

JAN 30 1975

JDW, Further ref your 1/6/75; spooks

1/18/75

The apparently unclear purpose of my visit to the road company on the other side of the river was to initiate an amicable settlement in redress of grievances not fully spelled out, not expected, but as you note, a first step. It gives them options they might not ask for and there is too much I can't do to start this one at what will probably be the end but need not be. Think it is time for a reminder.

On the orchestration of anti-CIA leaks one thing is perfectly clear: part of the CIA is shielded, as are some of the operations this part opposes, so I assume this part, namely so-called Ivy League liberals, took the initiative and have continued leaking after inspiring others to do likewise.

It is not certain that on the long run this leaking will not serve all CIA ends, those of the liberals and those of the baddies, who have already made their sacrifices. (If I read the international signs, detente may mean something else or be something else soon, so there may be regrets. But the Operations paranoia was long past its day.)

1/28/75: Other developments you know of. Like they did, too, find a few more things on me in the files. JL is to nudge again this week if he's heard no more.

To give you a better picture of what lies behind this, and I think that it is really the need for long overdue change, there is a guy I know slightly who works there in a completely non-operating capacity. He is a bookkeeper type, straight stuff. His view he puts simply, that the Angletons are of a different era and had outlived their time. There had to be this kind of change. This is also part of what I meant above in saying that what is happening serves all legitimate interests, including in the long run that of an efficient intelligence service.

Now I don't see any way reform could have been initiated simply because there was the need or because the international situation had changed.

Picture of these guys saying they were wrong, or the Russians were not about to land from some orbiting satellite.

The only way it could be brought about was by way of some kind of scandal. And the only kind of scandal that would not really hurt the essential international operations had to be what did not focus on them. Not even the bad ones. Note that the Chile exposures did not bring this to pass.

With Nixon having booted Helms he and the antedeluvians were natural goats. And there was Hunt who had already pinned a bum rap on LBJ to sweeten it for the GOPs. Not that LBJ was not responsible for bad things. That Goldwater things does not stack. And LBJ did not invent it. He and the peaceniks were convenient and not party-in-power.

There has been no time in years when this story could not have broken, as I've indicated in a more limited sense elsewhere, re my efforts. I tried to interest the Post in the story CDN broke over the weekend in 1968. Paul Valentine saw all I then had on it, much more than I told Finley. He was turned down. And you know of the WG-connected efforts.

Another partial answer to your question, who is behind it, I think is the anti-spooks. Any reading of Marchetti is consistent with this, too. Then also Kissinger put a crimp in the important part, analysis. So it is these guys and their friends who are fighting back.

Hurt to the CIA has to be defined. The hurt will be to wrongdoers only and then not as much as it should be. Actually, the Agency will be better off with a purge. Nobody will really be hurt personally. And in the end I think a better intelligence service will be the result. Perhaps not as the out-of-date ones want but as the new need requires. There will be strong resistance from the spooks and the revanchists. And there will not be all the exposure and reform needed, as the circumspection of the leaking forecasts.

fw

x On your agreement that the name of the grandfather is consistent with the ^{Leigh} alias being one of Hunt's unknown ones, would you please consider another possibility in terms of what you can recollect of what you read: is the content such that he could have enjoyed doing the book more than he did the others and thus did a better job? Some of his earlier writing, for example, is much better than what he turned out when he was boiling pots. And while there seems to have been no need for his hiding this moonlighting from the CIA, I suppose it is also possible that there are times when doing that might have seemed expedient. Helms seems to have been Gung Ho! for what he wrote. Perhaps others were not or he thought might not be. The sheer volume is consistent with the CIA subsidizing him to do it. And having read his own account of his own career, it is singularly skimpy. This is to say that he accounts for remarkably little real intelligence work for all those years of which he boasts so much.

The DC library has other Leigh books. Lesar is skimming.

He has established an interesting Weybright connection, with a publisher who has known connections. I'll be learning more when I get copies of his notes.

Going back to your agreement that little new seems to be emerging, let me add two things: more easily could and hasn't and this and more would have come out several years ago if there had not been widespread refusal to touch any of it. I have written some of this and offered it to many. Off the top, with variations in the nature of the offer but in no case not one that would not have led to fuller disclosures:

All TV nets, including PBS through NBACT (with IV); WxPost, LATimes, Time, Newsweek, AFL/CIO, Knight papers, Mollenhoff, London Sunday Times, and quite a number on Capitol Hill.

Hersh did not phone yesterday. He should have had my letter in time to. I did not expect him to and had not written a conciliatory letter.

What he did do is sick. He tried to check Roffman out with George O'Toole, of the PSE jazz. O'Toole is suddenly an expert on the JFK assassination? Because he is a former CIAer? What other expertise can Hersh attribute to him?

Naturally, O'Toole, who has done no real work, had never heard of Howard. So he asked Bud about him. From Bud he learned only that Howard is "some kid in school." Not that Bud could not have been more informative. Not that he does not know of my relationship with Howard. Bud also does not like Howard's strong reaction to a very sick appearance Bud and Sprague made jointly at the Unix. Penna.

What it any influence this has on Hersh and the solid material on Belin we'll see.

But it was not the way to be helpful to Hersh or to getting the Belin story out.

What Bud told Jim he had told Goulden about me is that we have personality differences but on fact and analysis he has never known me to be wrong and knows of nobody who dependability or work can be compared with mine. This is a somewhat higher recommendation than I have ever known him to offer. I do think it is not impossible today. I think it is more likely that Bud was much stronger than "personality differences." More like I can't stand the arrogant son-of-a-bitch.

That the Goulden/Washingtonian interest coincides with the beginning of the breaking of the CIA story and follows upon Szulc's clobbering of Kissinger is a provocative coincidence. Both are contributing editors of The Washingtonian.

Evaluation of Marchetti's book: he does not intend uncovering all that is possible. This is consistent with his belief that there is a need for an intelligence agency but not its excesses. Well, he manages not to give the address of the CIA's downtown office for the domestic-intelligence operation. He knew it. I checked it with him. The odd thing is that I had forgotten that Wise & Ross (Wise at least officed in the same building then) gave it years ago. I thus went to much work to figure it out (accurately, further than W & R did). I thus find omission of this specific interesting.

Best,

