



American Cause

a bipartisan, tax-exempt, political education organization

The Honorable George Murphy, Director

Special Report
June 1976

On the Separation of Church and State

Some preliminary observations on the lamentable consequences of
the Senior Senator from Idaho for the national intelligence services.

by James Angleton and Charles J. V. Murphy

Mr. Angleton spent 31 years with the Office of Strategic Services [OSS] and the Central Intelligence Agency, and through the last 20 years was Chief of Counterintelligence for the CIA. Mr. Murphy is a retired writer, Time-Life and Fortune magazine.

When the first revelations in Washington of the alleged misdeeds of the Central Intelligence Agency became a sensation in the European press 17 months ago, a veteran diplomat in Bonn expressed his consternation that the government of a great country should let itself be driven to disgorge vital state secrets affecting the security of the nation and its allies. "You don't have a country over there," he scolded *The New York Times'* correspondent, "you have a huge church."

That subtle witticism went right over *The New York Times'* good, gray, humorless head. The friendly diplomat had shrewdly perceived at the source of the orgy of self-criticism convulsing Congress and the press alike something more primitive than witch-burning or the whiplash of Puritan conscience. What he had discerned was not so much the return of a rebuking godly institution to American politics as the emergence of a fresh evangelical phenomenon in the affairs of State--a church spelled with a capital "C." Frank Church, to be precise, the senior Senator from Idaho. Events have borne out the diplomat's appraisal. In May, Senator Church emerged as a bustling candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination. In June, he was maneuvering on Jimmy Carter's coattails for the Vice-Presidential spot.

Church is a blown-in-the-bottle, copper-riveted, 24-carat example of the rough diamond from the frontier polished into a political celebrity within Washington's liberal left-wing Establishment. At 51, to be sure, he still slides easily when out on the hustings into the arm-waving, tub-thumping and rolling rhetoric that earned him in *Time* the accolade of "the boy orator of the Snake River Valley." But he is also master, as *The Washington Post's* senior political analyst David S. Broder recently noted, of the "cavalry charge" of self-criticism. He has been active on television and over cigars and brandy in Averell

Harriman's drawing rooms. And, in common with most ambitious politicians, he has kept both ears glued to the ground. Broder makes this additional observation: "He is a man who says, with a straight face, that only someone with 20 years' experience as a Washington insider has the know-how to take on the dreadful bureaucracy."

It takes more than a straight face for a man of Church's associations to carry off such a posture. It takes a strong stomach, too. Church has been a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for 19 years. During his service there he made his mark as an Establishment man. When the Johnson administration presented the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964, he voted for it. He was ranged alongside the rest as the calls came for ever bigger appropriations to carry on the Vietnam war. The sea change in his opinion about the American role in the outer world came only after the public had become disillusioned with the feckless strategy devised by President Johnson and Defense Secretary McNamara to satisfy the liberal establishment of which he is part. By Nixon's day, Church's interventionism had turned isolationist. Under the new colors he enlisted with the turncoats and co-authored the divisive legislation trimming the President's war powers and bringing disgrace and shame to the American exit from Southeast Asia. He was all for suspending foreign aid as early as 1971. While our troops were fighting in the field, he took his family on a junket to the Soviet Union, the chief arms supplier to our enemies. His virtuosity on the negative side of foreign policy makes him the logical successor to the aging Sparkman as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee--or, as Church would render it, the Little or No Foreign Relations Committee.

The Statesman as Muckraker

Church's swift rise inside the Liberal, left-wing Establishment has been sped by far more dramatic actions than these, however. In April, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, of which he was Chairman and in full control, issued a two-volume, 815-

Government. That was 15 months ago. During that interval scarcely a day passed that a bewildered nation did not see Senator Church's name on the front pages of the newspapers or his round, bejeweled presence crowding the television screen.

All that while he kept a sideshow going in an adjoining tent that was almost as destructive as the other. Four years ago, he took over the Chairmanship of a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee that was set up to investigate the operations of American-owned multinational corporations. His progressive disclosures of certain regrettable practices adopted by famous corporations to sweeten their sales pitches in foreign lands have been hardly less destructive of our nation's reputation abroad than the shocks produced by his exposes of the CIA and the FBI. Eminent personages in Japan, the Netherlands, Italy, and Saudi Arabia have been embarrassed, possibly ruined, by the details which he and his staff leaked to the press. Governments of friendly nations have been dismayed and shaken by the evidence of scandal in their own ranks, sprung upon them without warning and certainly without the benefit of judicial process.

There is an old-fashioned word for these lurid enterprises. The word is muckraking. *The Economist* of London, a journal which follows American affairs with a perceptive eye, described Church in January as "the scourge of immorality in undercover intelligence operations, and the inquisitor of corrupt practices by American corporations abroad"--prosecutor-cum-judge-cum-jury on the dirty tricks of his countrymen in other lands.

Let us give the muckraker his due. The CIA and the FBI in their arcane and overlapping responsibilities did engage in some illegal and ill-advised operations, although these were by no means altogether reprehensible when weighed in light of the national security considerations prevailing at the time. The CIA did briefly consort with political assassins who appear to have been recruited from "the gang that couldn't shoot straight," and it did allow itself to be briefly drawn into unworthy technologies associated, among other things, with explosive cigars. And in the realm of international commerce, where saints would starve, such respectable corporations as Lockheed and Northrop did pay out large sums to foreign agents and middlemen in ways which abroad, in most cases, were within the prevailing custom and usage for paying commissions, finder's fees, or whatever. It has all been laid out for the rest of the world to see--the crumpled skeletons rooted out of the closets of six administrations.

Now is the time to measure the benefits, if any, from the muckraking--and to take the measure of the muckraker as well. The *auto-da-fe* proceedings against the plane makers and the arms dealers remain alive, and while they last it is quite impossible to tell how many jobs of American workers they will eventually lose, how much foreign exchange will be sacrificed, and how much of the market for the world's best goods of their kind will be closed off. But the Select Committee on Intelligence has finally been disbanded, without tears, and its huge staff returned to the rear corridors of the Federal ant heap. Now the Senate in its collective wisdom must decide for itself how far it is prepared to go in fitting to the intelligence services, and most importantly to a now shaky and harassed CIA, the straitjacket Senator Church and the Committee's staff have been tailoring for it.

It's a good time, too, for the rest of us to start making up our

experience and deciding what is to be salvaged from the whole untidy

A Fantasy to Match the Idaho Mountains

For these weighty deliberations, Senator Church's report isn't much of a help. He personally pays lip service to the maxim that reliable and timely intelligence is desirable in the interest of national security. He praises himself and the committee staff for the discretion he would have us believe they exercised where national secrets were concerned. The truth is, of course, that it was an open secret in Washington that just about every intelligence secret revealed in camera before the committee found its way to the press. The Committee's report had exhausted its surprises long before it ever went to the printer.

The document is disappointing in other and more serious respects. Senator John G. Tower of Texas, the Vice Chairman, refused to put his name to the report, and he was joined in his abstention by Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona. Senator Tower reproved the Chairman and the majority members for ignoring the main task laid upon them by the Congress: that was to weigh the nation's needs in intelligence, measure the performance of the various intelligence agencies in meeting those needs, and suggest how best the intelligence work could henceforth go forward without upsetting "the delicate balance between individual liberties and national security."

Instead, the document is overwhelmingly a political tract for those Senators who wish to reduce the American position in the world: a scornful sermon on the inequities that, by their lights, are inherent in the intelligence process, especially in the field of covert political action. The report, by and large, denigrates the virtue of vigilance and prudence. It takes a harpy's delight in dogging the occasional misdeeds and misdemeanors, the improprieties, the blunders. There is contemptuous reference to the CIA's implied proclivity for the "dark arts of secret intervention--bribery, blackmail, abduction, assassination"--put at "the service of reactionary and repressive regimes," a bias which the chairman and his staff has caused U.S. foreign policy to become generally identified with "the claims of the old order, instead of the aspirations of the new."

Beyond all that, Senator Church argues airily that the CIA's covert activities, as well as those of the FBI in espionage matters, are largely stimulated by an exaggerated and now outmoded fear of Soviet intentions which he fails to define. American interests abroad, he would have us believe, would be far better served if the CIA were to become less edgy about Soviet actions and indeed if it ignored altogether the less blatant Soviet-fostered interventions in distant parts of the world. "We have gained little, and lost a great deal from our past policy of compulsive intervention," he argues, and from this conclusion he has compounded a peculiar prescription for taking the United States out of the Cold War, which was not of our making, and out of the world itself.

He urges us all to take "a longer view of history"--hardly an original piece of advice. He becomes more specific, though, when he bids the Executive Branch to rid itself of "a fantasy"--a figment of presumably overheated imaginations--that has "enriched" our national life. This precise term for this deranged condition is "the illusion of American omni-

potence," a polysyllabic echo of former Senator J. William Fulbright's acid phrase, "the arrogance of power," which mocked earlier American efforts from Truman through Lyndon Johnson to stay communist aggression and subversion.

Yet, on the recent evidence, it is Senator Church and his zealous supporters who have become enthralled with fantasy--the fantasy that the Russians have called off the Cold War. His long service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should have armored him against such a fancy. It is even more bewildering that he should still hold that notion after devoting so much time inquiring into the work of an agency whose principal business it is to contend with Soviet subversion and strategic deception.

The CIA files on the counterintelligence side of the House have been consistently clear on the point that the Kissinger diplomacy has not deflected the Kremlin from its basic objectives: Detente is a sham, a tactic; it is Soviet communism's Potemkin Village for waging Cold War.

It could be that Senator Church is only a cynic, as Mr. Broder suggests. That is no uncommon trait in a politician. Or it may be that he has decided to present himself as detente's man for all seasons. Be that as it may, the intellectual boundaries that separate him from the real world in which the CIA until recently operated so spiritedly and the one that fills his private vision are as stark as the mountains that wall off his native heath in Idaho. One has only to examine the Committee's findings on the CIA's intermittent intrusions in Chile, between 1963 and 1973, to appreciate how successful the man from Idaho has been in raising a fantasy to match his mountains.

The High Stakes in Chile

That the United States Government, starting with President Kennedy, channeled support, some of it through the CIA, to pro-American conservative and moderate political groupings in Chile is not in dispute, although one might question the wisdom of making the issue a shuttlecock in our domestic politics. The efforts of the late Salvadore Allende-Gossens to capture Chile for a communist minority in 1964 were foiled in some part by the CIA. Allende was already looking to Fidel Castro and, through him, to Moscow for the funds and managerial skills he had to have for making full-scale revolution. The American motive was to prevent Castro from spreading his influence into the Andes. The CIA's intervention in the Chilean political process consisted of little more than of providing funds for political rallies and editorial debate aimed at inducing the Christian Democrats and the moderate parties, who commanded a massive majority, to put aside their differences in the common interest of keeping Allende and his Marxist coalition from slipping into the Presidency through the gap between them.

That glancing intervention succeeded on an investment of but a few million dollars and the talents of a handful of specialists. Six years later, the contest was re-enacted, with the noncommunists again split and Allende and the radicals still controlling only 36 percent of the popular votes. This time he won because Kissinger was too much engrossed in wangling a visa to Peking, coming to terms with Hanoi, and cultivating detente with Moscow to heed the intelligence of the CIA. When the Soviet Army not risen against Allende in September 1973, he would to-

side the Soviet bloc.

The mischief in Church's handling of the CIA role in Chile issues from the crude attempt of his staff to saddle the CIA with the blame for Allende's fall. A separate report issued by the staff, which was drafted outside the Committee's cognizance but issued with the Chairman's sanction, charged the agency with having "worked through the covert process to subvert democratic processes" and having thereby brought "an end to constitutional government" in that storm-tossed country.

Such a finding is, to say the least, the shameless distortion of the facts that Senator Goldwater in his dissent said it was. To arrive at it, Senator Church's scholars had to gloze Allende's avowed schemes, in open association with platoons of Soviet and Cuban advisors, for silencing all political opposition, nationalizing industry, collectivizing the land, and firing up a revolution that would support Castro's campaign to destroy American influence, root and branch, below the Rio Grande.

"Cuba in the Caribbean," Allende proclaimed in 1970, "and a Socialist Chile...will make revolution in Latin America." Castro toured Chile before the 1970 election to rally the discontented to Allende's banner. Allende himself made no less than nine trips to Havana between 1956 and 1970. In 1968, he saw to it, as President of the Chilean Senate, that Cuban survivors from Che Guevara's foundered guerrilla war in Bolivia were given safe passage home; and, later, as President he permitted Castro to use Cuba's diplomatic offices in Chile to run his espionage and political agents in Bolivia, the Argentine, Brazil and Uruguay. There was no doubt about Allende's ambition: it was to set the Andes aflame.

Chile escaped sinking into a communist dictatorship by the skin of its teeth. The U.S. had little influence in the outcome. As for the liberal, left-wing panjandrums in the Congress and the press, it is depressingly plain that they still would have us believe that the overthrow of Allende was a crime against the constitutional order. They seem to have learned nothing from the test: Castro and the Soviet revolution-makers did. Allende's initial success in 1970, for which they orchestrated the strategy, encouraged them in the belief that Chile would provide communists in other societies with a model of how an electoral minority could achieve mastery inside parliamentary societies through skillful manipulation of the democratic process--a strategy presently being pursued with delicacy in Italy, France and Portugal. Allende's failure drove home the lesson that where the margins are thin the power cannot be held unless the armed forces have been brought under communist control.

When, therefore, Moscow's man in Portugal, Alvaro Cunhal, made his move in Portugal in 1974, just about a year later, he did so from what appeared to be a solid base of support within the armed forces themselves. Fortunately for Europe, the base was not as solid as at first it seemed. Once it started to crumble, as it finally did last winter, Cunhal prudently yielded the field with scarcely a shot. Then in Angola, a textbook application of Cuban military force behind a locally contrived "Popular Front" finally produced a decisive result--another fallen domino.

We would do well to ponder two inescapable questions: What weight would American counsel carry throughout Latin America, now that Castro has conquered an immensely promising strategic Africa, if Allende, his grateful ally, stood astride the Andes today?

What if anything can we expect from a Senate Foreign Relations Committee dominated by a man as befuddled as Frank Church is by the fantasies of detente, when Castro returns his attentions to Latin America, as in due course he will and must, to knock down for good the Chilean domino Allende all but toppled?

The Missed Opportunity

The missed meaning of the struggle for Chile is central to an understanding of the Church Committee's failure in what could and should have been a landmark inquiry into the methods and worth of intelligence. Quite above and beyond the question of whether the CIA was a "rogue elephant" running amok inside a constitutional society--the Committee to its credit ruled otherwise--there was the larger continuing question of whether it is up to the job. To understand what the job is, one has to take stock of the threat that the communist bloc presents to national security. On this crucial subject the report is all but silent.

Nowhere in its wordy, censorious document is there to be found a reasonable appraisal of the threat which the CIA was created to meet and fend off; nor of the changing disguises which that threat wears; nor of the changing targets at which it is aimed. There is no helpful information for American citizens about the character and resources of the KGB and the 27 other clandestine intelligence and espionage organizations which the Soviet bloc has mounted against the West. One looks in vain for a judicious assessment of the competence of the CIA to cope with these adversary services. And as for judging the performance of our own agency in appraising the Soviet Union's true capabilities and exposing its intentions, the pages are disgracefully blank.

American intelligence, along with its brilliant successes in the reconnaissance technologies, has suffered at least three serious failures over the last eight years. It was surprised by the Soviet bloc invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. It failed to call the Tet offensive in Vietnam earlier that same year. And it missed the Arab strike prepared for Yom Kippur. What is even more embarrassing, the communist war memoirs that have lately appeared in Hanoi convey a sinister hint that the highest American and South Vietnamese war councils were thoroughly penetrated by the enemy.

Finally, on the analytical side, the CIA has lately concluded that it has been underestimating the annual Soviet investment in weapons, forces, and military research and development by as much as 100 percent.

These are matters that Senator Church might profitably have addressed. Last fall, the House of Representatives own parallel Select Committee on Intelligence under Representative Otis Pike of New York made a promising start toward identifying the reasons for these failures. Unfortunately, that high purpose was quickly knocked aside by a left-wing majority bent on surpassing the rival committee in the volume of its leakage. Its final and still classified report, passed to a radical newspaper in New York, was consigned to the dust bin by an embarrassed House.

Unfortunately, the mischief has by no means ended. In May, the Senate responded to the Church Committee's report by creating a permanent 15-member select committee to oversee the

operations not only of the CIA but also those of all the other intelligence agencies--the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency as well. The Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees in both Houses will, as in the past, retain a jurisdiction in intelligence operations. The range of oversight had earlier been greatly widened by the Hughes-Ryan Amendment of October 1974 requiring that six committees in Congress--with half the Senate and 20 Representatives on their rosters--be apprised in advance of any covert action by the CIA under consideration by the President.

In emptying the CIA's "bag of dirty tricks," in Church's melodramatic phrase, the Congress had thus ended up by unclenching and all but disarming that agency at the same time. The vulnerability of the new committee to the vagaries of political self-interest can be ascertained from a cursory examination of the stands taken in the Senate on defense and foreign policy issues by the majority of its members. A sobering benchmark is the National Security Voting Index published in April by the American Security Council. This index rates the members of both Houses of Congress, on a scale ranging from zero to 100, by their votes on ten critical national security defense issues which a poll taken by the Opinion Research Corporation has established are favored by most Americans. On that index and in terms of the relative weights of their support of legislation most Americans consider critical to the nation's security, the eight most liberal members of the new intelligence oversight committee rank as follows:

Hart, Colorado	0%
Bayh, Indiana	17%
Stevenson, Illinois	0%
Biden, Delaware	0%
Case, New Jersey	11%
Hatfield, Oregon	0%
Huddleston, Kentucky	25%
Inouye, Hawaii	43%

It comes as a shock to realize that the paramount authority over the CIA and the associated military intelligence agencies will henceforth be exercised for the Senate by a body the majority of whose members are convinced, with Church, that the Soviet threat has waned. They will be supported, as he was, by a staff drawn from specialists of congenial outlook. Senator Mansfield has assured us that the traditional rules of self-discipline binding these bodies to reticence can be depended upon to protect the nation's intelligence secrets from disclosure. Alas, the feeble gestures the House of Representatives has so far made toward uncovering the source of the leak of the Pike Committee report to Daniel Schorr of the Columbia Broadcasting System hardly makes for confidence on that score.

Intelligence is the nation's first line of defense. In weighing the numerous other proposals put before it by the Member from Idaho, for further crippling and truncating the intelligence function, the Senate would be well advised in the Bicentennial year to give heed to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers: to keep Church (Frank) and State (affairs of) separate, at least where these life-and-death matters are concerned.

STAT

- I would like information on American Cause.
- I am interested in joining American Cause in the designated category.

<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000 Founder	<input type="checkbox"/> \$50 Sustaining
<input type="checkbox"/> 500 Patron	<input type="checkbox"/> 25 Sponsoring
<input type="checkbox"/> 100 Life	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 General

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Contributions are tax deductible