



Department of Justice

EM

PRESS CONFERENCE

OF

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. SAXBE

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

WITH

MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

11:00 .AM.

Monday, November 18, 1974
The Great Hall
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

The Attorney General answered questions on the following topics:

<u>TOPICS</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
FBI Authority to Conduct Counter-subversive Activity	2
Legality of "COINTELPRO"	2, 7, 14
Discontinuance of "COINTELPRO"	3
White House "Plumbers"	3
Actions Taken Under "COINTELPRO"	3, 13, 14, 18
Congressional Coordination on Release of "COINTELPRO" Report	4, 5, 9, 10
Propriety of "COINTELPRO" Activities	5
Ku Klux Klan	6, 7
Legitimate Activities	7, 8
Mr. Petersen's Review of "COINTELPRO"	8, 9
Mr. Kelley's Views on Report	9
Information Available to Attorneys General	9
Need for legislation	10
Mr. Nixon's Knowledge of "COINTELPRO"	14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Further Release of Information on "COINTELPRO"	17, 18, 22
Mr. Hoover's direction of "COINTELPRO"	19, 20
Deletions of Information from Report	20, 21
Opposition to "COINTELPRO" within FBI	21, 22
Civil Suits Arising from "COINTELPRO"	22, 23
Mr. Kelley Answers Questions to Counter Campus Disturbances	23, 24, 25
Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Programs	25, 26
Domestic versus Foreign Subversion	26, 27, 28

11/18/74
Press

P R O C E E D I N G S

QUESTION: Is there anything in the statutes governing the activities of the FBI that permits them to be -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: They are directed by a directive from the President, and I believe it was President Roosevelt, to take charge of counter-subversion -- of a counter-subversive activity at that time, and they have continued under that order to this date.

QUESTION: So the activities were improper, but were any of them illegal?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: This is a question that has caused us considerable concern. Mr. Petersen, in his review, does not believe that there were prosecutable offenses committed.

Now, with all of the instances of this, we may have missed something. We have asked the Civil Rights Division to look into it concerning 241. The Director -- the Assistant Attorney General Pottinger, at the present time, says that he does -- he has not discerned any that would be prosecutable.

However, if we missed something, why, we certainly are not closing the door.

QUESTION: Who directed that the program be con-

tinued in the active summary board, and for what reason?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The Director at that time was Mr. Hoover, and he directed that it be discontinued, and my only belief is, and maybe Mr. Kelley has other information on that, that after the plans were compromised by the files taken from the raid, illegal raid on the Media Pennsylvania office, that it was to be discontinued.

QUESTION: Well, I guess I asked that for further reasons, also. As you know, another group was set up in 1971 at the White House, perhaps under a somewhat similar mandate, namely the "plumbers".

Do you see any possible relation between this group and the start of other groups?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I do not.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, how many briefings took place under this program?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There were none.

QUESTION: How many lawyers in it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There were none.

QUESTION: Well, what did they do that was improper?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The only thing that they did was that they took disrupted activities. And if you will read in the report, we set up some instances which we believe to be improper. But there was no physical violence, there were

no break-ins, there were no wiretaps.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, could you describe the negotiations with Mr. Rodino and perhaps Mr. Eastland in connection with the timing of the release of this report now?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, it was not just those people who were involved with. In June we obtained an appointment and appeared before the Oversight Committee of the Senate. And told them that we were going to proceed in the same manner with the House of Representatives. We requested with Mr. Rodino that we meet with he and Mr. Hutchinson before we could proceed any further; but we had other problems, if you will recall, the impeachment. And they were deeply involved in that. We were not able to set an appointment at that time.

Now, I had gone to President Nixon with these facts, and he had directed me to proceed to make them public, to tell the appropriate congressional committees, and when we had thoroughly investigated, to make them public.

Then, before I was able to get an appointment with Mr. Rodino and Mr. Hutchinson, came the heat-up of the impeachment; and then the resignation of President Nixon.

Again, I had to go before President Ford, which I did in my first visit with him, and inform him of these activities and that I thought they were important and I thought they should be released.

positive moves.

QUESTION: What about in the case of such groups as the Ku Klux Klan groups in the South in the early Sixties, if we should contribute to resurgence of that type of activity, would you foresee such disruptive activities penetration and the use of informant methods.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There is certainly -- there's criminal intelligence, and we can use penetration for that purpose. But not positive disruptive activities; no.

QUESTION: Let me ask you a specific question about the Ku Klux Klan episode in the early Sixties. The FBI had about 2,000 informants in seven of the fourteen identified planned groups, which, if they could control those groups and order them, through their informants to cease violence, do you regard that as an improper action?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That is not an improper action, because there were no disruptive positive actions in there. But if you will review some of the things in here went beyond that.

Now, I am not unaware that there were conditions that existed in this country that demanded action. There were congressional groups demanding actions, there were a great many people demanding actions, and this was obviously done in response to that.

It goes clear back to the Communist Party USA in

in 1956, and it followed a pattern. It was effective. And I don't think there's a great many people who, looking back at the times, felt that they overreacted to the pressures from Congress and Presidents and everybody else.

But it continued, and it, in my mind, is not something that we in a free society should condone.

QUESTION: Should or would?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Should condone.

QUESTION: General, you said that most of these activities were legitimate. Could you say what was legitimate in your mind, and whether these things are continuing today?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: What I'm talking about, when public information is distributed, it certainly is legitimate. When information is given to friendly media, public information, calling attention to persons' activities, it was legitimate.

And most -- practically all of these things were public information that they were dealing with. It's only when you get into instances of false information, delivered anonymously, situations like that, that I don't think that law enforcement activities should be involved in that.

QUESTION: General, would you define "friendly media"?

[Laughter.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Friendly media?

QUESTION: Yes, sir.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, it's all friendly to me.

[Laughter.]

But, obviously, there are papers and other news outlets, magazines, which readily accept and print information favorable to organizations, bodies, and accept it without reservation. And I think editorial policy is the thing that dictates that. And over the years there are outlets that you can depend on, and I see nothing wrong in that.

But I think that's what I'm referring to, in friendly media.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, you said that Mr. Petersen concluded that there was no prosecutable offenses committed by officials of the Bureau. Are there any other types of perhaps administrative offenses, or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Technical violations?

QUESTION: Is there anything that directly calls for any action, disciplinary action, or anything else.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: This has been a difficult problem for us, and at the present time the principal involved in this, that could answer these questions, is dead. The directions were explicit and plain, and I think that this all has to be taken into consideration.

Now, Mr. Petersen can answer that question best

himself. But it is -- it's been a great problem for us, and that's why we've had to touch a lot of bases on this.

QUESTION: I have two questions. Is this a unanimous committee report?

Second, does Mr. Kelley agree some of these activities were improper?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, but Mr. Kelley can speak for himself. But the committee report was unanimous.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, on page 8 of this report, it says that the House Appropriations Subcommittee agreed on the counterintelligence programs.

Does that mean that Rooney and the rest of that committee were aware of all aspects of these programs?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't say that. Our first belief was, and when we started into this, that there were no Attorneys General and no Presidents and no Congressmen that knew anything about these programs.

We since have found memorandums to indicate that there were some fragmented information available to Attorneys General, and perhaps even to Presidents, to Committees of the Congress. But -- and I think that that is something that we can no longer say, that there was no -- there was none of the people involved, as Attorney General, President or Congressmen, that knew anything about it. I don't think we can say that now.

QUESTION: Well, if the report suggested that Congressman Rooney, or at least that subcommittee knew a little bit more -- at least that's the way I read it -- than the President or various Attorneys General, would that be a correct inference?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That is a correct inference, and we know that when Mr. Hoover went up there he often went off the record, and told them quite a few things. We have no record because it was off the record, but memorandums indicate that such was the case.

QUESTION: Well, a related question then --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: All right.

QUESTION: Do you think that legislation is necessary to bar this sort of thing, or is your directive and Director Kelley's directive; is that enough, or do you think that a new law should be --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't -- I don't think that you can pass laws that would completely foreclose any such activities.

QUESTION: On that point, Mr. Attorney General, --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Just a minute, I was -- right.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, when did Mr. Nixon -- he knew his advice on this, and -- [inaudible] -- would be inclined to agree with you that some of the activity was, quote,

-- [inaudible] -- that the committees know.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: As I recall, my conversation with him on the matter was of the nature that these things had happened, that I felt that there should be disclosure, and that they assured him that such things would not happen again. And he indicated approval of my proceeding on this program.

QUESTION: Was it within the context of this thing we're dealing with, that it should not have occurred and that he would agree with you that it should be disclosed, with the idea that you were disclosing something that was unfavorable and, as the committee held, recommended it?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. I don't -- I don't recall that at all. In fact, he spoke very little when I spoke to him about the matter, other than saying, Well, do what you have to do.

QUESTION: Was he aware that if it contained something that might be described as dirty tricks, similar to that which has been advanced about his operations.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I'm sure he did.

QUESTION: On the point of legislation, one possible way, I suppose, of dealing with this problem is through legislation governing use of criminal records. As you well know, the Congress issued a bill on that over a year ago, and since I spend a good deal of time jockeying back

and forth between the government departments, and some concern and even criticism concerning -- [inaudible] -- that the department is getting a little slow, and they are trying to work out an agreement.

What is the status effect of the criminal records, privacy legislation, and why is it taking a year, and even now trying to reach an agreement, if you think they are engaged in -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We have a privacy bill that was sent up to the Hill on November the 7th, which we think will answer all of those problems, and one of the great difficulties on a privacy bill is that you would make public information unavailable to law enforcement people that would be readily available to other people.

We have a direct collision on the privacy bill, and -- for instance, the Freedom of Information Act, and its -- you just can't go both ways. And I just can't believe that a person with a long memory in a police department would be illegal, and that's what we're talking about when we say that you can't pass on the records of people after a certain period.

QUESTION: In the bill of November 7, was there much of a change between the present policy of the Bureau and -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: It would create new

safeguards, and it's not just the Justice Department involved, it's all the other agencies of government that are involved in this bill that has been sent up there, and it was difficult to hammer it out; but it has been hammered out.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, I haven't had a chance to tell you this, but at least we are thoroughly in agreement -- [inaudible] -- but I see here on page 11 that it indicates that at least your Listening Ear does -- [inaudible] -- which, as I read it, would not be proper on the face of it, purely it isn't proper on its face. Nowhere do I see segregated the ones that you regard as of great threat and improper and so on. I am wondering if you are lumping them all under the same ball of wax here.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: What we're lumping here --

QUESTION: What you're denouncing and what you're approving.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: What we are announcing here in total are things that we would no longer do.

QUESTION: Well, they are not listed here, though, -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, with the -- we tried to list all of the various programs that were involved, as we say many of the activities within these programs were legitimate activities that involve no disruptive or positive activity, but for the purposes of the file we have included all of these

things and we have no program that would anyway approach a counterintelligence program. We are strictly interested in gathering investigative material for the purpose of prosecution of law violators.

QUESTION: This list of 12 things here, I think for the most part you consider legitimate problems.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: On page 11.

No, these are things that we do not consider proper.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, will you make public a list of the groups that were targeted?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I would think that these will be disclosed in --

QUESTION: When?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, we will have to ask Mr. Petersen about this.

MR. PETERSEN: Pardon?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He's requesting the targeted groups. Most of them are identified in here.

Now, on the new left, do you know offhand what were targeted groups?

MR. PETERSEN: Yes. First of all, a point of clarification on the last question.

All of the activity listed is not designated as improper or illegal. This was the program. Some things that were perfectly permissible in the course of an investigation were encompassed in the cointel program. My reaction is

that it simply is a bureaucratic response. We had to have something to put us in the program, and this was it.

Basically, the only two problem areas that really give me trouble are, one, where the Bureau's information is used for political purposes, and I think that's the last category. And then I think category six and seven, where it may have an impact on the economic or livelihood, ability of an individual to earn a livelihood. That comes into a questionable area, I think, in terms of potential or possible civil liability, but not much more than that.

Now, to the go to the second aspect of it, that we're talking about, the -- in terms of the extremist organizations, we're talking about the Students for a Democratic Society, and the Weathermen, the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, we were talking about the Nation of Islam, and the Revolutionary Action Movement, and some other black extremists, Black Panthers, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

So the question is not so easily answered as to whether or not the specific action, or specific category is illegal; it's a question of what specific action was taken with respect to a specific group under the confines of a particular movement.

Now, if there is a suspected -- Communist, we'll say, in an otherwise legitimate organization, an anonymous

communication might have been sent to advise the people of that fact.

Well, is that a proper or improper activity?

Well, if the individual lost his job, well that's -- that puts another dimension to it.

These are the difficult quality judgments that are involved, so it's very difficult to say that is all illegal. And what we have tried to say to the Bureau is, Look we don't want any programs like this. If you feel it necessary to take such action in the interest of the United States, then, by all means come to the Attorney General and seek legal advice before you proceed.

That's basically what we're trying to say, and that's --

QUESTION: Well, Mr. Petersen, are you going to make public this entire list of organizations or not?

MR. PETERSEN: I didn't propose to make public the list of organizations.

QUESTION: Well, you answered the question about these organizations on the list, why aren't you making it public?

MR. PETERSEN: Why am I not making it public?

QUESTION: Yes. Why are you not making it public?

MR. PETERSEN: Well, because it's not my prerogative to do so. I filed a report.

QUESTION: Well, you want full disclosure here, you say, in the interest of full disclosure.

MR. PETERSEN: We'll argue some other time.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I think that --

QUESTION: Mr. Attorney General, are you going to --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: -- I think over the next few months, on inquiries, we will assist in any way that we can to make full disclosure.

QUESTION: Well, would you respond to this question, sir: Was the Americans for Democratic Action on that list?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I don't believe so, no.

QUESTION: Was the National Urban League?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

QUESTION: Well, why can't you make the list public, so we won't have to ask a thousand questions?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Because we've got quite a group of these that we frankly haven't made final determination as to whether it's investigative or whether it is -- falls into this program. If it does, it will be made public.

QUESTION: Well, you've got so many thousands of proposals, and so many were approved? You must know the names of those groups.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We will give every assistance in giving full information on these programs.

QUESTION: General, in that regard, will you be

making public the papers or these files or anything like that to support this? So we know in some detail what was done in some of these circumstances now listed here as -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. You will be given everything but investigate reports.

QUESTION: When will this be available?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Immediately.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, Mr. Petersen just listed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in the context of several known violent groups, are we to understand that this program undertook to disrupt the Southern Christian Leadership Conference?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: There was obviously some activity on some unit of it, or it wouldn't be in there.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, was that hypothetical, or was it a hypothetical Mr. Petersen gave about a fellow being a member of the Communist Party. Was that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference?

MR. PETERSEN: That was just a hypothetical, you know, --

QUESTION: Oh, that wasn't true?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No.

MR. PETERSEN: That was just a hypothetical I used.

QUESTION: Well, how did the Southern Christian Leadership Conference get on the list? I didn't know that they

were radical or violent, or anything like that, group.

MR. PETERSEN: That's why we're concerned.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: That's what we're --

QUESTION: Can someone tell us what happened over that, for example?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I don't have that.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, what is the Nation of Islam doing on that list?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Simply because it was at one time determined that they were a group that they should be moved against, and this is why I'm telling you this. I'm not here to try to justify the activities that went on under this. I'm trying to help you understand what happened. And we say these names were listed. Why? I can't tell you. That's part of the problem.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, on page 16 of this report you list what you call the most celebrated of all the adverse -- [inaudible] -- and you also say in your report that the actions in one part were approved or disapproved, at the Assistant Director level or above.

Can you tell us if activities that disturb you were approved by Mr. Hoover?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I believe that he had firm control over the entire program.

QUESTION: Was the decision to terminate this in 1971 by Mr. Hoover alone, or was the administration involved in this?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: To my knowledge it was Mr. Hoover's alone. . . .

QUESTION: And is this primarily because the operation was blown -- or did he shift -- or was it decided to change policy in order for other reasons.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't tell you that.

QUESTION: Mr. Petersen, do you have an answer to that?

MR. PETERSEN: No, I just didn't -- we don't know.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, can you explain exactly what document is that we have? It's obviously not the original report we got from Mr. Petersen. Did they rewrite it for a specific reason or --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: The only difference between that and the first working copy is that there have been certain foreign intelligence, security matters removed that we think should be classified. They have nothing to do, substantially, with the problem or the program.

But it was information that was in here as a classified document, which we couldn't release as an unclassified document.

QUESTION: Well, this doesn't contain any of the stuff that is a possible prosecutable offence, that you talked about, I would assume that is one of the primary things you expected in a report from Mr. Petersen. Is there a longer, bigger

report that has --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. There is not. I think that Mr. Petersen can tell you that the original report did contain quite a few things. For instance, we had a statement in the original report that no Attorney General, no President, no Congressman knew anything about this. Since that time we have learned that that may not be entirely true.

QUESTION: Well, when did you learn about it? Who found that out?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We found certain memorandums and -- that indicated that this person had been given this fragment, this person had been given this fragment, and that there was obviously enough of it released that we couldn't make the statement that they had no knowledge of it.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, did anybody in the FBI, during or after the period of the program, make any serious attempt to oppose them?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No. Obviously the FBI is going to be damaged by this, and we discussed this problem, and it was agreed by Mr. Kelley and I that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and that --

QUESTION: Why, I think you misconceive my question. I mean at the time of the cointel program, did anybody

in the FBI hierarchy or at the lower level attempt to --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We have no knowledge of that. I could have asked the same question, and did. But to my knowledge it was, it was not opposed within the FBI, and those of you that were here know the tight ship that Mr. Hoover ran, and I think that's part of it.

And, Mr. Kelley, you know of no opposition within.

QUESTION: General, I just wanted to reaffirm one thing from a moment ago. We will have available to us, as I understand, the working papers that Mr. Petersen and his committee had available to them, -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes. We think that under the Freedom of Information, those are available.

QUESTION: General, how do you lawyers see the vulnerability of the government's civil suits filed by them that get into this program?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: We feel that this will have to be on a case-by case basis. Our general policy is that we defend a person whether he's the President or whether he's a GSA janitor, if what he performs he believes was an order, and in performance of his duty. And we've issued a new policy statement on that, guidelines to further acquaint the press with what these guidelines are. Because this is something that always comes up.

And I believe we will have available for distribution

a copy of these guidelines.

QUESTION: Could I follow up that question by asking Mr. Petersen what is/the ^{on} list of -- [inaudible]

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, but you've got the problem of, the statute doesn't begin to run, for instance, on Civil Rights actions, if it's a covert activity, until it's disclosed.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, in Mr. Kelley's memorandum or should I say press release -- [inaudible] -- it might seem to suggest that the cointel programs might be permissible if the campuses got violent again.

I'd like to ask the Director: do you foresee any circumstances where this sort of thing would be solicited?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: He's talking about campuses and if we had other civil disturbances of the kind that we had.

DIRECTOR KELLEY: Yes, I can see where possibly we might in the future encounter some of these activities, at which time, as was stated by the General and by Mr. Petersen, before we took any action we would go to the Attorney General and consult with him, or there is the possibility that legislation might be introduced, which would make this permissible.

And we have already asked that such a consideration be given, that there be legislation presented.

QUESTION: Would you elaborate on that? What sort of legislation would you ask for?

DIRECTOR KELLEY: Legislation to permit, under emergency situations, to do some things which counteract the effectiveness of such programs.

QUESTION: Like wiretapping, Mr. Director, or --

DIRECTOR KELLEY: What?

QUESTION: Wiretapping or any other specific activity?

DIRECTOR KELLEY: We have already requested wiretapping in domestic intelligence matters, yes.

QUESTION: But my question went to the policy of disruption, of deliberately disrupting --

DIRECTOR KELLEY: And my answer was directed towards that, that we might want to do so, and would, in the event we felt it was of such emergency nature, go to the Attorney General.

QUESTION: Could I follow that up and ask whether the existence of the new Oversight Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate would provide a vehicle? In other words, if you undertook such activities with the approval of the Attorney General, would you feel compelled to make a report to the Oversight Committees?

DIRECTOR KELLEY: I hadn't thought about it, but I think that it would be well within the concept of oversight that

we would tell them.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I'd like to follow up on that in regard to Oversight committees. We've recommended there be a Joint Oversight Committee of both House and Senate, that we could go to and make regular reports not just on what we've been talking about, but on day-to-day operations. And at the present time it's a rather fragmented picture. We have several committees involved that demand the same information repeatedly, and perhaps we're wishing for something that wouldn't be possible, but we'd like to see an Oversight Committee with a staff that we could meet with regularly.

I think this is one of the greatest safeguards that we could have in this country, because all Attorneys General are expendable and all Directors of the FBI and, as the years go by, I think to have continuity of reporting and continuity of congressional supervision, you have to be able to go up, report, ask instructions, just as you have that opportunity and responsibility, I think, to go to the White House, and report and ask instructions.

QUESTION: Are you suggesting a Joint Committee, or the usual --

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: A Joint Committee, established like the Joint Economic Committee, with joint membership and a separate staff that, then they could have

their feedback directly into their committees in the House and Senate.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, when was your meeting with the President, President Nixon?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: President Nixon? I think I first called this to his attention in not later than May, May of '74. Maybe April.

QUESTION: General, what are the circumstances in which you approve a program from the FBI and -- [inaudible] such disruptive activities?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: I can't foresee such situation today.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, following up that same question, Mr. Kelley in two recent speeches has stressed the threat from urban guerilla attacks from organizations in our country, and he said that they have declared war on them in the United States.

In those circumstances you still don't think that it could be disrupted activities directed against these groups?

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: No, I think that we can handle the situation. I certainly think that any counter-intelligence activities that are based upon falsifications should never be used. I don't think the United States should get involved in going this far in any domestic affairs.

Now, we reserve the right, however, certainly with foreign espionage and foreign control, that we must have that right to disrupt these activities and this is where we are in a rather deadly game, and I don't want to give the impression here that we're giving up all our opportunity if there is, to disrupt active foreign subversion.

QUESTION: Mr. Saxbe, could I follow up on that thought. This gets into that continuum of organizational hookups where you've got the domestic subversive groups going overseas, various and sundry instances, and getting coaching explaining, a way to fuse bombs and all kinds of other things.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Well, I think that we are now waging an effective campaign in this country against our domestic subversion, and we're doing it without aid of any kind of disruption. We're working on purely criminal investigative procedures, and I think that we're being effective.

However, without the help of a vigilant populace, we can't do this. People have to want to stop these disruptions, and we have to have the support of the local police. And we have had it.

But I can foresee no emergency situation now that would require these extensive activities.

QUESTION: I'd like to ask if there's a difference

of opinion between Mr. Kelley and you. He seems to think we need the right to use them on an emergency basis.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, but Mr. Kelley also recognizes in our dealings that this is a policy decision that would have to come from the Attorney General, and I as Attorney General feel that it should come from the President. And the Congress should be informed.

A VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Saxbe.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE: Yes, sir.

- - -