

Dear Jim,

9/17/73

To paraphrase <sup>Lope</sup>, I found ~~myxxsxxk~~ temptation toox hasty to stay, and my thoughts to the Ramparts just flying away.

So, I dropped other things and read Prouty's Watergate and the World of the CIA. It is, I think, both more and less than that, but it is not quite that.

For some time I have been wondering if, whether or not officially, Prouty is an Army cutting edge against the CIA. This provides no definitive answers, but it does not in any way discourage the belief and there is in it what can be used to argue the case. One minor example is in "Once a Spy", where once a Marine is to be always a Marine, once CIA is to be perpetually a CIA and perpetually under its protection. (49).

Because the conclusions are not supported by the body, I am, naturally, suspicious. More so because the conclusions will be so attractive to the informed reader as to the prejudiced. Because the allegations are excessive, I also find myself wondering if this is no more than his conviction speaking.

He is correct under "Super-Crinkite" (47) in saying that the daily CIA briefing tended to make the President the CIA's captive. What he omits here is that the daily briefing was only an extension of what began in OSS. I was in the shop that did it. For the top military as well as the White House. We were the ones who did the elaborate visuals for those presentations. We also had a staff of Hollywoodians to go with the artists like Eiro Saarinen and Henry Koerner and others later also very well known.

I find the quote of Lyman Kirkpatrick(47) that is faithful to his writing but not faithful to its spirit as it is not faithful to fact one of the more interesting protections of the military. The Bay of Pigs plan was military and CIA and there is no out for either in Kirkpatrick's claim that if JFK had gone within the framework of an NSC system" he "would have received a more realistic appraisal..." If my belief that the Bay of Pigs was designed to fail is right then this is even more persuasively a deliberate protection of those in the military who were guilty. (Even Hunt in Give Us This Day leaves no doubt that even Bender had nothing to do with the strategy.)

Haig's indebtedness to the CIS for his rapid rise (47) fascinates but has no direct relevance to the thrust of the article and its "proofs".

To say that when the Director of CIA is assigned to an important subordinate post (48) he is other than canned and to ignore that this happened only a couple of months before his (to have been honored) retirement is to be dishonest. It, as everything else in this piece, is favorable to Nixon. His conclusions, in fact, are based upon the unquestioned truthfulness of Nixon's explanations. He even blames Nixon's police-state concept on everyone else, especially the spooks.

This is not to degrade his interesting suggestion that Iran will become the center of the next trouble, a reasonable conjecture that has nothing to do with Helms' assignment there or his being canned.

Interesting that this former AF man says that only the Army's of military-intelligence groups "became involved in domestic activities." (48) Untrue. Larger scale true because it had larger appropriations, manpower and special responsibilities that were abused.

"One of the telling features of the Watergate episode(sic) is that it drew together a number of CIA personnel - past and present." False. It is less a "feature" than an expectable coincidence, an inevitable consequence of selecting Hunt. (49) This also has the effect of exculpating Nixon and his goons.

I know of cases where the CIA did not "show up to see that he does not stray from the narrow path." (49) But if we take this as truth, Boxley becomes more interesting. This again is Nixon exculpation.

That there must have been, his words, continuing relationships between Hunt and Barker et al for a decade is irrelevant and unsupported. (49)

That they must be "much more valuable to someone that their participation in the Watergate would warrant" is both false and exculpating of Nixon. The fact is that the money was intercepted by Hunt, who gave them crumbs only. The falsity here is relating it to CIA rather than to Nixon. (49)

The LBJ quote (49) is enormously distorted in its interpretation. The interpretation he gives it is refuted by LBJ's telling Janos and what he omits, telling Cronkite much

earlier. Many better explanations are more obvious and more reasonable. There is no basis for this one. One is the legitimacy of LBJ's presidency. Another is that the falsity of the WR was taht obvious.

Consistent with his gnat-rupturing is the misstatement of the U-2 reality (49-50). The Powers overflight in itself was enough, if not as certain as the shooting down.

(His saying that orders were given to abort pre-summit China overflights is new to me, is logical and expactable, and I can t argue with his conclusion, which I have always believed, that the Powers flgiht was ordêred, was deliberate.)

That "Kennedy ~~was~~ ran afoul of a deeper conspiracy", that LBJ's "statement suggests" this and that this and this alone is why JFK was killed is at best dubious and at worst wotr much thought. †t again shelters the military as well as the probable assassins.(50)

It is to torture political reality to say that this fear alone is what caused LBJ to decide not to run again, as it is also to again protect the military. (50)

In the light of these few criticisms, coming from a single hasty reading, it may be that his concluding paragrpah is worth more analysis than I can not take time for. It is phrased in a way to protect and hide just about everyone except, by inference and the thrust of what preceeds, the CIA. Especially Nixon.

cc HR, JL

HW 9/17/73