

JDW, Further ref your 1/6/75; spooks

1/18/75

The apparently unclear purpose of my visit to the road company on the other side of the river was to initiate an amicable settlement in redress of grievances not fully spelled out, not expected, but as you note, a first step. It gives them options they might not ask for and there is too much I can't do to start this one at what will probably be the end but need not be. Think it is time for a reminder.

On the orchestration of anti-CIA leaks one thing is perfectly clear: part of the CIA is shielded, as are some of the operations this part opposes, so I assume this part, namely so-called Ivy League liberals, took the initiative and have continued leaking after inspiring others to do likewise.

It is not certain that on the long run this leaking will not serve all CIA ends, those of the liberals and those of the baddies, who have already made their sacrifices. (If I read the international signs, detente may mean something else or be something else soon, so there may be regrets. But the Operations paranoia was long past its day.)

1/28/75: Other developments you know of. Like they did, too, find a few more things on me in the files. JL is to nudge again this week if he's heard no more.

To give you a better picture of what lies behind this, and I think that it is really the need for long overdue change, there is a guy I know slightly who works there in a completely non-operating capacity. He is a bookkeeper type, straight stuff. His view he puts simply, that the Angletons are of a different era and had outlived their time. There had to be this kind of change. This is also part of what I meant above in saying that what is happening serves all legitimate interests, including in the long run that of an efficient intelligence service.

Now I don't see any way reform could have been initiated simply because there was the need or because the international situation had changed.

Picture of these guys saying they were wrong, or the Russians were not about to land from some orbiting satellite.

The only way it could be brought about was by way of some kind of scandal. And the only kind of scandal that would not really hurt the essential international operations had to be what did not focus on them. Not even the bad ones. Note that the Chile exposures did not bring this to pass.

With Nixon having booted Helms he and the antediluvians were natural goats. And there was Hunt who had already pinned a bum rap on LBJ to sweeten it for the GOPs. Not that LBJ was not responsible for bad things. That Goldwater things does not stack. And LBJ did not invent it. He and the peaceniks were convenient and not party-in-power.

There has been no time in years when this story could not have broken, as I've indicated in a more limited sense elsewhere, re my efforts. I tried to interest the Post in the story CDN broke over the weekend in 1968. Paul Valentine saw all I then had on it, much more than I told Finley. He was turned down. And you know of the WG-connected efforts.

Another partial answer to your question, who is behind it, I think is the anti-spooks. Any reading of Marchetti is consistent with this, too. Then also Kissinger put a crimp in the important part, analysis. So it is these guys and their friends who are fighting back.

Hurt to the CIA has to be defined. The hurt will be to wrongdoers only and then not as much as it should be. Actually, the Agency will be better off with a purge. Nobody will really be hurt personally. And in the end I think a better intelligence service will be the result. Perhaps not as the out-of-date ones want but as the new need requires. There will be strong resistance from the spooks and the revanchists. And there will not be all the exposure and reform needed, as the circumspection of the leaking forecasts.