

(Continued from page 962)

The Air Force is trying to persuade cattlemen that the racetrack will not chase cattle from their grazing lands. It is telling nervous mining companies that they will still have access to the rich mineral deposits of Nevada's Great Basin. Hunters, Indians, and environmentalists are being assured that wildlife refuges, parks, archeological sites, and scenic areas will be left relatively undisturbed. All of these promises incur costs which must be added to the tab of the weapons race.

Douglas Bell, a planner on the Clark County, Nevada, MX oversight committee, gave some of the reasons for the locals' concern and recited an impressive list of demands being presented to the federal government. Because Nevada and Utah are so sparsely populated (with half a person per square mile), the MX project will hit the area like an alien invasion. The current estimate is that the local population will be increased by more than 100,000 because of the project. This influx will add stresses to a system bracing for the strains of a planned synthetic fuel from shale project and a large electric power plant construction program in Utah. Bell said that bringing even 450 workers into one of the upstate communities to prepare a worksite could mean a doubling of the local population. The Air Force intends to begin construction in 1982. How will the Nevada coun-

ties be able to install water mains, sewer systems, schools, and houses in time?

The Air Force hopes to limit the impact of the project by confining it within sealed construction camps and bases, at a distance of 30 or 40 miles from existing towns. Mobile casinos and brothels would find their way to the workers, and the latter would be discouraged from going to town. Bell said that many Nevadans like this concept, but he doubts that it will work. He thinks that, contrary to the Pentagon's predictions, many workers will bring families with them. They will not choose to live in camps but will settle in town or between town and the construction sites. Bell envisioned a flood tide of 20,000 mobile homes rolling into the state. He expects to see boomtown crime, inflation, clutter, and waste.

Because local planners think the Air Force is somewhat indifferent to the problems it is creating, they have drawn up a list of requests designed to bring negotiations down to earth. Bell recited some of them. The Air Force wants "fast-track" legislation permitting it to win quick approval from zoning and environmental protection authorities. The four-county MX oversight committee wants fast-track federal aid in return, and it wants all negotiations channeled through a single federal agency. It would like the military to build only low-income housing on its bases. Officers, the com-

mittee says, should be asked to find houses in town. A certain share (maybe 10 percent) of all jobs related to the project should go to Nevadans. Water and sewer projects should be built as often as possible so that they will serve civilian as well as military purposes. The Air Force should abide by state water rights laws and not use federal power to override them. It should develop a long-term water supply system for Nevada by tapping the deep carbonate aquifers and should keep its hands off the more accessible subsurface water. Congress should reimburse cattlemen for economic losses caused by the MX project. Nevada should receive an increased federal fuel allocation for the duration of the project. There are a dozen more demands.

The fundamental problem is that the proportions of the arms race have grown so that almost any significant new land-based missile system will be hugely costly. The MX racetrack system will take 10 years to build, yet is expected to enjoy a useful lifetime of only 10 to 15 years. Its impact on the people and state of Nevada will be so profound that the state may never be the same again. Nevada's political leaders are demanding a high price from Washington in compensation. It remains to be seen whether the Air Force can meet their demands without placing an intolerable new burden on the MX's political vulnerability.

—ELIOT MARSHALL

Congress Moves to Relax Curbs on CIA

Proposed bills may allow academics to be used as agents

Congress, acting in concert with the Carter Administration and in reaction to recent foreign policy problems, is backing away from the intelligence community reforms it proposed after the revelation of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Federal Bureau of Investigation skullduggery in the mid-1970's. Sensing a shift in the mood of the public at large, the Congress no longer supports restrictions on the use of covert intelligence actions to influence world events, or the normalization of contacts between spies and university professors, or the disclosure of historical and nonessential information about what the CIA has been up to.

The Senate Select Committee on In-

telligence introduced legislation on 8 February that abandons these reforms and also permits the burglary and wiretapping of U.S. citizens both at home and abroad under certain circumstances without a court order. Earlier prohibitions on the use of university professors as covert spies—which some leading spokesmen for the academic community decried as too weak—have now disappeared. Nothing in the proposal prevents the CIA from paying a professor to gather intelligence or to conduct secret intelligence operations without the knowledge of the school at which he or she is employed. Similarly, nothing in the bill prevents the CIA from conducting extensive background investiga-

tions of foreign students on American campuses without their knowledge, so long as they are being considered as potential agency recruits. Referring to the pleas of Harvard University president Derek Bok for guidelines along these lines, Senator Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.), a principal sponsor of the bill, said, "We just threw the ball back in Mr. Bok's court." Huddleston said that academic institutions were welcome to create their own prohibitions if they wished, but that it would not be done at the federal level.

The House intelligence committee is at present considering a much narrower bill than the Senate's, but one that is similar in one respect: It exempts the CIA

from most of the Freedom of Information Act, by permitting it to exclude the majority of its files from the data search mandated by a freedom of information (FOI) request. The only exception is information about the requester, which will still be supplied.

John Rosenberg, a historian in Washington and adviser to the Organization of American Historians, calls this exemption "an absolute disaster and a fraud. No one has yet demonstrated that the FOI has caused the problems the agency says it has. It's kind of like coming home and kicking the dog because you had a bad day at the office." Congress, he says, has little awareness of the importance of the FOI act to historians researching CIA-related topics. Noted works that depended on information gathered under FOI include Allen Weinstein's investigation of Alger Hiss,

The CIA is interested in math, optics, climate, chemistry, medicine, and virus research.

William Shawcross's book on Cambodia, and Peter Wyden's book on the Bay of Pigs.

The House bill also features a unique proposal, one that is strongly backed by the CIA but which the Justice Department has suggested is unconstitutional. The bill prohibits the disclosure of the names of CIA operatives or sources (including, presumably, professors), on penalty of criminal trial. Unlike the Senate's proposal, the ban is not restricted only to current and former federal employees with access to classified information; journalists and agency critics alike would be covered if they "intend to impede the foreign intelligence actions of the United States." Press disclosures about agency personnel involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion would presumably have fallen under this provision.

Each bill is being considered against the backdrop of American foreign policy reversals in Iran and Afghanistan, although the relevance of the reforms to these events is at best uncertain. Congress became galvanized when President Carter interrupted his January State of the Union Address to say, "We need to

remove unwarranted restraints on America's ability to collect intelligence." Although Carter used the words "collect intelligence," his reference was to a 1974 law that restrained the use of covert intelligence action. The law did this by requiring that the CIA inform eight congressional committees, a large enough group so that the agency has worried constantly about security leaks. David Aaron, Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs, told *Science* that removing the notification requirement is a long-standing concern of the President, "but when you find the Soviets stirring up trouble in Iran, doing more than that overtly in Afghanistan, taking aim at Pakistan, working with the East Germans and the Cubans in North Yemen, which is ultimately aimed at the Saudis, you have to have some action to deal with that." The Senate bill requires that only two committees be apprised of covert actions, although the White House believes even this is too much.

Concern about ties between the academic and intelligence communities was aroused by the publication in 1976 of the Church committee report, which in heavily censored sections reported that the CIA was "currently in contact with many thousands of U.S. academics at hundreds of U.S. academic institutions." Although most of the professors were used for recruiting and consultations on foreign affairs and science, some were being used to write and distribute propaganda, and several were being used abroad to "serve operational principles, primarily the collection of intelligence." Records released under FOI reveal the agency was particularly interested in the topics of mathematics, optics, climate forecasting, chemistry, and medicine, including virus research. The committee recommended not only that all researchers be informed when their funding came from the CIA budget, but also that the administrators at each school be informed of contacts between the agency and individual professors.

This led to the well-publicized attempt by Bok at Harvard to institute notification requirements and contractual limitations. CIA director Stansfield Turner refuses to abide by these guidelines (*Science*, 1 September 1978) and has organized a series of meetings with university presidents at the CIA headquarters in an attempt to dissuade them from enacting similar controls. Former University of Michigan president Robben Fleming received a letter from Turner in 1978, that said that operational use of academics is rare; Turner said having the capability was important in order to "assist the es-

cape of an Einstein or a Solzhenitsyn from an oppressive homeland," or to provide "the kind of strategic warning I am charged to provide regarding crises in our international relations, or such information as this Agency can obtain regarding transnational terrorist organizations." (This letter was released as the result of an FOI request.)

Huddleston says the wishes of the academic leaders were overlooked in the legislation because the CIA could cite instances where a great deal might be gained by using the professors as spies. "We looked at the practicalities and just decided differently, that a flat prohibition is not called for. It certainly doesn't prevent a ban by such institutions on their own." He added that the bill does bar the agency from placing its regular employees in academia solely to provide an intelligence cover.

Huddleston said the agency's exemption from the FOI act was proposed because foreign intelligence agents had initiated some of the requests. CIA spokesmen have declined to provide examples, claiming that to do so would confirm the value of the information thus obtained. David Aaron notes that whether or not such requests existed, "The law scares the hell out of friendly governments," who fear their cooperation might be exposed despite the numerous existing exemptions for national security information.

Morton Halperin of the Center for National Security Studies, which has used the law to obtain files embarrassing to the CIA on numerous occasions, termed the proposed exemption "a disaster. I think they just find it inconvenient. Administratively, it's a burden." John Blake, a former acting director of the CIA, appeared to confirm this in 1977 testimony before Congress:

"The (disclosure law) and the ensuing public interest constitute a somewhat traumatic experience for the national intelligence officer who had been trained and indoctrinated to conduct his work in secrecy."

Huddleston, who is considered one of the committee's moderates, says that although "the shackling of the intelligence agencies has been somewhat overstated, I am hopeful that recent world events have given the intelligence charter a major impetus." The committee plans to hold hearings in a few weeks and to report out a comprehensive bill by spring. The more limited House bill is given a better chance of ultimate congressional approval; however, most congressmen appear to favor as little restriction on the agency as possible.—R. JEFFREY SMITH