

Superficially critical of the CIA and exploiting its alleged role in foreign assassinations, this piece is actually a reformist pro-CIA piece that blames all the vices and abuses on political rather than inside-CIA figures.

Leaders range from presidents to Kissinger, to whom it is unfriendly (which is not to say unfair.)

The CIA line is apparently throughout to a careful reading. Any other kind gives the impression it is a real expose. Actually, unless the allegation of nuclear help to Israel is unpublished, there is nothing factually new here.

It says (129) that there is no CIA Portugal involvement. Aside from the impossibility of knowing the sleeper agents there or the leadership in the anti-government parties that were CIA, with or without present connection, the identity between the anti-government and CIA interests is quite obvious. He does not say it is not known. He is specific in using an unidentified source as saying there is no present CIA involvement, an improbability and something nobody can really know. Either way. (Not naming sources when they are known publicly is another characteristic of this writing.) (p.129)

Perhaps the single most important line in this entire piece that is so carefully promoted to make it appear to be a real expose is the repeated and false line that there can be no political assassination with an American CIA agent involved without presidential knowledge and approval. (pp. 124,6,30)

With a three-month publication lag one can anticipate problems that can be caused by developments. It is now clear that there were CIA plots vs. Castro, many of them; and in no case is there even credible evidence that any President approved any plot of that the 40 Committee even passed on one.

There were plots - confirmed. Then how can any responsible writer who serves no hidden master claim that presidential approval was re-requisite?

= In the day's context this is another anti-Kennedy "liberal" tax-job/ CIA defense.

It is made up of the non-secret, generally the well-publicized of the past, but is palmed off as new and sensational, an expose, which it in no sense is.

The blurbing says this is the fourth of a series.

Without regard to the earlier three, this serves CIA's gut interests.

Even in laying it on Kissinger.

One continues to wonder why when all his earlier books have the same pro-CIA lines.