

Dear Jim, When a writer believes what he says it may be unfair to call him dishonest. What then may be relevant is what he believes and thereafter what his belief drives him to do and to write. I have only begun Tad Szulc's Dominican Diary. I regard the beginning as dishonest writing by a dishonest writer. He sneaks his prejudices in. Honesty requires making them and the reasons for them explicit. I am aware that perhaps he is unaware, that in expressing his belief he believes he writes honestly, but I do not believe it to be the case. He is neither insensitive nor a fool. I believe he knew exactly what he was doing and writing when he did this. And because it is not presented as and is not a scholarly work, because it is aimed at a popular audience, I believe the inherent dishonesty is more culpable. The net effect is to validate evil and justify American intervention to the point I've reached. He is to this point laying a foundation for reader belief that any allegation of any "communist" influence is in and of itself justification for anything, the inherent faith of the "liberal" wing of the CIA. Consistent with this is an assortment of clever but intellectually dirty writer's tricks. One is to say that while JFK broke relations "the United States" considered restoring them. Maybe some of his fellow-believers, but not JFK. Another is to present LBJ's belief as though it was original with him whereas there had to have been an input to him that was given to him as solidly factual. Again, this most likely came from those we believe were Szulc's associates. To summarize, the beginning is entirely consistent with Szulc's serving of the interests of the "liberal" CIA faction and is entirely inconsistent with straightforward, honest reporting. He is so caught up in this that whereas he begins by saying that the Times sent him there, he actually says he went there because of his wife's "intuition." This immediately suggests that the man will be depending on devices. Paralleling the political dishonesty that claiming red justifies anything is the total absence of characterization of the belief of the fascists as fascist belief, or as fascism. This is carried out to the finest detail, as where he never indicates the ownership of the media that campaigned against Bosch or its political orientation. It is made to seem as the expression of majority, popular belief and that Bosch's beliefs and practises led to his overthrow. The only descriptives to this point are "dictatorship" as applied with no further description to Trujillo and "rightist" without indication of what is encompassed. In short, all indications are that our analysis is correct. HW 11/4/73

Ed, to a friend and for your information