply say, hey, this has to be  
6 signed out by the Attorney General. This isn't going to work.

7 It seems to me that what we do need here --

8 Mr. Kirbow. If what we are trying to do is get his  
9 participation, just having him approve it doesn't get his  
10 participation, I think we ought to put that in if that's what  
11 we want to do.

12 Mr. diGenova. I think the word "approve" is wrong. It  
13 should be "participate." The sale or disposition of any CIA  
14 proprietary --

15 Senator Huddleston. How are you going to make it "partici-  
16 pate?"

17 Mr. diGenova. I think the word we want is "consultation."

18 Senator Huddleston. I think what we are trying to do is  
19 replace what other agencies have to do in an overt way and  
20 under a specific law, which this agency is not under, so it will  
21 have some assurance that it is being done in a proper way.

22 Mr. Kirbow. I don't disagree with the AG being in on the  
23 act, but this one gets you participation on disposition.

24 Senator Huddleston. Well, figure a way to get it done.

25 Mr. Aaron. Well, what I wanted to say was I would like to

1 note that back on page 67 where we have struck out the reference  
2 to Mr. Raborn and intend to expand on the pressures having  
3 been brought to bear, part of that expansion should include  
4 a statement that there is no -- or that the Federal Disposal  
5 of Property Act does not apply to the CIA, which is a crucial  
6 aspect.

7 Mr. Kirbow. They are exempt, and then bring in the  
8 requirement for CIA, or for the AG participation.

9 Mr. Aaron. And that includes that.

10 Mr. diGenova. So we will rewrite 5 to make it consultation.

11 Ms. Culbreath. David, on cover, may I just say, didn't  
12 we decide to delete the opening paragraph?

13 Mr. Aaron. You're right, you're right.

14 Ms. Culbreath. We were just going to list the recommen-  
15 dations.

16 Mr. diGenova. Yeah, we already said that.

17 Mr. Aaron. NOW, we have a recommendation that the  
18 CIA should make an effort to place a greater proportion of its  
19 officers abroad under nonofficial cover, and that recommendation  
20 is in brackets. Recommendation (a), that the CIA make a  
21 greater effort to place a greater proportion of its officers  
22 abroad, "under nonofficial cover" is in brackets.

23 Senator Huddleston. That relates to the Welch discussion.

24 Mr. Aaron. It relates to the Welch discussion and it  
25 relates to the difficulties and problems of official cover.

1 Mr. Bader. How do you feel about this, Joe?

2 Mr. diGenova. This is a problem because just like the man  
3 says, cover is a relative thing. I don't think there is  
4 anything wrong with saying that the CIA, that they should make  
5 an effort to put -- really not much of a recommendation -- should  
6 make an effort to place a greater proportion of its officers  
7 abroad under nonofficial cover, and the Agency does not see  
8 that in this form, wouldn't view that as a bad thing. They think  
9 cover is, if it is deep and effective, is okay. They just say  
10 well, their answer this way, well, you know, you don't do  
11 much work under deep, nonofficial cover, and one of the prices  
12 you pay is you don't have a lot of operational freedom. You  
13 have to work hard at your regular job and you don't do a whole  
14 heck of a lot.

15 The recommendation, the way it is phrased, is sort of a  
16 push to them to see if they can find better ways. It also  
17 probably tells them that maybe they should use proprietaries  
18 abroad a little more, which are very, very efficient, according  
19 to Eric, according to both things, operations and cover.

20 Mr. Aaron. I think we have got to be careful on this  
21 point. I mean, we ought to wait until the staff director  
22 returns because I think he has a particular interest in this  
23 suggestion, but we are talking about moving more people into  
24 unofficial cover. I would like to express my own personal  
25 reservations about that in terms of its relationship to a

1 number of things that the Committee has already decided to do.

2 Senator Huddleston. We are eliminating a lot of cover.

3 Mr. Aaron. That's the first thing.

4 Now, the second thing -- and these are nonofficial cover  
5 categories. The second thing that we are doing is trying to  
6 place somewhat greater authority in the hands of the ambassador  
7 and the missions overseas to know what is going on. That is  
8 something that they can do when it is in their house. It is  
9 something that's extremely difficult for them to do when it is  
10 off in the forest someplace.

11 So it is -- and as Joe just said, it looks like a recommen-  
12 dation to use more proprietaries, in part because it is in the  
13 same section, but in reality because that is one of the ways  
14 they might do it, and I just wonder how much we have thought  
15 through for ourselves where the balance of our recommendations  
16 lie, particularly since most of the stuff is derived basically  
17 from operational experience anyway.

18 There was a period, toward the end of Mr. Bissell's  
19 career in the Agency, or maybe shortly thereafter, when they  
20 began to try to put more people in unofficial cover, and it  
21 wasn't a very good experience for them.

22 Mr. Kirbow. David, how does the ambassador lose control,  
23 whether it is official or unofficial, except that he has got  
24 them in his compound? It is an official government function  
25 over which he has absolute control.

1 Senator Huddleston. But if they keep coming to the  
2 embassy to check with him, they blow their cover, unless they do  
3 it by telephone.

4 Mr. Kirbow. Well, I don't think they should go to the  
5 embassy at all. I think their contact should become covert.

6 Mr. diGenova. Well, we're sort of caught between a rock  
7 and a hard place because we know the official cover is we cover  
8 it best .

9 Senator Huddleston. Well, maybe we could approach in  
10 that one way is to improve official covert

11 Mr. Aaron. That is the one recommendation we make here,  
12 but the limits on that are very -- they are just structural,  
13 like.

14 Senator Huddleston. It seems to me like we are in an  
15 area that we know a lot less about than the people who are  
16 in the business.

17 Mr. Aaron. That is sort of my feeling.

18 Mr. Kirbow. We are asking them to proscribe against  
19 anything that they can convince an oversight committee in the  
20 future is essential in the trend of that time.

21 Senator Huddleston. Shouldn't we say that the time has  
22 come for a whole review of cover to see whether or not they  
23 can find some better ways?

24 Mr. Maxwell. We might say that the first large scale  
25 study in '48 and '49 of the Agency, done by Mr. Dulles, among

1 others, recommended very strongly that there be more unofficial  
2 cover.

3 I think the Agency has been under considerable pressure  
4 throughout its existence to do that, and as Joe pointed out  
5 there are certain limits to what it has been able to do.

6 Senator Huddleston. Well, I think rather than suggest  
7 what ought to be more or less official or unofficial cover, the  
8 whole matter ought to be studied immediately by the Agency, and  
9 see if they can find some new ways consistent with all the  
10 restraints and prohibitions that the Committee has placed upon  
11 them.

12 (General laughter.)

13 Senator Huddleston. All right, where does that leave us  
14 here today as we close out today's session?

15 Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that in keeping  
16 with an earlier discussion today, that because it is a summary  
17 of findings as well as an introduction, that perhaps while  
18 we are nice and fresh, tomorrow we might take up the intro-  
19 ductory section prepared by the Staff Director, so that if we  
20 change it much, we either make the rest of our --

21 Senator Huddleston. Have any of the other members seen it  
22 at all, Bill?

23 Mr. Miller. Just Senator Mathias.

24 Senator Huddleston. All right, do you want to meet at  
25 10:00 o'clock in the morning?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mr. Aaron. Are we going to terminate now?

Senator Huddleston. They've got a vote going and it's 5:10.

I think we'd better.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 o'clock p.m., the Subcommittee recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

---