

military spying on civilian political figures and would not tolerate it during his Administration." Later, Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert F. Froehke testified before the Committee that various military counterintelligence units had indeed kept political card index files on 25 million American citizens and extensive dossiers on thousands of others. Again, as in the case of the C.I.A. political operations noted above, the pattern of official denial followed by public admission seriously damages the credibility of the Government and the image of the Intelligence Community (of which military counterintelligence units are only a low-level subdivision responsible for the security of military installations).

Professor Ransom does not attempt to provide simple answers to the kinds of problems which beset the Intelligence Community. There are none. However, he does provide a framework and depth of field against which proposed solutions can be judged. He is deeply concerned with adequate control of covert operations, which have been over-sold and over-used in the last decade. He concludes that "... a secret operation, if justified, should only be planned and authorized by the highest authority, and then only if the chances of maintaining secrecy

are strong enough to justify the risks of disclosure. If not, some other instrument of policy should be chosen or no action taken. There are, of course, no formulas for easy decision-making." Like Lyman Kirkpatrick, a former Deputy Director of C.I.A., Ransom recommends that "covert political operations should only be undertaken to prevent a direct threat to national security and as an alternative to overt military action." He also recommends that "the President and State Department should exert effective policy control over secret foreign operations at all times. Put another way, the President and National Security Council must efface their authority to know what the intelligence establishment is doing and to control it."

Although the President and his staff advisors may have difficulty controlling the intelligence establishment, by studying Professor Ransom's book they can get an objective look at how it is organized and the often politically explosive implications of what it is doing. Such an overview is an indispensable antidote to the self-serving briefings or "snow jobs" with which the intelligence agencies themselves seek to indoctrinate each new Administration.

• • •

THE MITRIONE CASE

Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The recent letter which you published by Mr. Ernest Lefever (June, 1970) demonstrates that the man has Christian instincts but he apparently restrains them when it comes to criticizing U.S. programs.

"In terms of moral condemnation, there should be no split-level morality which condemns the occasional, limited, and unauthorized sins of our friends and overlooks or excuses the officially sponsored and massive brutality of our enemies," Mr. Lefever states.

"Our friends," meaning those whose policies are in accord with U.S. self-interest, are only guilty of "occasional," "limited" and "unauthorized" sins. But "our enemies" are guilty of sins which are "officially sponsored" and practice "massive brutality."

In his next sentence Lefever says that "all governments" should be "judged by one ethic" even though it is obvious that he holds a double standard for "friends" and "enemies." It is not surprising that someone whose thinking is so preconditioned would have completely misunderstood the intent of Father Colonnese's interview.

Father Colonnese did not accuse Dan Mitrione of practicing or teaching torture; He said that there is sufficient reason to request a thorough investigation of the Office of Public Safety's role and activities in Latin America. The evidence is admittedly circumstantial and not legally binding. But it was not our intention to prove guilt: only

to state that sufficient evidence exists to warrant a thorough investigation by an impartial source.

Mr. Lefever's biased good-and-bad-guys concept of international social justice apparently rejects the need to scrutinize U.S. programs and policies. He claims that if we wanted to find out the truth, "a simple phone call to the State Department would have yielded all the facts." He then quotes a denial by the A.I.D. director in Rio and recommends that the matter be dropped. What naïveté.

Mr. Lefever then reports that U.S. policy advisory assistance has been withdrawn from some countries "where police power has been abused." Well, Mr. Lefever, it's been abused to criminal proportions in Brazil and there are filing cabinets full of atrocity testimony from Brazilian torture victims to document those barbaric practices.

This office has been supplying Brazilian torture data to Senator Frank Church and Senator William Proxmire who are investigating U.S. assistance to Brazil and elsewhere in Latin America. During Senator Proxmire's hearings yesterday (July 13th) it was announced that the State Department will discontinue the A.I.D. public safety assistance program to Brazil.

The official reason given was that Brazil's police will be sufficiently well trained by the end of fiscal 1972 and will not require additional U.S. assistance. The

purpose of the A.I.D. assistance according to Mr. Lefever is to promote humane police methods. The Brazilian police have disgraced the humanitarian traditions of that country by the animalistic brutality of their systematic torture methods. If the purpose of the A.I.D. program was to instill humane police methods, it has been an overwhelming failure and I submit to you that is the real reason why the program has been abandoned.

We pointed out the Mitrone case because it illustrates that, in the minds of many Latin Americans, U.S. police advisors are considered part of the local police apparatus which uses torture to suppress not only terrorism but also legitimate dissent. These U.S. police advisors are popularly thought by many Latin Americans to be involved in the financial support, implementation and even teaching of torture methods. This was pointed out in a recent interview I had with Romeo Perez, an editor of the Christian Democratic newspaper in Montevideo, Uruguay where A.I.D. police advisor, Dan Mitrone was killed.

"The general reaction in Uruguay to the killing of U.S. police advisor, Dan Mitrone, was one of indifference," Perez explained. "Even the most unaware of our citizens suspects that Mitrone was advising our police in the methods of torture which have become their new pattern of interrogation in recent years.

"Because of this, Mitrone was a little-liked figure, and his killing by the Tupamaros did not produce that same negative public opinion which would have resulted if someone else had been killed. For example, there would have been a very strong negative reaction if the Tupamaros had killed U.S. agronomist Claude Fly or the kidnapped Brazilian Consul Aloysio Mares Dias Gomide.

"But because of the function Mitrone was fulfilling in our country, he was looked upon as an expression of U.S. support of our repressive police organization and an example of U.S. intervention in Uruguayan internal affairs. He is believed responsible for introducing methods of torture to the Uruguayan police."

I do not contend that Mr. Perez's interpretation of Uruguayan public opinion makes Mitrone or the agency for which he worked guilty of torture. I do contend that this consensus persists amid large sectors of the Uruguayan people and in many other Latin American countries where U.S. police advisors are currently operating. The truth or falsity of that prevailing attitude must be established.

The State Department says it would "welcome scrutiny" of this program "by any responsible person." That is what we requested and have been working to accomplish for almost two years. But that "responsible person" must be an impartial agency or organization not co-opted by close association with the agency being investigated. Why would anyone object to our efforts to speed such an investigation? Why should the desire to improve the U.S.-Latin American image and rechannel needed tax dollars be considered anti-American by critics such as Lefever?

Our efforts to speed such an investigation were supported by *worldview* and many other publications which felt that the unanswered questions surrounding this program must be resolved. Our contention is that the A.I.D. public safety program has failed in its stated purpose of humanizing police methods in certain Latin American countries characterized by severe repression. We also contend that the United States' image in Latin America has suffered serious harm by being linked with police agencies guilty of barbaric torture. In the minds of many Latin Americans, the U.S. is guilty of complicity in these actions. Guilt by association is unfair but that does not make it any less real or damaging.

Senator Proxmire suggested that the United States should deny such assistance to any country found to violate human rights. Some Latin American countries which come immediately to mind are Uruguay, the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Guatemala. The Mitrone case served to focus attention on Brazil and Uruguay. The program for which he worked has now been canceled in Brazil. If we are able to sustain the momentum and get impartial on-site investigations, it will also, one hopes, be removed from other oppressive countries.

While Senator Proxmire's hearings on the A.I.D. public safety program were being conducted, a film was shown in the Senate auditorium to legislators and their staff assistants. The producer introduced the series of filmed interviews with Brazilian torture victims by stating that some of the footage had been omitted. He explained that several Brazilians stated on film that there had been English-speaking people present during their tortures whom they presumed to be Americans. The producer explained that speaking English wasn't proof that they were Americans and he removed those comments in the interest of objectivity.

The film footage can be removed much more easily than the doubts they cause in the minds of those who, also in the name of objectivity, can not completely dismiss the possibility that they may have been U.S. police advisors. What is needed is an impartial investigation.

In countries where the A.I.D. public safety program coexists with brutal police repression of legitimate dissent it should be canceled. Residents of the U.S. and the Latin American country involved should be told that it was canceled because the U.S. people in no way countenance the torture of military or civil prisoners.

Mr. Lefever states in his opening sentence that "the torture of military or civil prisoners deserves the severe censure of humane men." I agree. Let's do it without further delay, whether it exists amid "friend" or "enemy," sponsored by the Left or the Right. It is a pure evil unalterable by political expediencies.

James T. Cotter
Information Director
Latin America Bureau,
United States Catholic Conference
(Prepared in consultation with
L. M. Colomeres, Director
Div. For Latin America, USCC)