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Within the United States today, a problem exists. This problem can be stated as whether or not there should be a secret agency in a free and democratic society and does the presence of such an agency conflict with the morals and ethics of this society? Unfortunately there is too much information to present in a paper of this magnitude, and much of that information is negative. However, the areas covered and the issues presented here, both negative and positive, will hopefully give the reader a clearer view of the CIA. Under the term agency, there are many different sizes and types of organizations. There are private ones as well as public. However, there is one public agency
which wants to keep a very private profile. This organization is the Central Intelligence Agency. Most of their business is highly secretive and thus they do not care for much public attention. Although most people think of the CIA as a very compact agency, consisting only of undercover agents, or "spies," it is really very diverse. There are many different branches with a multitude of subdivisions under each main branch. The CIA, also known as the "company," has only a part of it devoted solely to espionage. Instead there are many phases and processes that information goes through. To start, the agency or agent must have some sort of plan or directive. They cannot just go out and find information. There should be a need for something and then a plan should be set up. Then of course there is the part of collection where the agent goes after his target and completes the mission. After this is accomplished, he then can analyze the data collected, or have others do it. This information is also sifted through to find out what is true or not, or thought to be true or not. Then finally they must decide
what to do with their information. According to Jeffrey Richelson there are four basic uses for CIA intelligence information. (Richelson, p.4) The first one is policy making. The leaders of our country can use this knowledge to aid in making the right and proper decision. For example if the president was considering whether to have a peace talk with a foreign country and was almost ready to say no, but the CIA informed him that the foreign government was going to start a war if he said no to the talks, then he would have a lot more to consider. Another use is planning. When the government finds things out about other countries they can decide on many courses of action. For example, if they find out that a country is saying one thing while doing another, the government may cut off sanctions or change a policy or directive. This brings up the usefulness in a conflict situation. Information is highly important when it comes to negotiations and knowing just how far the opposition can be pushed. The fourth benefit of using intelligence is warning. The government can be warned of
impending danger and thus try to find a way to stall or avoid the problem. The use of this agency and its importance is immeasurable. However, secrecy is the key to this operation.

A common question which arises is whether or not it is possible to have proper oversight and control over an agency whose primary directive is secrecy. Thus, the presence of the CIA in the United States has raised much controversy since it was started in 1947. Both sides, either pro or con, have been argued effectively as to the importance of the CIA in foreign intelligence and protection of American citizens through its clandestine activities. Some wonder whether Harry S. Truman helped or hindered our society when he created this hard-to-control secret organization. Obviously there are many positive things the CIA can help us with but it is important to look and see if they are contrary to what the United States standards will allow.

According to the "Declaration of Independence," there are certain things every man deserves--life, liberty, and the pursuit
of happiness. These beliefs are still held today. For those reasons our government was established and it is there to protect these rights. The government is in power to help us lead safe and protected lives and to stop people from harming either themselves, others, or society in general. While the government is doing this it must also be aware of threats to our peace from abroad. Therefore, as part of the defense system, the government relies on the CIA to protect our security. They do this through espionage, counter-espionage and of course analysis of information.

It is essential to the defense of the US to have information regarding the future plans of foreign countries. Even George Washington ordered that his men should "leave no stone unturned" in collecting intelligence against the British. (Lefever, p.1) Today the government attempts to do the same. Some intelligence collection is not secretive; for example, the US is technically aware of other countries' satellite programs only because it is too hard for them to conceal. Also, intelligence is gained from
defectors, as well as from just analyzing others past actions to predict future ones. But these attempts only go so far and therefore the CIA comes in. This is all very necessary and, as John Jay said in the *Federalist Papers*, security must be considered in respect the "preservation of peace and tranquility, as well as against dangers from foreign arms and influence."

(Rossiter, p.42) As much as it was true when Jay wrote this, it is still true today. Protection is one of the top priorities of the American government. Agreeing with Jay, James Madison listed "Security against foreign danger" at the head of the list.

(Rossiter, p.256)

When leaders of this country talk face-to-face with those of other countries, it is unlikely that they are told the whole story of what is really going on within each of their countries. Thus it becomes necessary to find out what goes on behind the scenes. The only way for this to be accomplished is to place undercover agents in necessary places. Madison also spoke about "safety and happiness of society are the objects at which all
political institutions aim and to which all such institutions must be sacrificed." (Rossiter, p.279)

Originally the safety and happiness of the society was the goal of the CIA, but is that true today? If the CIA interferes with these objectives, then from Madison's point-of-view, the CIA must be sacrificed. So what needs to be investigated are the pros and cons of the "company," in other words, whether the CIA is a help or hindrance to the people of this country and the ethics they hold. Of course there may be differing attitudes towards the agency itself but the importance is in the overview, regardless of any bad publicity.

CIA BACKGROUND

The CIA was not always like it is today. It has developed and changed in many ways since the beginning. To start with, the CIA evolved over a period that lasted almost ten years. It all began with the inspiration of one man, William ("Wild Bill") Donovan. Donovan was called this because of two things. First,
he ran a very loose administration while he gathered people for recruitment. Second, he was very brave and daring—he loved to be as close as possible to enemy lines and those caught behind them. Donovan took his idea of a special agency to President Roosevelt in 1941 and Roosevelt passed a military order that established Donovan as 'Coordinator of Strategic Information' (Cline p.55) Donovan was to answer and operate only under the direction and supervision of the President. On July 11, 1941 the Office of Coordination of Information was established. This was still a basic operation with limited capabilities. One year later this office became known as the Office of Strategic Services. This organization was the basis for the CIA but was disbanded after the war was over because the president felt it was unnecessary.

When President Truman took office, he decided there was a need for the CIA, rekindled Donovan's idea and started the Central Intelligence Group in 1946. This group consisted of the Secretary of State, Navy, and War and a personal representative
(Admiral William D. Leahy) of the president, plus other selected individuals. However, Cline points out that there was an on-going argument between confederation and centralization of the intelligence activity. (Cline, p.119)

The subject of unification of the armed forces was a major issue. What happened was that some felt that all branches should act as one and that each branch should share all of its information with each other, not to mention equipment and the like. Meanwhile, others felt that each branch should be individualized and have a loyalty to its own branch while minding its own business and doing its own thing. Therefore the CIA was created by the National Security Act of July 1947. This act put the Director of the CIA in charge. He was to have access to all information "relating to national security, Including military intelligence and signals intelligence." (Cline, p.119) Obviously a compromise was made. Each branch would not know all about each other but there would be someone that did so that there would be no misunderstandings. Thus the CIA was no longer going to be
brushed aside; it had now become a central coordinator and central evaluator of all intelligence.

CIA TODAY

There have been many directors since the beginning of the CIA. The following is a list of the directors, eleven in all.

Directors

1947-50  Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter
1950-53  Gen. Walter Bedell Smith
1953-61  Allen W. Dulles
1961-65  John A. McCone
1966-73  Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr.
1973    James R. Schlesinger
1973-76  William E. Colby
1976-77  George Bush
1977-81  Adm. Stansfield Turner
1981-87  William J. Casey
1987-    William Webster

The DCI is appointed by the President of the United States. He is a powerful man because of the position he is in. Obviously he has control over the CIA. However, he also oversees all foreign intelligence, the foreign intelligence divisions in: the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the armed services, Department of State, Treasury, Commerce and Energy, and even the branch within the FBI. (Pamphlet, p.2) This is an
extreme amount of work and therefore he has many people working below him.

The director does however perform many duties such as preparing a budget for the intelligence community, coordinating information collection efforts, protecting methods and sources of intelligence and also he has to conduct long-range planning. The DCI is responsible only to the National Security Council and the President. He is different from other government employees as he has the ability to fire people without going through normal civil service procedures. This is to ensure every possible means for complete security within the company.

There are four main branches or directorates within the CIA. The first is the Directorate of Operations. This is the clandestine arm which is involved in espionage and other types of field work. While this branch is obviously the one that is the most known by citizens, there are others which are very useful to the United States.

The second is the Directorate of Science and Technology.
This section does all of the designing and developing of as small as computer chips to as large as a stealth bomber. It operates all of the technical operations systems. It also does all the research engineering of these secret projects.

The third is called the Intelligence Directorate, which is the analytical arm. It collects the reports and findings of other directorates and analyzes them. It then is required to give reports of its discoveries and make sure they are as accurate as possible. In other words it is this branch's job to decide which information is just garbage or misinformation and what information is not.

The fourth is the Directorate of Administration, providing support for the other three. It is also the one that is the most public. It has services in personnel, financial management, and communications. This branch also deals with the training of new employees, security and the payroll. (Pamphlet,p.2) Basically, this branch is the most similar to any other agency's managements.
There are numerous sub-directorates. For example, under the Science and Technology directorate is the Office of Research and Development, Office of Development and Engineering, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Office of Signal Intelligence Operations, Office of Technical Service and the National Photographic Interpretation Center. Each branch has a similar amount of sub-directorates except for Operations. They work following a case-by-case method and do not need different sub-directorates.

The Intelligence Branch, for example, has the most sub-directorates. These are the Office of Soviet Analysis, Near Eastern and South African Analysis, East Asian Analysis, African and Latin American Analysis, Office of Scientific and Weapons Research, Global Issues, Imagery Analysis, Current Production and Analytic Support, Information Resources and the Office of Leadership Analysis.

Because of the vast area needed to be covered, many sub-directorates are required for this branch. Most of the people
employed in this branch work in Washington D.C. but some also
travel abroad. This sub-directorate in particular encourages its
employees to continue their education. It is necessary for these
men and women to have excellent writing skills because they are
continuously writing reports that are needed in a hurry or they
will come out after the fact.

The last Directorate is Administration, which closely
resembles the management section of a regular agency. Its sub-
directorates are the Office of Medical Services, Security,
Training and Education, Finance, Logistics, Information
Technology, Personnel and the Office of Communications. This is
the only sub-directorate that has some jobs that do not require a
college degree. This is the sub-directorate that deals with the
problems the other branches may encounter (Table 1).

There are many ways Congress interacts with the CIA and its
multitude of branches. As stated before, the Director of
Intelligence does the majority of direct interaction with
Congress. He presents video tapes, short daily reports and other
TABLE 1 (CIA APPLICATION BROCHURE)
extensive research papers to either President Bush, Vice President Quayle, cabinet members or the National Security Council. He must also give briefings to the policy makers in certain departments. (Such as the Departments of Defense or State) The main oversight however, comes directly from the NSC.

CIA'S PAST PROBLEMS

Oversight was not always as rigid as it is today and certain incidents have happened that cast a negative light upon the CIA. Many CIA operations that people have questioned were authorized by presidents. They include CIA involvement in overthrowing governments in Iran (1953) and in Guatemala (1954), a failed attempt to over-throw Indonesia (1958) and the successful installation of regimes in Egypt (1954) and Laos (1959). Probably the one everyone knows about however was in Cuba (1961), the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs disaster. (Oseth, p.26)

It was while Allen Dulles was director that these incidents occurred. Dulles was a strong believer in fighting back at the Soviet Union's advances into third world countries. As far as
these countries are concerned Oseth states that the CIA involvement was just a plan to stop the real Soviet challenges Dulles saw in each country. Dulles felt that the CIA needed to act quickly enough to stop even possible advances by the Soviets. Dulles said, "Whenever we are given the opportunity to help, we should assist in building up the ability of threatened countries and do it long before the Communist penetration drives a country to the point of no return." (Oseth, p.30) Thus every action Dulles made, he felt was totally justified. However, an oversight board, was drastically needed.

Take, for example, the situation in Laos. There was no strong oversight occurring but even though things got out of control the government knew part of what was occurring. The U.S. was so determined not to allow Laos to become a Communist country that a 'secret army' was sent in. This army was completely paid, controlled and directed by the CIA (Frazier, 1978). The CIA brought in people from all over South East Asia and decided exactly when, where, and how the; would fight; they also had them
carry out espionage missions, assassinations and sabotage.

Meanwhile, Laos was being torn apart due to all of the fighting and destruction. There may have been some form of corruption in obtaining the money from the U.S.. After all, we supposedly spent millions and set up a secret army, yet a few Communist forces could be enough to threaten the defense of the entire country. The CIA had extremely close ties to the Committee for Defense of National Interests and also backed Nosavan as a strong political leader but not with nearly as much fervor as the Pentagon officials. Because of this as well as other disagreements, the CIA often went behind the government's back, so to speak.

(Stevenson, 1973)

The Bay of Pigs was the first great public disaster of the CIA and was the one that started public skepticism towards the agency. Before the 1960's, the CIA was thought of more positively by the people. The people thought that the CIA was untouchable. Every time the CIA was criticized, attacked from strict right-wing supporters or even if they were charged with
incompetence, it was glossed over and the agency escaped lightly. (Jeffreys-Jones, p.118) However the tide began to turn and the relationship between them and the White House suffered.

On the home front the CIA was chosen to be the scapegoat. Kennedy finalized the plan for the CIA to go to Cuba and to set up a guerilla task force to support those in the counterrevolution but that any American involvement was to be "plausibly deniable" (Jeffreys-Jones p.121) Because of errors made in planning, the invasion was put down and the whole world found out the CIA was involved.

Many mistakes were made, such as important documents sent to the president by the CIA did not get through. Everyone blamed everyone else and the only person who seemed to know what truly was happening was Castro himself. This horrible disaster for which the CIA took the blame, started allegations that circled the globe. Whenever foreign politicians found themselves in trouble (not just those on the left) they used the CIA as a scapegoat once again. (Jeffreys-Jones p.124) Even after this
incident however, Kennedy still had a solid faith in the
principle of covert operations and he believed it was the CIA's
duty to carry them out. (Jeffreys-Jones p.128)

It seems obvious that the CIA was not to blame here. The
CIA operates on a need-to-know basis where the agent or whomever
knows only what the person directly over them feels is necessary
for them to know. Thus everyone was operating on orders that
came from the government. They should not be accountable for the
orders from the government. Kennedy was probably behind the
Cuban incident because an almost identical situation that
happened in Chile when "covert US financing of opposition
political factions in Chile had its origins in the Kennedy
administration. (Oseth, p.27) An ambassador to Chile from 1964
to 1967 testified that the incident "transpired under imprecise
congressional mandates, haphazard oversight, and moneys provided
by Congress." (Johnson, p.146)

Another example of presidential control was when, according
to Quirk (1986), Nixon was president he was the one that
instigated the overthrow of Marxist President Salvador Allende in Chile. Evidently DCI Richard Helms was surprised at the order. However in 1973 Allende was overthrown by the Chilean military, not the CIA. Even the Church Committee found the CIA not responsible for the coup. (Oseth, p.26) However, people throughout the world and even some in America still believe that the CIA was responsible. The CIA keeps getting the blame for government backed operations that go awry. It is the same as a carpenter yelling that it is the hammer's fault for missing the nail. Oseth states how there is not any difference between CIA operations or negotiations or stationing troops. It is all "official" US government activities with the exception that US "sponsorship" is disguised and hidden in the CIA. They only "express and reflect the goals America adopt..."(Oseth, p.26) In a sense the CIA is just a very intelligent gopher. So as far as the total operations themselves, the CIA can be ruled out as the one that always instigates such activities.

PRESENT CONTROVERSY
However, this does not mean they are innocent. Focus should be placed as well on the methods the CIA uses to carry out their operations. According to Oseth's view of the public's critique of the CIA, there are two major critical themes. First, some people agree that the CIA should not be able to conduct intelligence activities in the United States. (Oseth, p.51)

Some citizens make allegations against such things as wiretapping, breaking into places, mail intercepts and the CIA using their influence by doing things such as training police officers in clandestine techniques and involving the "company" through subsidies and such in the academic areas. (Oseth, p.52) I believe that these citizens are right in feeling uncomfortable with the idea of the CIA infiltrating America that way.

Rockefeller had an investigation conducted and he too felt the same way. His report said that he acknowledged the necessity for the CIA and he generally spoke well of the CIA but he also said that he had misgivings of abuses such as opening up the U.S. mail, the infiltration of other agencies, alleged Mafia
connections and the CIA's support role in the attempt to
assassinate Castro. (Lefever, p.105) After all, these secret
agents are people as well and they should have no right to break
the laws any more than a normal citizen should. These people are
not above the law. If an inch is given then where should the
line be drawn? Previously the courts were having trouble finding
"the distinction between criminal investigations and counter-
intelligence operations." (Oseth, p.53) There should not have to
be a distinction between right and wrong depending just on who
the person is.

The second theme of criticism in some peoples' eyes are the
types of activities "allegedly conducted, contemplated, or simply
existing within the realm of operational capability, abroad."
(Oseth, p.51) In other words many do not feel comfortable
knowing that the CIA has easy access to the opportunity to
assassinate some foreign citizen. Or even such things as the CIA
so well infiltrated within the enemy's government, that they
could influence political events. People do not feel safe with
an organization having that much power. This killing goes against the American ethic.

There were some measures taken to stop the use of electronic surveillance by anyone. This act (the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968) stopped the use of electronic surveillance except when obtained by a judicial warrant. This did not work well however, because there was a clause that allowed the surveillance if the President thought the matter was a threat to national security. (Oseth, p.55) This was just like before. Because of plausible deniability, no one really knows whether the president actually gave permission or not. None of this was very moral or ethical.

The problems some people have with the foreign intelligence are elevated when we are not in times of war. After all, during wartime the president does things he would not do in peace time (sanctions, threats, etc.). It is doubtful that, even today, President Bush would be upset if the CIA could have said or done something to prevent the war with Iraq. Whenever the CIA can
really be useful, it seems that no one complains. When there is no conflict people feel that they have no need for the CIA, but when war breaks out they become thankful that they have foreign intelligence. All great powers and even many small powers have foreign intelligence services and we should not be excluded. (Lefever, p.5) It is hard to tell when we are not at some form of war. With everything that goes on in the middle east, we cannot put the CIA on hold. It is far too dangerous. For example, right now things look very promising in our relationship with the Soviet Union. But there should be serious doubt that the Soviets would put their KGB on hold. A country should not just walk along blindly as it could fall into a trap. The main thing is just to make sure that the CIA follows what American oversight sets for it.

MEDIA EXAGGERATIONS

Many problems noted earlier were exaggerations in the public's eye. Most Americans feel that the CIA has been weakened over the past two decades and it has been basically because of
the "sensational criticism in the press." (Lefever, p.10)

Former Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird stated that "the CIA has been the target of prolonged, sometimes blunderbuss congressional investigations that uncovered few illegalities or abuses but provided forums for lurid and widely false allegations."

(Lefever, p.10)

People who do not like the CIA say that it is because the CIA tries to change peoples' opinions by giving only certain information or by doing certain things. Then, the press deserves the same criticism. Much of the press prints or tells all the dirt and even remotely negative stories on the CIA. How can the American public get an honest view of the CIA with such one-sided journalism? Television in the past has been the biggest problem. "According to polls, the majority of young persons and adults, including the college educated, rely more on T.V. that on any other source for their knowledge of current affairs, and trust it more." (Lefever, p.96) Lefever helps explain the Fairness Doctrine. Basically what this doctrine states is that every
television station has an obligation to air both sides. This is a democracy and both sides of an issue are to be presented so that the American citizens can compare the two and form a fair opinion depending on their feelings and beliefs not the stations. This doctrine has been upheld in the Supreme Court and thus has the force of the law behind it. (Lefever, p.97) However, a study was done between 1974 and 1978 which clearly shows a one-sided story. These years were chosen because there was enough data to create a correct study. The results are astonishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORK</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED NETWORKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart deals with 1,079 news items that are about U.S. foreign intelligence activities. The stories on the chart total 2,126 minutes of evening news broadcast time. Each story from January 1974 through October 1978 was given a neutral, favorable or unfavorable rating. The percentage reflects the amount of time that each story is given. (Lefever, p.110) Obviously the negative stories far outweigh the positive ones. Regardless of what the stories were about, the public was given a view that for the most part puts the CIA in a bad light. It is also obvious that there are not two equal sides presented and the audience is not being given a fair perspective of the events.

Often the news stations do not hear a lot of good things about the CIA. The only operations that the press are going to hear a leak about are the bad ones. If everything goes according to plans in a CIA operations then no one is likely to hear about it because it is secret. When a story is uncovered, it is because someone did something against normal procedures. Yes,
these stories should be covered, the citizens have a right to know. However, the contributions the CIA makes should also be mentioned. Lefever feels that one of the main problems is that the news stations never told the 'why' or the 'reason' behind their actions. For example, during the two months covering the CIA activity in Chile, the CIA was blamed for trying to overthrow the government, but not once was it mentioned that President Allende had brought his party to power with only 36.5% of the vote and that he was "pursuing Marxist domestic and foreign policies with the close collaboration and support of Moscow and Havana." (Lefever, p.115) The viewers did not receive the motive or a description of the ruler. All they were told was that the CIA interfered where it did not belong, not mentioning that Congress supported the action. According to the study; "almost 69% of the stories reported that the CIA engaged in immoral, illegal, or questionable activities or was not sufficiently accountable, while only slightly over 11% reported that the CIA performed essential intelligence functions or was accountable."
(Lefever, p.115)

In other words, the evening news shows in no way came close to showing what a free and democratic society deserves to see. According to Richard M. Bissell Jr., who was Deputy Director of Plans under Allen Dulles and father of the U-2 spy plane, when asked if he thought the CIA had a bad name in the American public's view, he answered yes. "That's because we never had good public relations...The early CIA people felt it wasn't necessary because everything could be kept secure and secret. In a democracy that's tough to do." (Quirk, 179)

The CIA's operations should not all be thought of negatively. When there is a war, men kill each other in the name of their country. Espionage can be thought of as an extension of war. Agents follow orders because it is necessary to defend our country. Both actions are for the same purpose, and thus should be judged similarly.

CHURCH COMMISSION

There have been some questions about the CIA in the past.
The Church Commission was set up to investigate and report on the CIA. However, most of the alleged abuses of the CIA proved groundless. (Quirk, p.196) Americans have problems with the CIA operating within the U.S. and the Commission agrees that when the CIA agents start to control the institutions and individuals it becomes difficult to tell the difference between the U.S. democratic system and the communist system. (Church, p.179) They studied the CIA's covert funding of the National Student Association (NSA) and in the investigation studied not just what the CIA's operations did to the institution but especially focused on what it did to each of the individuals and how it covertly used them. They asked the question, "Are the independence and integrity of American institutions in any way endangered by clandestine relationships with the Central Intelligence Agency?" (Church, p.180) To answer their questions they studied three different areas.

First, they studied the covert use of "academic and voluntary organizations." (Church, p.118) They found out that
part of the time the CIA was involved but had little to no control of the institution. They just funded them so that they could do things they needed to do. However, sometimes they used their influence, but usually it was not a bad relationship at all. For example, when our companies were competing with communist companies, the CIA provided money and information to help our companies get ahead. Such companies were either based over seas or internationally, yet some were student, labor, cultural, or philanthropic organizations. (Church, p.182)

Regarding some universities, usually the CIA's personnel keeps a relationship with someone, usually in the administration or placement office (usually by contract) which allows the CIA to approach students who are suitable for employment in the CIA.

The Church Commission then studied whether the CIA used the media. The two main purposes of the CIA usage according to Church were for information and for cover. These people provide access to all forms of media throughout the world for the CIA. (Church, p.192) One of the negative things about this is that
the CIA can plant a story in a foreign newspaper or such and if it makes the impression it is supposed to make, usually the United States will pick up the story as well and Americans will get 'fallout' propaganda. Because propaganda is used by almost everyone, as long as Americans do not let it cloud their judgment, it is not harmful. They need to make sure that they attempt to find out both sides to an issue before passing judgement.

Lastly, they investigated the use of American religious groups. This topic is most important because religious groups are separated by law from other types of organizations. The Church Commission states quite frankly that, "making operational use of U.S. religious groups for national purposes both violates their nature and undermines their bonds with kindred groups around the world." (Church, p.201) Luckily on February 11, 1976 the CIA announced that they did not have any kind of contract with an American clergyman or missionary. "This practice will be continued as a matter of policy." (Church, p.202) The Church
Committee accepted the CIA's statement and suggested passing a law prohibiting all use in the future.

The best way to judge the CIA is to look at some of the situations they have gotten themselves into. The only problem with studying the actions of the CIA is that because the secrecy covert action requires is so great, it is hard to tell whether the CIA's actions are being done to reach an established foreign policy goal. This is dangerous because problems could be exaggerated and worse things happen than need to happen. It is a very complicated and ethical question to ask yourself whether someone deserves to die.

In 1983 in Morocco a man died. 'Dlimi' was a member of a group that was against the king. He also was the king's right hand man. The CIA as it turned out suspected him and was investigating him of treason. Eventually they videotaped a covert meeting of him. That month he was taken to the palace and killed. His body was then put in a car and it exploded. No one was allowed to see the body. (Blum, p.315) This allegedly was
done to protect the king, but people could not see why it was necessary for the CIA to be involved. The reasoning was that Morocco was a key country in our diplomatic relations with the middle east. If the king were overthrown, then our contact would be broken. These actions taken by the CIA were not found out (supposedly) until later. The question is whether the man had to die or was there some other alternative? Most would probably say there should have been an alternative. However, if he had not been killed, the king might have been overthrown at the cost of many lives. There are many 'ifs' in the CIA's game and some may say they made the wrong choice after the incident is over, but if a bloodbath had occurred and it became public knowledge that the CIA knew that 'Dlimi' was involved, they might be asking why they did not kill him in the first place.

Another example is the CIA involvement on the ground in Laos. There are arguments for both sides as to whether this involvement was good or bad, but whichever it was, it did change history. The CIA created, trained and directed an army of its
own. They used this army to carry out espionage acts, assassinations, sabotage, etc... (Frazier, p.91) They had some 20,000 troops fighting in Laos and without these troops the country may have been taken over by communist forces.

SET STANDARDS

A review should be done to see if the CIA meets the ethic standards of the United States. The first standard Lefever stated to be looked at is the objective of the action and is it just? Just, meaning used to protect one's country or ally and unjust is when action is taken only to conquer and control someone: as defined by the U.N. Charter. As long as the CIA does not get power hungry, this one should be kept in check.

The second standard is to make sure the manner they choose to reach their objective is both just and fitting for the situation. The amount of force used should equal the situation, try to measure and do only what is necessary. Purposely destroying life or even property for no reason is wrong. For example, because of the American ethic, the forces stationed in
Vietnam went to "great lengths, great expense, and substantial risk to spare civilians and help resettle refugees." (Lefever, p.16) The troops had a goal and killing these people was not necessary in achieving this goal.

The final standard should be to see if the outcome would enhance the chance for it to be just? What ever happens as a direct result from the actions is most important. In other words, did the end make a more peaceful, safe and just situation. The CIA attempts to follow these standards but sometimes it may go beyond them thus it must be watched to make sure it does not hurt the American public.

The only problem with oversight is too much of it. Congress should of course try to keep the CIA responsible but they should be careful as to not cripple its effectiveness. There needs to be basic control and knowledge but not every detail should be known. This would make it too easy for leaks and it would significantly lower the capability of the CIA. (Lefever, p.18) Accordingly, some feel that Congress now has too much power and
control over the CIA and has made it impossible to have covert 
action at all. One positive note is that since the changes have 
come about, there have been no major unauthorized disclosures 
about covert operations since the permanent intelligence 
committees were established. (Lefever, p.27)

PROS FOR CIA

There are many things to speculate on and many previous 
charges. There are, however going to be many ifs. The positive 
side of the CIA and its goals should be looked at as well. The 
reason the CIA was created was so that the U.S. strategic board 
would have complete and accurate enemy intelligence reports upon 
which military decisions could be based. (Troy, 1981) Many times 
one promising part of the knowledge collected by the CIA is that 
it becomes a "force multiplier"(Oseth, p.15) In other words 
because our government would know in advance about who their 
adversary is, it can use a small number of people to defeat a 
large number.

Also, terrorist activities could kill millions of people but
intelligence could help a counter-terrorist movement stop it.

Another advantage is to have an agent placed where they could influence the affairs of another nation by secret and "unattributable means" (Oseth, p.13) Counterintelligence is also important because its activities protect our government against foreign espionage or such dangers as assassinations, sabotage or terrorism. Oseth states that, "all agree, however, that CIA as an activity involves a distinctive set of operations which protect the American intelligence apparatus and the national policy making process from penetration by foreign espionage, human and technical." (Oseth p.21) Even Senator Church who began his inquiry with skeptical views of the CIA and the whole intelligence community stated that there was "legitimate work to be done by the intelligence-security agencies, even in the area of covert operations" (Oseth, p.59)

As far as the use of covert action, there is no way to separate it from clandestine collection, and these two are directly related to the analysis of such information. Bissell
(Quirk, 1986) stated that most people feel that it is 95% covert action and 5% analysis. He argues that in reality it is the opposite. In other words 5% is necessary to finish the analysis that has been started. Agreeing with this is Paul Blackstock, he states that the country we live in often uses covert action and "clandestine techniques because this may be the only way to fill important gaps in the information needed to defend itself" (Barnds, 1969) Every country does these things. Even though it may be technically illegal, every one accepts it as a means to an end. Blackstock feels that it is a necessary function that defends our national interest.

Even so, there used to be many problems with the CIA and congress before the oversight reforms. Congress created the NSC with authority over the CIA but the CIA in turn had control over all of the foreign intelligence. With the CIA as large as it is, it was hard for the NSC to control everything. It was also difficult to have the accountability needed for an organization of its size. However, former director of the CIA stated that the
agency was always prepared to deal with congress in the manner that congress preferred. (Breckenridge, 1986) Many times the congress would leak intelligence sources to the press and then the CIA would clam up. It seemed that if Congress was given oversight privileges then they should have been responsible enough to handle sensitive information properly.

In order to help the NSC, the house and senate armed service committees were also put in charge of over-viewing the CIA. However they were so busy concentrating on the intelligence coming in not only from the CIA, but also from other military services that they were in control over, that they spent too much time studying it and not enough time on how it was gathered. Thus how could they judge the morality or ethical standards of the CIA if they were not even paying attention. Thus more committees were created to help.

This caused yet another problem; the more committees created, the more people that knew about classified information and the greater the chance for a leak. Therefore in 1980 the
Intelligence Oversight Act was passed and it limited the number of committees to basically the Senate and House Permanent Select Committees on Intelligence. Lefever states that "Congress has reorganized itself and is now in a position to monitor, evaluate, and alter the behavior of the intelligence agency." (Lefever, p.xii) Under President Reagan he 'revamped' the Intelligence Oversight Board so that it would "enhance the security of the United States by assuring the legality of activities of the intelligence community" (Oseth, p.155).

**MONETARY ASPECTS**

As far as monetary aspects of the CIA, different people are responsible for the budget. First of all the Armed Services and Appropriations Committee is involved in the financial programming and budgeting of the CIA. Each directorate is taken into consideration as well as the agency as a whole when the total budget is being created in the overall Executive budget. This is done in co-ordination with the OMB. Since there are many things the OMB might not understand, the CIA makes sure that the people
in the oversight committees know what the issues are about. That way in "areas of agreement, the uncontested items can be approved without delay, [and] where there are disagreements, the issues can often be worked out" (Blum, p.75). The CIA is also allowed to have a certain amount of money set aside (held by the Treasury) just in case of future contingencies. Congress can not make them go through the same auditing process that other governmental agencies go through by the General Accounting Office because of the high classification of information.

A problem that arises with many people and agencies is that they want a list of the CIA's expenditures and budget. However because of all the secrecy surrounding the CIA, these items are not going to become public knowledge and people will have to trust the government that everything is spent towards things that the 'American ethic' would approve of and if we can not trust the government there is no point to our system.

There was a method that the CIA sometimes used for the distribution of some of its funds. Supposedly with the Oversight
Act this is not done anymore though. The CIA had money pass through many hands before reaching its intended source. Blum told how the CIA gave money to a foundation or a fund and they in turn gave some to a newspaper guild, education association or the like in whatever state or country they wanted it in. Then in turn, they gave to groups or organizations who then would pay off the person or persons who did the clandestine work to begin with. (Blum, p.410) This could probably still be done but it is done primarily to protect the source.

Because of these methods it becomes increasingly apparent that very few individuals know exactly where the money really goes. Congress gives a certain amount of money to the CIA but one starts to wonder if it can really be traced as to where it ends up. Hopefully the men and women within the CIA have integrity and enough honesty so that it will remain an upright organization. After so many scandals, hopefully they will not have any in the future. The CIA is necessary and if it sinks back to the level it was in before the reforms, it might be
stopped like what happened to the O.S.S.

**CHANGING CIA**

Although the tension between the United States and the Soviet Union has eased tremendously--this was not always the case. Many people thought that agents used to buy and sell each other for secrets. According to Breckinridge however, it was not at all uncommon for a citizen of a third world country to agree to help the U.S. against the Soviets. (Breckinridge, p.297) This was actually so common that the CIA would make sure that it was alright with the person's government before proceeding--assuming that the government was an ally, of course. One must realize that it would be foolish for the CIA to recruit someone who does not have high standards and strict loyalties to their country, otherwise they might turn against the agency. Therefore, because of the extremely strict recruitment procedures it should be apparent that these people are not going deliberately to do anything to hurt the organization or this country. Agents are not even allowed to be friends with someone from another country
unless it is permitted by the CIA.

Members do only what the CIA permits them to do and the CIA does only what is necessary. When the United States went to war with Iraq, the military did whatever was necessary to protect America and democracy in general. This too is the goal of the CIA. If the killing and destruction of a war is acceptable to protect ourselves, then espionage and covert actions should merely be trifles in defending our well-being. There are certain laws involving espionage, and the CIA agents follow them the same as ordinary citizens follow ordinary laws. The CIA's actions might seem drastic but war is a very drastic time. Many citizens feel they have the right to know, but it is not wise and it could be hazardous for them to know. Agreeing with this, Senator Leverett Saltonstall said, It is not a question of reluctance on the part of the CIA officials to speak to us. Instead, it is a question of our reluctance, if you will, to seek information and knowledge on subjects which I personally, as a member of Congress and as a citizen, would rather not have, unless I believed it to
be my responsibility to have it because it might involve the lives of American citizens." (Breckinridge, p.293) In other words he does not want to endanger his life, other lives, or the project's life unnecessarily. Congress has the oversight to know what is going on, and if they believe that the CIA is following policy and not endangering anyone then nothing needs to be talked about. The CIA has become a major arm of our foreign policy in some parts of the world. Congressmen agreed that they should not supervise the CIA in the way they do other agencies, due to the need for security (Oseth, p.58) In the past it seemed that there were no definite answers as far as the CIA was concerned. There used to be a fog as to exactly where assassination orders or other negative orders originated. Plausible deniability came into play often and no one could be pinpointed for the blame. But things have changed now. The Senate and House have control over the CIA. The Committees have control over all aspects of the intelligence process and they pass on every report that comes through. (Lefever, p.41)
CIA'S FUTURE

As far as the future goes, the U.S. will probably always need some sort of intelligence operation. It may not be targeted towards Russia or Iraq but somewhere else. Many ideas were tossed around as to reorganizing again but were found faulty. According to Breckinridge, although the CIA has its problems, the way the system is now organized it has the necessary structures and procedures to continually improve and any major reorganization would be extremely disruptive. Instead of change, each branch should concentrate on strengthening its own weaknesses. The CIA may still have problems but every agency does and Congress has approved this system for now.

The CIA should just be left alone now or another incident like what happened in Greece might occur. Because of the Church commission's prolonged inquiry and exposure of the CIA, a station chief in Athens, Richard S. Welc'n was gunned down two days before Christmas. Charles Bartlett wrote that "spies traditionally function in a grey world of immunity from such crudities. But
the Committee's prolonged focus on CIA activities in Greece left agents there exposed to random vengeance."(Johnson, p.161)

Agreeing with him Director Colby also stated that the death was due chiefly to the "sensational and hysterical way the CIA investigations had been handled and trumpeted around the world"(Johnson, p.162) After all his cover was blown and he was in the country as basically an open target. This was an unnecessary death and hopefully nothing like that will happen again.

These things do not happen often but when they do the public hears about it. But it is just totally unnecessary for the public to know everything--it is just an impossibility. If the public knows, everyone knows including those that are not supposed to know. Blackstock agrees and states that our government can "classify, protect and withhold information affecting national security (mainly defense and foreign affairs) from the opposition without at the same time withholding it from the general public as well. (Barnds, p.73)
So basically the only decision to make is that, the CIA belongs in a free, democratic society. Obviously this paper has only shown a few selected views but because of the secrecy surrounding the CIA, it is difficult to present all of the positive aspects. Many have written horrible criticisms about the CIA but this paper attempted to show that the CIA is necessary. Of course not everything negative is discussed, but then it is impossible to discuss every positive aspect either. The reader will have to come to a conclusion for himself. However, from everything observed there was cause in the past for people to question whether or not the CIA went against the American ethic. However, because of the changes in the past few years and the oversight now implemented there is now a safeguard to protect the morals and standards of today's society. If it were possible for the CIA to let Americans in on their secrets they would, but of course that is ridiculous. Clandestine work is a secret and there are millions of things that they have done to benefit the country. They would probably like to expose some
of this material to save face and gain the public's respect again but they cannot. Thus it is up to the people to accept that they have an organization working for them that they can not know about, it is for their own protection and for the good of the United States of America.
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