

FIT TO KILL

The Presidency And Political Assassination

Medford Evans, a former college professor and once administrative officer on the U.S. atomic-energy project (1944-1952), earned his Doctoral Degree at Yale. Articles by Professor Evans have appeared in Harper's, Sewanee Review, and elsewhere. He is an



AMERICAN OPINION Associate Editor and author of Secret War For The A-Bomb, The Usurpers, and The Assassination Of Joe McCarthy. Also BICKLEY'S BROTHER IN LAW

■ BOTH a Mafia family and a metropolitan police department require certain operational virtues, such as group loyalty, personal courage, quick thinking, and physical stamina. As opposing teams they not infrequently develop a certain mutual respect.

Shall we not expect this principle to hold on the international level? The tough professionals who staff the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, British Intelligence, and the Soviet K.G.B., and whose business it is to develop the fullest information on each other, can hardly avoid developing also what we call a "healthy respect" for each other, and at least at intervals this may shade into wry admiration or even indulgent regard. The existence of such tendencies helps to explain the apparent ease with which Kim Philby, for a notable example, was able to move easily in all three of the aforesaid organizations.

But just as professionals develop respect and regard for each other, even across their generally invisible battle lines,

so do they also develop a certain sense of alienation from the great mass of ordinary — and, as the professionals must see them, "dumb" — citizens whose interests they are hired to serve, and more especially from the politically elected or appointed officials to whom they are supposed to report and from whom they are supposed to take orders. A James Bond does not relish saying *Yes, Sir* to a politician.

Unless he himself has selected the politician to whom, as part of a more or less entertaining charade, he says *Yes, Sir* in public. Or unless the politician, beneath his veneer of public service, has enough steel to be a super secret agent himself. One way or another, there is an ever-present likelihood in any very large government that the agency at the highest level at which the power to kill is constantly and immediately available will tend to perpetuate its own power, and increasingly to choose those who nominally have direct power over it.

There is some tendency, as is well known, for national armies (or navies or air forces) to assume such self-perpetuating power. Yet armies cannot be invisible, and since in "free" countries public opinion, however attenuated, remains a factor, the military image can be a political handicap. Even apart from this, the kind of organization which is most effective in large-scale declared war is not as a rule sufficiently subtle or flexible to cope with the perils of peace. An army, navy, or air force operates best when a nation is aroused by a common sense of national danger, and thus gives full support to its armed services. When opinion is atomized and personal alienation fre-

quent, a secret police agency will be more powerful than an army; it will indeed control the army as well as the civilian population. Such is evidently the case rather completely in the Soviet Union.

In the United States the secret police is not overtly developed to the point where it can intimidate directly the general population, though the Internal Revenue Service comes within shouting distance. But at the higher levels of political information there seems to be a force which selects personnel and prepares agenda. Appointments and programs sometimes have to be cleared with the Congress, but that is seldom a matter of serious difficulty. The kind of staff work for the Establishment that I have here in mind is largely done, I believe, at our major universities or other institutions of higher learning, which as a rule receive large sums of federal money and sustain influential tributary agencies of the government. The latter are sometimes open, sometimes covert, as was the C.I.A. set-up at M.I.T. for many years. It is interesting to reflect, for instance, on the extent to which the whole hideous misadventure in Vietnam was both planned and dismantled at M.I.T. and Harvard. The notorious think-tanks, such as RAND in Santa Monica, California, where Daniel Ellsberg once flourished, are of great importance, but they are not self-perpetuating in the same way as are the great universities, and as is the intelligence community as a whole, in which all these institutions I have mentioned, and others, participate.

It may be noted that of the components of this intelligence community which I have mentioned, only agents of the Central Intelligence Agency are legally authorized to kill people. (There is a problem, however, in the fact that no one knows who many of the agents of the Central Intelligence Agency are.) This whole community, with the C.I.A. as its striking arm, is very powerful.*

For some time perhaps the chief prob-

lem faced by the intelligence community in general and the C.I.A. in particular was the problem of the President. As for the C.I.A., it was created in Harry Truman's Administration, and its first director was one of Truman's fellow Missourians, Admiral Sidney Souers, an insurance executive in St. Louis, whom I have met, and who is known to all as an admirable representative of Middle America's top-level business community. Since the days when Sid Souers was its head, the C.I.A. has come a long way, baby.

Plainly enough, an organization with so few restraints on its power to act is not going to be content with *any* restraints. The C.I.A., like other elite corps that are licensed to kill, tends to be an "inner-directed" agency. You may recall James McCord's indicating that his primary motivation in pulling the house down on the heads of the Nixon Administration was to save the reputation of the C.I.A. The publishers of *The Secret Team* (Prentice-Hall, 1973) say of its author, L. Fletcher Prouty, "Not being a CIA man, he was exempt from taking the oath of secrecy." As a colonel in the Air Force, and Focal Point Officer in the Pentagon (a position which gave him access to much C.I.A. information not known to many C.I.A. agents themselves), Prouty was subject to all laws and regulations governing official

*Within hours after writing the above I received for review a book on foundations by the "Liberal" British-born journalist and politician Ben Whitaker, containing an elaborate circle chart to illustrate how the C.I.A. has devised a system "to provide secret government funds to private persons and organizations." I have also refreshed my memory, as the lawyers say, by reference to my own book, *The Assassination Of Joe McCarthy* (Western Islands, 1970), wherein I find the following: "In 1967 Sol Stern, in an article in *Ramparts* magazine, stated that in the channel of non-governmental instrumentalities through which CIA disburses funds for clandestine operations is one Paul F. Hellmuth, a member of the law firm of Hale and Dorr, Joseph Welch's firm at the time of the Army-McCarthy hearings." It is also the firm of James D. St. Clair, President Nixon's lawyer at the time of impending impeachment.

secrecy, and had, of course, taken the regular oath of loyalty of a commissioned officer. There can be no oath which either increases or diminishes the force of those laws, or of the officer's regular oath to uphold the Constitution. If the C.I.A. has a *special* oath — if its agents take such an oath — the intended effect can only be to bind those agents in a kind of blood brotherhood, as is common in secret societies. Such a sworn fraternity could hardly endure taking orders from anyone not of the brotherhood.

Yet if the President of the United States is elected by the people, there is no way to assure that he will be one of the brothers — there is indeed the highest degree of probability that he will not be. And blood brotherhoods do not lend themselves to the device of *ex officio* membership. There are rites to be observed and tests to be endured which a newly elected U.S. President might scorn to go through even if the brothers were prepared for his instant acceptance. No, the only solution of this anomalous situation is for the C.I.A. itself to control the succession to the Presidency. The Agency has from the start been free of any *other* supervision. No Cabinet member can question it; Congress, which appropriates the vast sums which C.I.A. spends, cannot investigate *how* those sums are spent. As Harry Truman told Merle Miller glumly (it was a rare and unwelcome occasion when Truman, who had set up the C.I.A., admitted a past mistake): “[I]t’s become a government all of its own and all secret. They don’t have to account to anybody.” (*Plain Speaking*, Putnam, 1974.)

There was a time when it appeared to insiders as though they might have to account to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. After the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Kennedy said: “We will have to deal with the C.I.A.” Or so Roger Hilsman reports in *To Move A Nation* (Doubleday, 1967). In *A Thousand Days* (Houghton Mifflin, 1965), Arthur Schlesinger Jr. quotes President Kennedy more fully:

As for CIA, “we will have to do something. . . . I must have someone there with whom I can be in complete and intimate contact — someone from whom I know I will be getting the exact pitch.” He added, “I made a mistake in putting Bobby in the Justice Department. He is wasted there. Byron White could do that job perfectly well. Bobby should be in CIA. . . . It is a hell of a way to learn things, but I have learned one thing from this business — that is, that we will have to deal with CIA. McNamara has dealt with Defense; Rusk has done a lot with State; but no one has dealt with CIA.”

He tried to deal with the Agency by appointing as its Director one John McCone, described by Schlesinger as “a self-effacing head of the CIA.” Kennedy himself was less self-effacing. He was, however, soon to be effaced. On November 22, 1963, some agency dealt with J.F.K. It is Colonel Prouty who has written:

The Secret Team has very close affiliations with elements of power in more than threescore foreign countries and is able when it chooses to topple governments almost anywhere in the free world. [Which would include the United States.] Whether or not the Secret Team had anything whatsoever to do with the deaths of Rafael Trujillo, Ngo Dinh Diem, Ngo Dinh Nhu, Dag Hammarskjöld, John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and others may never be revealed, but what is known is that the power of the Team is enhanced by the “cult of the gun” and by its sometimes brutal and always arbitrary anti-Communist flag-waving, even when real Communism has nothing to do with the matter at hand.

I don't know whether that means Colonel Prouty thinks the "Secret Team" is really anti-Communist. One would assume that he is not so naïve. He identifies what he calls the Secret Team thus: "At the heart of the Team, of course, are a handful of top executives of the CIA and of the National Security Council (NSC), most notably the chief White House adviser to the President on foreign policy affairs." Throughout the Nixon Administration that chief advisor has been Henry A. Kissinger, who retained the post after becoming Secretary of State. During the Johnson Administration, this control spot was occupied by Walt Rostow; under Kennedy it was held by McGeorge Bundy.

That the C.I.A. has never been anti-Communist (at least not since its early days under Truman) is forcibly suggested by Roger Hilsman, a high State Department official under Kennedy, now a professor at Columbia. "Far from being a haven of extreme conservatism," writes Hilsman, "the CIA during the Eisenhower administration was the one place that Senator McCarthy was unable to touch in his witch hunt and was in fact the only place in the Eisenhower administration that had room for the young activists who wanted to work with youth and labor movements abroad." (*To Move A Nation*.) For emphasis, Hilsman adds on the next page:

As mentioned above, the agency had stoutly protected its people from McCarthy and was one of the few parts of government in the Eisenhower era where new ideas were encouraged and activists permitted to do things . . .

It is widely believed that in the Kennedy era activists supported by the C.I.A. in Vietnam were permitted to murder South Vietnamese President Ngo dinh Diem and his brother Ngo dinh Nhu. Reporters as much at odds as the late

Marguerite Higgins and the astute Hilaire du Berrier agree that the Vietnam *coup d'état* of November 1, 1963, had U.S. support. Miss Higgins centered her fire on the State Department. She called Assistant Secretary Hilsman at two a.m. and said, "Congratulations, Roger. How does it feel to have blood on your hands?" (*Our Vietnam Nightmare*, Harper, 1966.) Du Berrier reports in *Background To Betrayal* (Western Islands, 1965):

... the storming of the palace was an affair that the young hot-heads of the USIS [U.S. Information Service] and CIA should have stayed out of. European papers told of American "advisors" entering Gia Long Palace with the first wave of troops . . . Correspondents wrote of American "photographers" whom they had never seen before and who did not use their cameras, accompanying each advancing wave.

Of course, involvement of the C.I.A. in the assassination of Diem by no means automatically proves the Agency's involvement in the assassination of John Kennedy; nor does it prove that this, the only agency to resist successfully the "witch hunt" of Joseph R. McCarthy, was or is anti-Communist, as both Colonel Prouty and New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison have said it was. What is rather well established is that the C.I.A. does not categorically reject assassination as a form of political action. Also established by now is an all but universal belief that the Warren Commission reported erroneously that Lee Harvey Oswald acted wholly alone and on his own in Dallas on November 22, 1963. For this general belief Jim Garrison can claim much credit. He failed (to the astonishment of courtroom spectators) to get a conviction of Clay Shaw in criminal court, and (in my opinion) he is mistaken in supposing that the C.I.A. is "Right-

wing," but he collaterally succeeded in convicting the Warren Commission, in the court of public opinion, of what would be massive perjury had the Commission's report been made under oath.

What has never been settled to even approximate satisfaction is the question of *motive* in the killing of Kennedy. (John Kennedy. The motive in killing Robert Kennedy seems clear. It was to prevent Bobby from becoming President in 1968 and thus in position to avenge his brother's murder.)

The Warren Commission concludes quite rapidly with such psychological verbalizing as that "Oswald was moved by an overriding hostility to his environment" (in which case he might logically have killed someone closer at hand), that he was "perpetually discontented with the world around him" and had "expressed his hatred for American society and acted in protest against it" (in which case he might well have joined Kennedy's Peace Corps, like other youthful protesters). The Commission adds that Oswald's "commitment to Marxism and communism appears to have been another important factor in his motivation," but does not explain how this led him to assassinate the President of the United States. Of course, any such explanation would lead directly to the basic struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States, and to the worldwide Communist campaign to strengthen the former and weaken the latter by every means possible, open or covert. It would lead, as a matter of fact, to the ineluctable conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was involved in a conspiracy to kill Kennedy. This was precisely what the Warren Commission was evidently set up to deny.

It is not my present purpose to go into the immense volume of data in which so many investigators have found so many reasons to reject the main conclusion of the Warren Commission — that Lee Oswald was a "loner." Any number of astute critics, of all shades of political

ideology — from Mark Lane on the Left to Dr. Forrest Chapman on the Right, with Vincent Salandria, Josiah Thompson, Jim Garrison, Sylvia Meagher, and others somewhere in the spectrum — have conducted clinical studies of the pathology of the Warren Commission. I take it for granted that no serious student today accepts the Warren Commission's Report as a true account of the assassination of President Kennedy. But if it is not a true account, *the deception must be deliberate* — for the Warren Commission had every advantage in investigative resources.

In other words, the Report of the Warren Commission was a coverup — greater than, but quite possibly not unrelated to, Watergate. The purpose of the coverup was to protect the secret team (to borrow Colonel Prouty's expression) that did the job, whether Oswald and Jack Ruby were or were not members of that team.

So what was the *motive* of the team? Without pretending to say precisely what the relationship was between the team and the C.I.A. (or the F.B.I. or the Secret Service), we might suppose that the motive originated in discontent with the attitude of President Kennedy toward the C.I.A. His attitude toward the F.B.I. was, from an organization man's point of view, hardly more satisfactory. According to Arthur Schlesinger, Kennedy considered the F.B.I. "one of the most important elements of the American myth" — an "element in the panoply of national power requiring both propitiation and control." (*A Thousand Days*.)

Undoubtedly Kennedy, with true Harvard hauteur, initially regarded the sophisticates of the C.I.A. with significantly greater respect than the comparatively square types of the F.B.I. By the same token, once he had been disillusioned by the bloody fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, he would have seen in an uncontrolled C.I.A. something far more menacing. When the thought struck him that his brother Rob-

ert was being wasted at Justice and should have been put in position to "deal" with the C.I.A., it seems not to have occurred to him that the F.B.I., which is under the Attorney General in Justice, might run amuck without Robert Kennedy's restraining presence.

The C.I.A. had had no trouble with Truman, who did not realize until too late what was happening, and none with Eisenhower, who was undoubtedly himself part of the secret team. Probably the agency did not anticipate trouble with Kennedy, but suddenly trouble developed. It would take no great study to conclude that if you could have trouble with one President, you could have trouble with another — unless you developed a procedure to exercise control of your own over the succession to the Presidency.

The chic British traitor Kim Philby described the difference between the F.B.I. and the C.I.A., even as early as 1949, by saying that the former were homespun Middle Americans, who "were therefore whisky-drinkers, with beer for light refreshment." (Had Philby realized how many F.B.I. men do not drink at all, he would have been shocked.) He continues: "By contrast, C.I.A. men flaunted cosmopolitan postures. [Philby had at that time never heard of a Cosmopolitan centerfold posture.] They would discuss absinthe and serve Burgundy above room temperature. This is not just flippancy. It points to a deep social cleavage between the two organisations, which accounts for at least some of the asperity marking their exchanges." (*My Silent War*, Grove Press, 1968.) The tone — I should say *ton* — of the C.I.A. is cultivated. The Agency exudes culture, though as generally with the radically chic, it may cultivate the brutal, the savage, as well as the fastidious and the epicene.

If I dwell a bit upon the lifestyle of the C.I.A. brotherhood, it is because I imagine it may well be the only agency of the United States Government where

there might be some collective familiarity with the writings of the late Sir James George Frazer, F.R.S., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, author of the monumental anthropological treatise *The Golden Bough: A Study In Magic And Religion*. Frazer says that the primary aim of *The Golden Bough* (which in its full form comprises twelve volumes and in its abridged edition fills 756 pages of small type) is "to explain the remarkable rule which regulated the succession to the priesthood of Diana at Aricia." (Abridged edition, Macmillan, London, 1922, Page v.) Of the woodland lake of Nemi, south-east of Rome, Frazer writes:

In antiquity this sylvan landscape was the scene of a strange and recurring tragedy.... In this sacred grove there grew a certain tree.... A candidate for the priesthood could only succeed to office by slaying the priest, and having slain him, he retained office till he was himself slain by a stronger or a craftier.

* * *

The questions which we have set ourselves to answer are mainly two: first, why had Diana's priest at Nemi, the King of the Wood, to slay his predecessor? Second, why before doing so had he to pluck the branch of a certain tree which the public opinion of the ancients identified with Virgil's Golden Bough?

But it is more economical to quote the summary given by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, where we read: "*The Golden Bough*... directed attention to the combination of priestly with kingly office in the 'divine kingships' widely reported from Africa and elsewhere. According to Frazer, the institution of divine kingship derived from the belief that the well-being of the social and natural orders depended upon the vitality of the king, who must therefore be slain when his

powers began to fail him and be replaced by a vigorous successor."

The Golden Bough is almost a bible to many who reject the Bible. Refusing to accept the attested miracles of Christianity, they seek refuge in every kind of superstition and form their own eclectic or syncretistic mythology. It is not difficult to imagine the interest with which a sophisticated political scientist concerned with the question of Presidential succession might read Frazer's account of the killing of the divine king among the Shilluk, a people of the White Nile. Frazer writes in part as follows:

... regarding their kings as incarnate divinities on whom the welfare of men, of cattle, and of the corn implicitly depends, the Shilluk naturally pay them the greatest respect and take every care of them; and however strange it may seem to us, their custom of putting the divine king to death as soon as he shows signs of ill-health or failing strength springs directly from their profound veneration for him and from their anxiety to preserve him, or rather the divine spirit by which he is animated, in the most perfect state of efficiency: nay, we may go further and say that their practice of regicide is the best proof they can give of the high regard in which they hold their kings.

The passage illustrates the possibility that those who planned the *coup d'état* of November 22, 1963 — howbeit they may have been moved mainly by practical matters of the Presidential succession — could very well have held John Kennedy in the highest (reverential) regard. The other face of that coin is that many who certainly did not and never would or could have plotted John Kennedy's death yet viewed that death, once it had occurred in the manner it did, as an event of

mythological import, of (even beautiful) symbolic significance. Consider this from Edwin S. Shneidman's *Deaths Of Man* (Quadrangle/New York Times Book Company, 1973), a volume with a foreword by Arnold Toynbee:

... the very mention of the assassination of President Kennedy is apt to produce a concatenation of diverse and warring feelings: one may wish him alive and vibrant today, and rank his assassination with Lincoln's as a national tragedy, while at the same time reflecting that there could have been no more Greek-god death for him, no more dramatic end to a meteoric career, no more ennobling climax. What more "appropriate" death could he have had?

You might work yourself up to feeling that Lee Harvey Oswald (or somebody) did John Kennedy a favor. If it was Lee, the favor was quickly returned by Jack Ruby. With interest, for if Lee had lived to face trial he might have brought someone else in to share the spotlight which, thanks to the Warren Commission as well as Jack Ruby, he now occupied in solitary splendor.

It seems of special interest that William Manchester, author of *The Death Of A President* (Harper & Row, 1967), was familiar with the work of Sir James George Frazer, though he does not spell Sir James's last name correctly. Manchester begins his final chapter, "Epilogue: Legend," as follows:

In early April of 1960, during the lull that followed the Wisconsin primary, Senator John F. Kennedy read Mary Renault's *The King Must Die* in his Georgetown home. Although fictive, this novel is based on a custom which Sir James Frazer [sic] found in every early society: the ritualistic murder of

the folk hero. The noble victim went by various names. In Britain he was Arthur [whose court and palace were at Camelot], in Germany Siegfried, in France Roland, in Scandinavia Balder the Beautiful; Mediterranean tribes knew him as Apollo, Attis, Moses, Adonis, and Osiris, and ancient India had loved and lost Vitramaditya

Manchester's summary seems inaccurate; in the abridged *Golden Bough* Frazer does not treat of Arthur, Siegfried, Roland, Moses, or (by name at least) Vitramaditya. He does indeed treat — and at great length — of Balder, Attis, Adonis, and Osiris. There are numerous references to Apollo, but that major Olympian deity is scarcely a "folk hero," nor do we have myths concerning his death, though considering that he was the god of light and poetry perhaps we should have. Yet if it be somewhat strange to have Apollo in this list, to have Moses classified with Adonis passes understanding.

Inaccurate or accurate as a summary of Frazer, Manchester's report is still a blockbuster if he is correct — and we have no reason to suppose that in this he is not — in saying that six months before he was elected President, John Kennedy read a book entitled *The King Must Die*. Manchester's own use of this extraordinary biographical datum is to comment: "In the twentieth century that legend [of the ritualistic murder of the folk hero] is vestigial. Yet no one familiar with world religions can doubt its viability, and the nature of its atavistic power must be understood if one is to grasp what happened to the memory of John Kennedy."

I would amend that to read: *if one is to grasp what happened to John Kennedy*. It would be very chic to dress a political assassination with leaves from *The Golden Bough*. The F.B.I. would never think of it.

Those who worry about liberty and constitutional government in America

(and what American does not?) frequently concern themselves with the election process — whether the Electoral College should be retained; if so, what relationship should exist between popular vote and electoral vote; how party nominations should be determined — by convention, by primaries, by some combination, or none of these; whether we should strive to maintain "the two-party system" or encourage the formation of new parties — on and on. Yet such questions lose their relevance if there is in fact a clandestine system operating effectively to veto any choice the electorate might make (by whatever means) if the winner is not acceptable to an invisible elite.

John F. Kennedy, originally thought to be agreeable to the *Insiders* (though not one of them), proved intractable in his relations with the Central Intelligence Agency, and particularly in his opposition to further buildup in Vietnam. He was assassinated.

Lyndon Johnson, though culturally alien (i.e., Middle American, Southwest subdivision), was viewed hopefully by the *Insiders* as possibly just the man for political maneuvering unhampered by scrupulosity, though capable of unctious if that should seem useful. Johnson was very satisfactory in the Vietnam buildup, but (possibly because of some residual sincerity in his chauvinism) apparently intended to use some of that buildup to badger North Vietnam. When he declined to seek or accept his party's nomination in 1968 (when he could almost surely have won re-election) he was not unmindful of the *coup* which had made him President in the first place.

Bobby Kennedy seemed assured of the Democratic nomination after Johnson's abdication. He was, however, the *last* person the *Insiders* wanted in that office at that time. He was shot by a conveniently fanatic Arab. Possibly Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon were equally acceptable to the *Insiders* in

1968, though the history of the two 1968 conventions suggests a preference for Nixon. What shook the experts (including no doubt the *Insiders* themselves) was the nearly ten million votes George Wallace got. *That* had not been anticipated.

When in 1972 Wallace announced he would run as a Democrat, the *Insiders* must have breathed a temporary sigh of relief. They were sure (as of January) that Wallace could not get the Democratic nomination (which was in retrospect clearly intended all along for George McGovern), and sure that if he did get it he could not win the election against the incumbent Nixon. By May they were not sure of anything. Wallace's triumphs in Florida and Wisconsin, his visibly approaching triumph in Michigan, of all places, and the nationwide stir over the issue of school busing signaled a possible upset of the game plan to nominate McGovern and re-elect Nixon. In Laurel, Maryland, on May fifteenth, Wallace was shot five times at point blank range by Arthur Bremer. Miraculously, the Alabama populist survived. *Vox populi, vox dei*. The voice of the people is the voice of God, and that day in Laurel God protected His man. Nevertheless, the *Insiders* (through another secret team) had effectively vetoed Wallace's nomination as a Democrat in 1972, as they had vetoed Bobby's in 1968.

Then in 1973 came the revelations of Watergate, triggered by old C.I.A. agent Jim McCord, and the nation learned that there was indeed in Washington a secret team — or perhaps a whole secret major league. No one any longer doubts that the mystique of power in America (as in the world) involves hidden or significantly deceptive actions taken by secret agencies — CREEP (this name for the Committee to Re-Elect the President is itself bureaucratic slang for a secret agent), C.I.A., F.B.I., Secret Service, National Security Council, and others, including the Symbionese Liberation Army (S.L.A.), which is presumably nongovernmental, though as

we have noted, nobody knows *what* C.I.A. does with its money.

Jeffrey Hart has written that the S.L.A. represents "the appearance on the American scene of the distinctive political institution of the 1970's: the small, extremely violent, underground terrorist group." (*Human Events*, March 23, 1974.) What must be realized is that in an era when such groups flourish, the issue will be settled by violence, or the credible threat thereof, which is a form of terror. It is to be hoped that the prevailing violence or terror will be that of police agencies which openly and honestly represent and protect the people whose taxes support them. But the issue of violence cannot be avoided. That is why legitimate governments exist.

Of primary importance is the question whether the Chief Executive is legitimately chosen. So long as our government supports an agency of the magnitude of the C.I.A., with the license to kill and vast secret funds, there is little likelihood that any President can be elected or even nominated without its consent.

Watergate has taught us the importance in illicit action by governmental or quasi-governmental agencies of the "cover-up." Consider now the irony of our present national situation. Because he is suspected of complicity in the coverup of the break-in at Watergate, President Nixon is threatened with impeachment and removal from office. Yet the most criminal coverup ever imputed to a governmental agency is the coverup by the Warren Commission of evidence of a conspiracy in the murder of John Kennedy. Such a coverup means that the Warren Commission knowingly aided every conspirator except Lee Harvey Oswald to escape, and means that the members of the Warren Commission are, in Sylvia Meagher's phrase, accessories after the fact in the assassination of President Kennedy.

And a member of the Warren Commission is now Vice President of the United States. ■ ■

WELL SAID!