

WxPost/CIA/ Domestic Intelligence: Marilyn Berger's 1/1/75 "Angleton Move May Hit Israel"  
jump head (p. 1 subhead "Israel May Feel Impact." HW 1/1/75

While for other purposes whether this story idea originated with Berger or the Post of her/its sources would be material, for the following comment it is not relevant.

Her talk-show appearances after she returned from China identify her as still a cold warrior, probably of social-democratic belief.

The thrust of this story is that the firing of Angleton may be hurtful to Israel because Angleton and Israeli intelligence had worked out a by-pass of "established channels" and because Israeli intelligence is so good.

For this to be true, there would have to be what she does not say, an input to Israel from the CIA and via Angleton alone. If this had been the case, then there would be no point in not saying it because it will be read in by other intelligence services, including Arab. And if it had been the case, there is absolutely no reason why any other professional in Angleton's slot could not perform the same function. Where it could benefit Israel, by giving to Israel, a Mongolian idiot from Mecca would serve as well as Angleton.

A fundamental factual error is relevant, really basic, in consideration of ~~whether~~ whether the converse, that the Angleton firing could hurt the U.S., is or could be true. She concludes what amounts to a defense of both Angleton and the CIA by saying that despite his obvious political bias (far-right) "he dealt only with raw intelligence and did not participate in drawing up the national intelligence estimates on which policy is based." This is entirely false. The only possible correct <sup>in</sup>formation is that he did not, personally, draw these estimates up. He did "participate" by being first of all a source of intelligence, then an initial filter (after those below him also filtered), then a censor of what is put into channels, and in the analyses he prepared or had prepared and then went over himself. And, of course, there is no possibility of separating belief from intelligence analyses because belief dominates what is seen and perceived and understood and interpreted and then written, even if one does not permit belief to interfere with reporting. The national intelligence estimates used to work upward, not downward, and there is no reason to believe this has changed in any way. Or could.

Berger has to know this. Any Washington political reporter has to know it. So does the national desk have to know it. The question why the gross error that amounts to a defense of the indefensible?

The whole thing is doctrinally wrong, too. The departure of Angleton can have significance only if it signals a change of policy. In this case the reason obviously has nothing to do with policy toward Israel. However, there may be a change imminent if not already started, toward Israel. Then this kind of <sup>story</sup> ~~seems~~ tends to blame, for those who will not approve a change in policy, those other than the ones who cause changes in policy. Not Ford or Kissinger, for example, but the protest over domestic wrong-doing by the spooks, who were doing wrong to those Berger doesn't like, perhaps? The departure of Angleton can't influence what the Israelis were willing to give CIA either because they know very well that what he got was not for him alone. What he got was for CIA use and the government's. To this his presence or absence is immaterial because if the Israelis did not trust his subordinates or his successor, they would have no trouble working out another "bypass." The same people would then get the same intelligence only by a different channel.

I think she also errs in assuming that what the Israelis would give would be only "raw intelligence" that would then be kept as "raw intelligence" by Angleton. The latter for sure. The Israelis would not be giving copies of their own raw intelligence. They would not disclose agents' identifications or sources, etc. They would give an analysis or a summary or a paraphrase or, more likely, a combination and probably from more than one source.

Taken with the continuing Post downplay of the whole story, which continues, this kind of story and this kind of error raise questions about the Post's policy at the least. It is in the position of defending the CIA when it is under proper criticism, the kind of criticism the Post has made of the FBI, for example, where the FBI could claim jurisdiction.