

1/25/72 dear od, excuse typing, must favor thump while longer, it seems. you will recall that after malabrida's analysis i jokingly valled revisionism you took a position that like his, in a way i do not now recall made the cia better guys rather than his good guys. i then argued that the best that could be said for the cia is that it wanted success, had had more experience in this kind of dirty work and learned more easily what did not work and what failure looked like, and that above all it had learned never to let its own paper get into any other hands so that what it really thought, wanted to do and planned was largely unknown. i think i also said they were the ground floor on this. well, i have been nibbling away at the bantam pentagon papers, finding it too depressing to read steadily the few times i might. early this a.m. i came to a short passage that illustrates the points i was trying to make, a place where the cia view is recorded. as i recall, this begins on about p.471. it was in 1966, at the time ky was at his most stupid and most unsuccessful. in passing, i note that the times' analyst has made no ref. to ky's statement that hitler was his idol and model. everybody then was more pessimistic than ever, and had come to the point where it was open, where they let their hair down, said this is the way ky is, we cannot win, no matter what, everything we do gets us deeper in, farther from victory, its ruinous in counter-productivity and costs of all kinds. so, they had a meeting, and the only representative who recommended no change in unsuccessful course was that of the cia. everybody else was more pessimistic and as i recall it one, agreeing with the cia on course, said it was with pessimism, something not attributed to the cia. so, accepting this as valid, i argue it as proof of my position with one exception: i exaggerated and was wrong on the perception of the cia, that it was not as smart as i had thought. but if ever there was a time for the agency, had it been good guys of any kind, to have asserted itself and its influence to the salararia-attributed end, that was the time, the crucial juncture. here was their real chance to be good guys and they were the baddest. i think that in our own evaluations we should remember there is much we do not and cannot know as fact of them because they are so hidden, iceberg simile. example, was bundy then still their man? od did he not have to be, did he still think their way? lw