

1/21/74

The page you sent me from Fortune 12/73, "The Rethinking of U.S. Detente," is quite interesting. I can't cite the page because it appears to be a left-hand <sup>page</sup> and that edge, about 3/8", is missing. The caption, partly missing, reads, "\_\_\_\_\_ circle at the CIA." Perhaps there was nothing in what followed that you thought would interest me. This section does continue.

There is no intelligence agency that can't be criticized with considerable legitimacy. There is also none that isn't criticized unjustifiably. I have my own beliefs about what happened at CIA. Some is indicated here.

Helms would not take the WG rap without a direct order from Nixon, who could not give it without incriminating himself. Helms got it because he refused to incriminate the Agency to exculpate Nixon. I have more on this than is public.

Kissinger's reasons are neither stylistic nor academic. He could not and would not brook independent analyses so he had to end them. Any means to the end satisfied him, just so he ended it. The little that appears in the Pentagon Papers makes the point that there came a time when there were major policy differences and the White House and the brass were wrong. They didn't learn. The CIA wanted success. It was not a matter of high principle.

Schlesinger's role in these affairs is not at all as this page concludes, "insisted that the CIA lay bare its entire embarrassing involvement in the [Watergate] episode." The committee didn't want it and the CIA didn't <sup>do</sup> it and what it did do the committees suppressed, because that little was too much.

Unless we know where that fired 1,000 came from we don't know what happened inside the Agency. They have been described as "old timers." This could mean not the right-wingers but those of the "liberal" part of the family. Where reductions should have been made - and not based on age - was in dirty tricks. There is no indication of which I am aware that reductions were by function except with the ~~Kissinger~~ Kissinger end of the analyses. And this is the essence of real intelligence. It can be heeded or ignored by those with the power, but it must be made. And independently.

So we have Kissinger who, unless there had been a change of which I am not aware, in a large measure of control over intelligence because he is chairman of the Forty Committee and because of his White House role, ending independent analyses by the CIA and at the same time controlling those made by State, which he also heads. In short, precisely the situation that crippled Hitler: one man controls what can be reported and credited while at the same time he controls the policy that is supposed to be influenced if not formulated based on independent analyses.

It is to pray for disaster.

And, of course, it is totalitarian.

So, if there is anything else in this piece that might be of interest, I'd like to see it, as I would anything related that you may see.

I have and have read Hunt's The Coven, so if you see it, thanks but don't get it. I found it relevant enough to be looking for the other things he did dealing with diabolism apparently under the pen-name St. John and reprinted by Fawcett.

I also have and have barely begun Szulc's Compulsive Spy. If you see any promos on him or it I'd like to see if they drop anything.

Szulc seems very much to be a secret voice of the "liberal" survivors in CIA.

Over the weekend there were radio reports of a Times of London expose not in the WxPost. Seems that we have 40 agents, whether in toto or additions not clear, in England spooking over their labor problems. Does this seem like a necessary CIA function - or even a proper one? Or that the right guys - even the right kinds of guys - were fired in the Schlesinger purges?

No, the reporting fails to indicate what happened.

Thanks,