



THE DAVID ROCKEFELLER CENTER  
FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

Working Papers on Latin America



**"The Case of the Missing Letter in  
*Foreign Affairs*: Kissinger, Pinochet and  
Operation Condor"**

**By Kenneth Maxwell**

**No. 04/05-3**

## The Author

**Kenneth Maxwell**, Senior Fellow at Harvard University's David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies and Visiting Professor in the Department of History, was until July 2004 the Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Inter-American Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations and Western Hemisphere book reviewer for *Foreign Affairs*.

His latest books are a new edition of the classic *Conflicts and Conspiracies: Brazil and Portugal 1750-1808* (Routledge, 2004), widely known in Brazil in translation as *A Devassa da Devassa*, and *Naked Tropics: Essays on Empire and Other Rogues* (Routledge, 2003).

Contact: [kmaxwell@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:kmaxwell@fas.harvard.edu)

Published by the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies (DRCLAS),  
Harvard University.

Copyright © 2004 Kenneth Maxwell

The author bears sole responsibility for this paper. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies or Harvard University.

## **DAVID ROCKEFELLER CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES**

### **Mission**

The David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies (DRCLAS) at Harvard University works to increase knowledge of the cultures, histories, environment and contemporary affairs of Latin America; foster cooperation and understanding among the people of the Americas; and contribute to democracy, social progress and sustainable development throughout the hemisphere.

### **Working Papers on Latin America**

Harvard affiliates are encouraged to submit papers to the Harvard Working Papers on Latin America series. Copies of published working papers may be purchased at the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies for \$5.00 (add \$1.00 for postage and handling if mailing is necessary). Please make checks payable to Harvard University. Working papers can be found free of charge online at <<http://drclas.fas.harvard.edu>>.

For information about DRCLAS programs, activities, and publications such as this Working Paper Series, contact:

June Carolyn Erlick, Publications Director  
David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies  
Harvard University  
61 Kirkland Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Tel: 617-495-5428  
Fax: 617-496-2802  
e-mail: [jerlick@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:jerlick@fas.harvard.edu)  
internet: <http://drclas.fas.harvard.edu>

# The Case of the Missing Letter in *Foreign Affairs*: Kissinger, Pinochet and Operation Condor

By Kenneth Maxwell

*It may seem strange that in a book describing my stewardship of affairs I should feel obliged to include a chapter on the downfall of Chile President Salvador Allende Gossens in September 1973. It is a testament to the power of political mythology – for, contrary to anti-American propaganda around the world and revisionist history in the United States, our government had nothing to do with planning his overthrow and no involvement with the plotters.*

–Henry A. Kissinger, *The Years of Upheaval* (1982): 374

*There are no secrets that time does not reveal.*

–Jean Racine, *Britannicus*, Act 4, sc. 4 (1669)

## **PROLOGUE**

Henry A. Kissinger and William D. Rogers, his long-term collaborator and vice chairman of his consulting firm, Kissinger Associates, Inc., are at the center of the nasty imbroglio at *Foreign Affairs* magazine which is the subject of this paper. What follows is a Nixonian drama in four acts: preemption, suppression, and cover-up followed by denial; and it led to my resignation in May 2004 as Western Hemisphere book reviewer at *Foreign Affairs* and from my endowed chair as a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations over what I regard as a fundamental matter of principle. This was not a battle I sought out, nor was it on a topic of my choosing.

Three strands had come together in 2003 which refocused attention on the U.S. role in Chile during the 1970s: (1) the thirtieth anniversary of the coup of September 11, 1973, which overthrew President Salvador Allende, was imminent; (2) thousands of U.S. government documents had been declassified as a consequence of the arrest of General Augusto Pinochet in London on October 16, 1998; and (3) the dogged and on-going efforts over the years of the National Security Archive (NSA), a Washington-based non-governmental research group at George Washington University, to gain access to the secret records about Chile under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) were beginning to bear fruit. The NSA's lead researcher on Chile, Peter Kornbluh, took advantage of these circumstances to produce a powerful and comprehensive dossier on Chile and the United States, entitled *The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability*.<sup>1</sup>

I was asked to write a review of Kornbluh's book by James F. Hoge, Jr., the editor of *Foreign Affairs*. I did so, and it appeared in the November/December 2003 issue of the magazine under the title "The Other 9/11: The United States and Chile, 1973."<sup>2</sup> My review

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability* (New York: New Press, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> Kenneth Maxwell, "The Other 9/11: The United States and Chile, 1973," Book Review Essay, *Foreign Affairs* 82, no. 6 (November/December 2003): 147-151.

provoked a response from Rogers, who had served under Kissinger in the State Department in the 1970s, to which I replied. This exchange was published in the January/February 2004 issue of the magazine.<sup>3</sup> Rogers then wrote again, angrily attacking me for alleged “bias,” and Kissinger conveyed his acute displeasure to Hoge via at least two powerful intermediaries. This time I was not permitted to reply.<sup>4</sup> The questions in debate were thus left overly personalized and diverted attention from the real issues.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the unprecedented denial of the right of response by *Foreign Affairs* to one of the magazine’s own book reviewers to a harshly critical letter about a review allowed serious misrepresentations of historical fact and ad hominem accusations of bias to stand unchallenged. The result was to cut off a discussion about the role of the United States and Henry Kissinger in Chile, and of the accountability of public officials in highly controversial foreign policy actions in the principal foreign affairs journal of the nation. This converted a controversy over the historical record into a suppression of free debate.

At the core of the objection from Rogers and Kissinger was my discussion of Operation Condor, a state-sponsored terror network set up by the Pinochet regime to track and eliminate opponents, and one of its most notorious actions, the assassination on September 21, 1976, of Orlando Letelier, Allende’s foreign minister and later minister of defense, less than fourteen blocks from the White House. I had told Hoge privately, both in person and in writing, that if the debate over these questions was suppressed because of Kissinger’s pressure on *Foreign Affairs*, this would inevitably in the course of time become a public matter damaging to the reputation of *Foreign Affairs* and the Council on Foreign Relations, its publisher. It was a toxic mix, and it was foolish to believe it would go away: the combination of the names of Pinochet and Kissinger; the story of Letelier’s assassination; the coincidence of the terrorist attack on the United States in 2001 and of Allende’s overthrow in 1973 both taking place on a September 11; the imminent release of declassified documents that would refocus attention on Kissinger’s policies toward the military dictatorships in South America and Operation Condor—all these elements together would guarantee attention. I attempted over several months to quietly persuade Hoge that the situation was unacceptable. Nevertheless *Foreign Affairs* did not address the issue and continues to let it fester.

The September/October 2004 issue of the magazine contained a letter of protest signed by Harvard Professor John Coatsworth and ten other distinguished Latin Americanists who are members of the Council on Foreign Relations, as well as a response by Hoge. The protest letter reads:

---

<sup>3</sup> William D. Rogers, “Mythmaking and Foreign Policy,” letter to the editor, and Kenneth Maxwell, “Maxwell Replies,” in “Response: Fleeing the Chilean Coup; The Debate Over U.S. Complicity,” *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 1 (January/February 2004): 160-165.

<sup>4</sup> William D. Rogers, “Crisis Prevention,” letter to the editor, *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 2 (March/April 2004): 179-180.

<sup>5</sup> My own view on these matters is that human rights should be upheld regardless of the ideological complexion of the regime violating them. In fact, I had never been forgiven by some leading figures on the Left in Portugal for defending the right to due process of the would-be Portuguese Pinochet, General Kaúlza de Arriaga, in a letter to the *New York Review of Books* at the height of the Portuguese Revolution. I had been the first to criticize publicly the fact that many individuals in 1975 in Portugal were being held in jail without due process. See Kenneth Maxwell, “Letter From a Portuguese Prison,” in response to “Portugal Under Pressure” (May 29, 1975), *New York Review of Books* 22, no. 20 (December 11, 1975).

*To the Editor:*

We members of the Council on Foreign Relations have devoted much of our professional lives to the study of Latin America and the relations between the United States and this region. We read Kenneth Maxwell's balanced and thoughtful review (November/December 2003) of the recent collection of official documents edited by Peter Kornbluh and published by the National Security Archive under the title *The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability*.

We were thus dismayed by the tone and the content of the two letters from former Undersecretary of State William D. Rogers (January/February 2004 and March/April 2004), and appalled by the journal's decision not to publish a response by Maxwell to the second of the Rogers letters, which sought to impugn the motives and integrity of Maxwell, a scholar of impeccable rigor and honesty. This decision denied readers an opportunity to weigh competing views, contrary to the journal's policies and traditions.<sup>6</sup>

In his response, "The Editor Replies," Hoge claims:

*Foreign Affairs* believes Maxwell and Rogers were given ample opportunity to have their competing views weighed in the exchange of correspondence that was published in the January/February issue. Subsequently, Rogers complained that Maxwell's reply to his response contained a new and damaging implication. Maxwell confirmed that he was implying that Rogers and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had contributed to the creation of a permissive environment for political violence by Chile's government under Augusto Pinochet. Rogers was given the opportunity to reply to that specific issue in a second letter. An early draft was read over the telephone to Maxwell and he agreed that it should end the exchange. That agreement was then conveyed to Rogers. Later, Maxwell reconsidered and sought a reply on the premise that Rogers went beyond addressing the issue in question and impugned Maxwell's professional integrity. *Foreign Affairs* felt there was not sufficient cause or fresh information to warrant a change in the agreed-upon ground rule.<sup>7</sup>

The "Letters to the Editor" section where this exchange appears has not been posted on the magazine's online edition of this issue, the first time such a letters column has been excluded.<sup>8</sup> Rogers' letter attacking me for bias, for example, is posted online under the title "Crisis Prevention."<sup>9</sup> Nor is there any acknowledgment in this issue of *Foreign Affairs* that book reviews on the Western Hemisphere are missing, the first time this has happened.<sup>10</sup>

More seriously, Hoge, without the consent of the signatories, removed the final sentence of the letter sent to him. The uncensored version had concluded with a request:

We urge you to find an appropriate way to repair this lapse before it becomes a permanent stain on the reputation of *Foreign Affairs*.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> John Coatsworth, Albert Fishlow, Robert Kaufman, Martha Muse, Renate Rennie, Riordan Roett, Thomas Skidmore, Paul Sigmund, Clint Smith, Alfred Stepan, and Nancy Truitt, "Kenneth Maxwell," letter to the editor, *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 5 (September/October 2004): 187.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> See <http://www.foreignaffairs.org>.

<sup>9</sup> See <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20040301faletter83269/william-d-rogers/crisis-prevention.html>.

<sup>10</sup> Princeton Professor Jeremy Adelman, who had been appointed my successor as Western Hemisphere book reviewer for *Foreign Affairs*, resigned shortly after his appointment. See David Glenn, "Foreign Affairs Loses a Longtime Editor and His Replacement in Row Over Editorial Independence," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 25, 2004: "On June 11, Jeremy I. Adelman, a Princeton University historian hired to succeed Kenneth R. Maxwell as the magazine's book-review editor for the Western Hemisphere, resigned after only three weeks."

<sup>11</sup> John Coatsworth, e-mail message to author, May 11, 2004: "FYI."

Hoge excised this sentence. He avoided thereby the central issue in contention, justifying his action by claiming that a “ground rule” was established and agreed to. It was not. He relies on one-sided accounting of carefully contrived one-on-one conversations to sustain his argument. In doing so Hoge has implied publicly, and claimed privately to reporters, that I am lying about the pressure brought to bear by Henry Kissinger on *Foreign Affairs*:

Mr. Hoge ... denied that Mr. Kissinger had pressured him. He demanded that Mr. Maxwell produce proof of his accusation. He said that he did not print Mr. Maxwell’s final rebuttal because both sides had had their say. Mr. Maxwell said that he had learned of the pressure in discussions with Mr. Hoge and had kept records of those conversations.<sup>12</sup>

I draw on these records here. The detailed paper trail in this case is partly the fortuitous result of the fact I was traveling extensively for business in Europe and South America at this time. I also was advised, by a close friend with whom I discussed the controversy as it began to develop, to keep a detailed log for my protection, which I began in mid-November of 2003.<sup>13</sup>

The letter from Coatsworth and his colleagues gave Hoge the opportunity to end the controversy gracefully, either by publishing the rebuttal to Rogers’ accusation of bias I had submitted, or by correcting Rogers’ misstatements of facts. Instead, as I will demonstrate, he chose to give precedence to a secret promise made to Rogers.

Hoge has been the editor of *Foreign Affairs* since 1992. After a career in journalism at the *Chicago Sun-Times*, where he rose to become editor-in-chief and publisher, he moved to New York in 1984 to become president and publisher of the *New York Daily News*. Hoge is vice chair of the board of Human Rights Watch and chairman of the board of the International Center for Journalists. He had invited me to take over the Western Hemisphere book review section in 1993. I had enjoyed a cordial relationship with him over the years and greatly enjoyed my job at *Foreign Affairs*. He had never sought to influence what I wrote in the book reviews section and the choice of books to be reviewed was left entirely to my discretion.

The Council on Foreign Relations and *Foreign Affairs* have played an important role in American society. I had happy and productive years—fifteen and eleven years respectively—working for both. My repeated private efforts over several months to persuade Hoge to deal frankly with this matter was motivated by my desire to protect the reputation of the Council and *Foreign Affairs*, not damage them. As I told Hoge and Richard N. Haass, president of the Council, in my letters of resignation of May 13, 2004:

I have no personal ax to grind in this matter, but I do have a historian’s obligation to the accuracy of the historical record. The Council’s current relationship with Mr. Kissinger evidently comes at the cost of suppressing debate about his actions as a public figure. This I want no part of.

---

<sup>12</sup> Diana Jean Schemo, “Dispute Over Pinochet Book Claims Another Casualty,” *New York Times*, June 16, 2004, The Arts/Cultural Desk, sec. E.

<sup>13</sup> The log was maintained jointly throughout with my immediate staff at the Latin America Studies Program at the Council on Foreign Relations. I am greatly in their debt for their loyalty, discretion, and resilience during a very stressful period.

## ACT I: PREEMPTION

Henry Kissinger and William Rogers, who has become his surrogate in these matters, would have it that the accusation that the United States played a role in Pinochet's bloody overthrow on September 11, 1973, of the democratically-elected government of Salvador Allende, is a "myth" that is "lovingly nurtured by the Latin American left."<sup>14</sup> Both men went to considerable efforts to preempt the critical reception of Peter Kornbluh's book prior to its publication, a volume based on thousands of declassified U.S. government documents concerning U.S. policy toward Chile while Kissinger was National Security Advisor to President Richard M. Nixon and later Secretary of State under Nixon and President Gerald R. Ford. These efforts included a failed attempt to place in *Foreign Affairs* an article by Mark Falcoff of the American Enterprise Institute favoring their interpretation.<sup>15</sup> Rogers arranged for Falcoff to visit Kissinger in New York where he was granted access to Kissinger's telephone transcripts of this period. But the ploy did not work. *Foreign Affairs* rejected the article. Hoge told me he regarded Falcoff's piece as "too narrow a defense of Kissinger." He then asked me to write a more wide-ranging review essay on Kornbluh's book for the next issue.

Falcoff's rejected article was subsequently published in *Commentary* magazine with the title "Kissinger & Chile: The Myth That Will Not Die." Falcoff argued that the Kissinger telephone transcripts "establish that Chile was *not* an important part of the then National Security Adviser's daily diet." (italics in original) According to Falcoff, Nixon "was evidently pleased ... but exhibited no sense of complicity with the coup-makers themselves." And Falcoff bizarrely credits "Pinochet and his associates" with "rescuing for Allende and his government a place in Chilean history they did not earn and to which they could not otherwise have looked forward."<sup>16</sup> To prove his point Falcoff quoted from a conversation between Nixon and Kissinger on September 16, 1973, five days after the coup in Chile. Nixon asked Kissinger: "Well we didn't—as you know—our hand doesn't show on this one though." According to Falcoff, Kissinger answered: "We didn't do it."

As a result of the release of the full text of these telephone conversations by the National Security Archive on May 26, 2004, we now know what Kissinger actually said on that occasion was as follows: "We didn't do it. I mean we helped them. \_\_\_\_\_ created the conditions as great as possible (??)"<sup>17</sup> Falcoff gave no indication whatsoever in his

---

<sup>14</sup> Rogers, "Mythmaking and Foreign Policy," 160.

<sup>15</sup> James Hoge, e-mail message to author, September 5, 2003: "I have a sensitive piece submitted for publication and want to enlist your aid in evaluating it before making a decision."

<sup>16</sup> Mark Falcoff, "Kissinger & Chile: The Myth That Will Not Die," *Commentary* 116, no. 4 (November 2003): 41-49, citations from pp. 42, 48 and 49.

<sup>17</sup> The blank underline—likely indicating that a word or words were deleted—and the question marks in parentheses are from the original transcript. See "The Kissinger Telcons: Kissinger Telcon on Chile," edited by Thomas Blanton, *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book* no. 123, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB123/chile.htm> (posted May 26, 2004), and Neil A. Lewis, "Delight Over Coup is Evident in Transcripts; Discussion Between Kissinger and Nixon About Events in Chile," *New York Times*, May 28, 2004, National, sec. A.



*Commentary* article that he was excising parts of the sentence in what he purported to be a decisive piece of historical evidence.<sup>18</sup>

My review of Kornbluh's book in *Foreign Affairs* was not inflammatory. Leslie H. Gelb, former president of the Council on Foreign Relations, told me that he had read it three times and found it to be "straight down the middle." Nor did Hoge find it "biased" before Kissinger made known his displeasure. Hoge's editorial comment on the review, found in the table of contents of the issue in which it appeared, reads as follows: "Thirty years after the overthrow of Salvador Allende in Chile, *The Pinochet File*, a 'dossier' of declassified documents, lays out the true U.S. role."<sup>19</sup>

In fact, the first criticism came from Thomas S. Blanton, director of the National Security Archive, who wrote to me to say he thought I had unfairly characterized the use of declassified documents.<sup>20</sup> As a historian I have always believed these needed to be cited with great caution, especially if they had been "redacted," whereby parts of the text are blocked out in the process of declassification. I had said this in my review of Kornbluh's book. Blanton's arguments seemed to me to be very fair and worthy of discussion, and I suggested that they merited a comment in *Foreign Affairs* to clarify the question of the use of Freedom of Information Act documents as historical evidence.<sup>21</sup>

On Friday, November 7, 2003, I was told by e-mail that Rogers had responded to my review essay and that Hoge was going to publish it in the January/February issue of *Foreign Affairs*. The issue was very close to going to press, so I was asked to reply as soon as possible. I was in London at the time and turned in my commentary to *Foreign Affairs* via e-mail on November 10 as requested.

William D. Rogers had served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs under Kissinger during the Ford administration from October 1974 to June 1976 and then as Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs until 1977. He has for many years been active in Latin American affairs as a senior partner in the influential Washington, DC,

---

<sup>18</sup> I was asked by *Commentary* in November 2003 if I would like to comment on Falcoff's article. I declined. I have known Falcoff for many years and respected his work. It was only after the release of the full text of Kissinger's Telcons in May 2004 that I discovered Falcoff had used a partial quotation without acknowledging the fact.

<sup>19</sup> To accompany the publication of the review, *Foreign Affairs* staff had prepared a collection of its previous articles and other materials on Chile as a follow up for its bi-weekly e-mail newsletter, but this was quietly killed and never appeared.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas S. Blanton, e-mail message to author, November 21, 2003: "I think you make a very useful distinction between two types of contemporary history, one "based on documents and testimony accessible to all historians" and represented by Theodore Draper, the other rising from anonymous sources and leaks and represented (in effect, though you don't name him) by Bob Woodward. But I don't think you are correct to place previously secret government documents released through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in the Woodward category rather than the Draper category. Woodward does not use the FOIA; while Draper is one of FOIA's biggest beneficiaries."

<sup>21</sup> Author's e-mail reply to Thomas Blanton, November 25, 2003: "Dear Tom: You make very good points—and yes I do think they are worth an FA [*Foreign Affairs*] comment to clarify question of use of FOIA documents."

law firm of Arnold & Porter. He joined Kissinger in his consulting firm as vice chairman in the 1980s working in the Washington office on a part-time contract.<sup>22</sup>

Rogers is a non-partisan Democrat who served within a Republican administration. He has been active in the Council on Foreign Relations over the years, serving on the Council's board of directors between 1980 and 1990. I had amiable dealings with him over the fifteen years I headed the Council's Latin America Studies Program, mostly over U.S.-Cuban relations, a matter about which he has had an ongoing engagement. When in the 1950s Rogers joined the small Washington law firm of Arnold & Porter (then known as Arnold, Fortas & Porter), it was one of the few law firms which took on the defense of people who were targets of Senator McCarthy. Rogers became involved with the long-running case of China specialist Owen Lattimore.

In his lengthy response to my review essay, Rogers echoed Falcoff's claim that there was "no real evidence" of U.S. support for the military coup and that to argue otherwise was to nurture a "myth." He objected in particular to the discussion in my piece of three specific events and the role of the U.S. government (and that of Kissinger in particular) in each of these episodes: the 1970 assassination of the commander of the Chilean armed forces, General René Schneider, a strict constitutionalist who rejected U.S. attempts to block Allende's assumption of office as president; the 1973 coup itself, which led to Allende's death; and the 1976 assassination of Orlando Letelier and his American colleague, Ronni Moffitt.

Kissinger, Rogers asserted, had given a "stern human rights warning" directly to Pinochet and ordered "four U.S. ambassadors in the Southern Cone to tell the heads of their respective governments that political assassination and human rights violations would irreparably damage their relations with the United States."<sup>23</sup> Rogers was referring to Operation Condor, though he did not mention it by name.

It struck me at the time that Rogers was in effect writing a counter review. The text I had been sent had the look of a cut-and-paste job. The attacks on my comments appeared to have been added to a previously written text focused on Kornbluh's book and not on my review of it. I said as much in my published response. Subsequently, I learnt that Rogers had indeed written much of the text and circulated it previously. Evidently, as with the Falcoff "review," most of his "response" had been written originally as part of a strategy to preempt

---

<sup>22</sup> Walter Isaacson, *Kissinger: A Biography* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 733.

<sup>23</sup> Rogers, "Mythmaking and Foreign Policy," 162. Rogers' claim that he and Kissinger vigorously defended human rights is not how he described his own attitudes at the time. Lars Schoultz reports from a 1975 interview that: "Secretary Kissinger's assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, William D. Rogers, liked to compare his marital experience and the Nixon-Ford administration's activities on behalf of human rights. He contended that he was much more willing to accept his wife's criticisms of his social misbehavior if she waited until they were alone in bed rather than chastising him publicly. Following this approach, Rogers argued that he could be more successful by tactfully suggesting rather than by openly demanding that a repressive regime relent. (Interview with William D. Rogers, November 6, 1975, Washington, D.C.)." Schoultz commented: "Readers of some maturity will recognize that private criticism by most spouses displays a wide range of intensity. The quiet diplomacy ARA [Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Department of State] had in mind during the Nixon administration was not modeled after George and Martha's connubial interaction in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*" See Lars Schoultz, *Human Rights and United States Policy toward Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 121.

the critical reception of Kornbluh's book by orchestrating and promoting the view that it was based on a "myth."

I was queried by the *Foreign Affairs* editors on my reference to the privileged access granted to Falcoff to Kissinger's 1973 telephone transcripts. Falcoff, whom I have known since we were both graduate students at Princeton in the 1960s, had told me himself about his arrangement with Kissinger and Rogers' role as liaison. It was in any case no secret; Falcoff had made the fact explicit in his *Commentary* article, where he says Kissinger "has kindly let me review them."<sup>24</sup> *Foreign Affairs* had been in touch with Rogers to "fact-check" during the editing process.<sup>25</sup> When I received my edited copy I became concerned Rogers had also been given advance access to my text itself since he altered several segments of his critique to take specific account of my counterarguments. I e-mailed Hoge twice to inquire if this was the case.<sup>26</sup> Hoge strenuously denied that this had occurred.<sup>27</sup>

Rogers did get final page proofs, however, which I was not given. He e-mailed me on December 3, 2003, on his law firm's stationary, demanding sources of several of the

---

<sup>24</sup> Falcoff, "Kissinger & Chile," 42.

<sup>25</sup> In the first draft of my response I had called Rogers "Kissinger's lawyer." He is often cited in the press as such, and questions from the press to Kissinger's office were often redirected to Rogers in this capacity. [See for example: Tim Johnson, "Argentina's 'dirty war' hounding Kissinger," *Miami Herald*, August 30, 2002: "...Kissinger's office in New York City referred calls to William Rogers, his lawyer ..." as well as Larry Rohter, "As Door Opens for Legal Actions in Chilean Coup, Kissinger Is Numbered Among the Hunted," *New York Times*, March 28, 2002, Foreign Desk, sec. A: "William Rogers, Mr. Kissinger's lawyer, said in a letter..." Rogers' biographical page in the Arnold & Porter LLP website states: "He has been active in the consulting firm of Kissinger Associates since the mid-1980's and remains so today. At the same time, he maintains an active law practice, as arbitrator and adviser to the present partners." See "Arnold & Porter LLP – Attorneys – William Rogers," [http://www.arnoldporter.com/attorneys.cfm?attorney\\_id=355](http://www.arnoldporter.com/attorneys.cfm?attorney_id=355).

Rogers was contacted by Gideon Rose, managing editor of *Foreign Affairs*, to inquire on this point. Gideon Rose, e-mail message to William Rogers, and Rogers' e-mail reply to Rose, November 10, 2003, forwarded to the author by Rose: "Dear Mr. Rogers, Sorry to bother you again, but we just wanted to fact-check something. Is it true that you are Dr. Kissinger's lawyer?" Rogers responded to Rose: "No. I do not represent him in any legal proceedings. Nor am I counsel for Kissinger Associates. In all pending cases in which he has been sued—three, pending, I think—he is represented by a Department of Justice attorney, who writes and signs all the papers on his behalf. I did, once, fifteen or twenty years ago, represent him, but not since. I am Vice Chair of Kissinger Associates and a retired partner of Arnold & Porter." This struck me as a narrow lawyerly construction that avoided the question of whether he gave Kissinger legal advice and assistance. Nevertheless, I removed this designation from my text.

<sup>26</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, November 13, 2003: "I am very disturbed reading the revised Rogers response—from the four major additions he made it seems he was given access to what I wrote—is this the case? If so, we need to revisit the whole matter." Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, Gideon Rose, and Daniel Kurtz-Phelan [associate editor of *Foreign Affairs*], November 14, 2003: "Given the specifically targeted and substantial post facto amendments Bill Rogers has made to his piece, not to mention the escalation of the tone in which they were written, I regret it is absolutely essential that my additional sentences be added..."

<sup>27</sup> James Hoge, e-mail message to author, November 14, 2003: "We did not make available to Bill Rogers or to anyone else a copy of your reply to his response. Nor did we give him or anyone else a verbal summary of your comments. He knows of your reply because we called [*sic*] to check whether he was Kissinger's lawyer. He said he was not and so we removed such reference from your copy. That is the extent of our interaction with Rogers. I have no idea what prompted his revisions. It is, however, common that our authors amend their texts in such fashion, some far more fulsome than Rogers. We close the edition today. Unless I hear otherwise, I will assume that you want your reply published."

citations I had used which were most damaging to his arguments.<sup>28</sup> Since the sequence of events between December 3 and December 5 form the basis of Hoge's claim that a "ground rule" was established and that I agreed to it, it is necessary to review the chronology of events over these days with precision.

### **December 3**

I took Rogers' demand for sources with the utmost seriousness, considering his e-mail to me came from Arnold & Porter. I forwarded the e-mail to the editors at *Foreign Affairs* inquiring as to the correct procedure in the face of such a demand.<sup>29</sup>

### **December 4**

I was told to reply to Rogers directly, and I did so by e-mail midday on December 4, with copies to Hoge, Gideon Rose, managing editor of *Foreign Affairs*, and Daniel Kurtz-Phelan, associate editor, with the full sources of all my statements.<sup>30</sup>

At 3:08pm that afternoon Rogers sent Hoge an angry and intemperate e-mail. This text formed the basis of Rogers' second letter in *Foreign Affairs* to which I was not permitted to respond. This e-mail from Rogers was not "read [to me] over the telephone," as Hoge asserts in his "The Editor Replies" comment in the September/October 2004 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. The text was forwarded to me by Hoge's office, via e-mail at 3:45pm, with the request that I call Hoge, which I did immediately. Hoge said to me that Rogers was a very

---

<sup>28</sup> William Rogers, e-mail message to author, December 3, 2003: "Can you give me the supporting cites and dates for the references (in your forthcoming *Foreign Affairs* piece) to: the US tipping off the French and Portuguese about Condor assassination plots; the assassination warning Bush gave to an unidentified congressman; Kissinger's statement to Carvajal; and my statement about resigning if there was CIA 'destabilization' 'on my watch.' All on proof page 164."

<sup>29</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, Gideon Rose, and Daniel Kurtz-Phelan, December 4, 2003: "Please see copy below of email from Bill Rogers. Please note he refers to 'proof page 164', which must be subsequent to the proofs I last saw, since I do not have this pagination. Happy to respond with cites and dates for references, but please first advise me as to propriety."

<sup>30</sup> Author's e-mail message to William Rogers, December 4, 2003: "Dear Bill: Thanks for your email inquiry. Re: points 1 and 2: Both citations are from John Dinges, *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and His Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents* (New York and London: The New Press, 2004). [uncorrected proof] For France and Portugal see pages 6, 8 and 170 (for July 30, 1976 exchange of information on Condor). For warning and Bush see pp. 219-223 for extensive discussion of episode and pp. 215-216 for Bush's warning. Re: point 3: Carvajal citation is from page 228 of Peter Kornbluh's book, and note 63 on page 525: "See the memcon of 'Secretary's Meeting with Foreign Minister Carvajal,' September 29, 1975, p.1." Re: point 4: See quote below from your 'Legends in the Law' interview published in *Bar Report* (October/November 1999), publicly available at: [http://www.dcb.org/for\\_lawyers/resources/legends\\_in\\_the\\_law/rogers.cfm](http://www.dcb.org/for_lawyers/resources/legends_in_the_law/rogers.cfm) 'So Kissinger called and asked if I would become the legal advisor. I said no. I told him I would not serve in the Nixon administration. The day Nixon resigned, Kissinger called back and asked me to reconsider. This time he wanted me to run the Latin American Bureau of State. I went to see him and gave him my views with respect to Vietnam, which were not at all consistent with what the administration had been doing. I also told him I'd heard rumors that the U.S. Government had destabilized Chile through the CIA. I said if there were any CIA covert operations going on during my watch, I'd resign and denounce the operation.' Best regards, Kenneth"

The "Bush" referred to in these e-mails is George H. W. Bush, director of the CIA at the time. Bush had personally warned Congressman Ed Koch, later to be mayor of New York City, that he was a target. Koch, then a leading liberal in the House of Representatives, had successfully proposed an amendment to cut off monetary aid to Uruguay. Bush, a former colleague of Koch's in the House of Representatives, had called to warn him that the action had provoked a threat and a plan of action to kill him. The intelligence community had initially discounted this threat, but had taken the matter more seriously after the assassination of Letelier.

good lawyer but that he would not allow Rogers to attack me personally. Hoge did not say he would publish this e-mail. But since Rogers did attack me personally in it, I assumed that it would be subject to revision if it were ever to be published. I told Hoge that in this case my inclination was not to respond. In saying this, I had two things in mind—not only Hoge’s assurance that he would not publish a personal attack on me, but my own e-mail sent to Rogers earlier that day, with citations to evidence I expected he would consider. Hoge mentioned no “ground rule” at this point, explicitly or implicitly. Nor did he tell me he had made any commitment to Rogers that he would have the last word.

### **December 5**

I followed up in writing to formally *preserve* my right to reply. What I wrote in my e-mail of December 5 to Hoge was as follows:

Assuming this (or whatever eventually emerges) is for the March/April issue I had better see the final product in case I need to react - hopefully not - but just to preserve my option to do so until I see what Bill says after more reflection.<sup>31</sup>

I was by now alarmed that an effort might be made either to discredit me or to pull my response entirely.

### **December 8**

On December 8, 2003, I sent copies of my exchange of e-mails with Rogers over the citation and the text of the exchange to be published in *Foreign Affairs* to several close friends on a confidential basis. I wrote then:

There was a furious response to my *Foreign Affairs* review on the book by Peter Kornbluh on Pinochet. The next issue (Jan/Feb) will have the reaction by William Rogers and my response; it will be up on FA website and be mailed to subscribers on December 15, but given heat generated in some powerful circles on this I anticipate some sort of preemptive strike by them to try to discredit me or the response before then. ... I have clearly trodden on the tail of a very nasty snake here!

Little did I realize then how accurate my premonition was to be...

---

<sup>31</sup> Author’s e-mail message to James Hoge, December 5, 2003. I did not receive a reply from Hoge.

## ACT II: SUPPRESSION

I now know that the die had been cast from the beginning. As Rogers himself inelegantly put it to Diana Jean Schemo of the *New York Times*, “[Hoge] promised me that I would have the last word and that Maxwell was shut off.”<sup>32</sup>

Hoge has repeatedly and publicly denied the role of Kissinger in bringing pressure to bear on *Foreign Affairs*. He told Scott Sherman of *The Nation*:

I never talked to Henry Kissinger about this at all ... nor has anybody else told me that Henry had a view one way or the other.<sup>33</sup>

He told David Glenn of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that:

... the decision to cut off debate was made in February. “During that time, I didn’t talk to Pete Peterson [Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations], I didn’t talk to Henry Kissinger, I didn’t talk to anybody,” [Hoge] says. “These are editor’s decisions, which I made. Period.”<sup>34</sup>

He also told Rafael Cariello of the Brazilian newspaper *Folha de São Paulo* that Henry Kissinger “did not even know about these exchanges of letters” in *Foreign Affairs*.<sup>35</sup>

I have not claimed Kissinger spoke to Hoge directly on this matter. In fact, Hoge had told me Kissinger was “refusing” to speak to him. The question was not this; it was by whom, how, and when Kissinger chose to convey his messages of displeasure.

In his interview with Scott Sherman of *The Nation*, Hoge was explicit as to the timing of Rogers’ call (December) and its cause (Operation Condor):

After round one of the exchange, Hoge received a call from Rogers, who recoiled from Maxwell’s suggestion that he was directly (or indirectly) complicitous in Operation Condor. Hoge urged Rogers to send a second letter, and—curiously—assured him that the letter would conclude the exchange.<sup>36</sup>

Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, publicly confirmed Kissinger’s anger and his own role in communicating it to Hoge. In fact, Peterson saw no conflict at all in his action:

Mr. Peterson, who is also chairman of the Blackstone Group, a capital-investment firm, says he called Mr. Hoge in December merely to convey Mr. Kissinger’s unhappiness. “I didn’t ask him to do anything,” he says. “I’m the chairman of the organization. If a member calls, and he’s unhappy about something, I don’t think it’s unnatural for me to say, ‘Jim, this is your area. You deal with it however

---

<sup>32</sup> Diana Jean Schemo, “Kissinger Accused of Blocking Scholar,” *New York Times*, June 5, 2004, Arts & Ideas/Cultural Desk, sec. B.

<sup>33</sup> Scott Sherman, “The Maxwell Affair,” *Nation* 278, no. 24, June 21, 2004, 8, 23-24; posted online on June 3, 2004: <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20040621&s=Sherman>.

<sup>34</sup> Glenn, “*Foreign Affairs* Loses a Longtime Editor ...,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 25, 2004.

<sup>35</sup> Rafael Cariello, “Rixa com Kissinger afasta brasilianista; Kenneth Maxwell deixa Council on Foreign Relations e acusa ex-secretário de pressionar revista a não publicar carta sua,” *Folha de São Paulo* (Brazil), June 8, 2004, Mundo.

<sup>36</sup> Sherman, “The Maxwell Affair,” 23.

you see fit.' ... But that I would interfere with anything specifically like that is really an outrageous suggestion. I have great respect for Hoge and for the independence of that magazine."<sup>37</sup>

It is worth noting that Kissinger did not address himself to the editor of the magazine, but to the chairman of the organization that owns it.

Hoge published Rogers' December 4 e-mail as a "Letter to the Editor" in the March/April issue of *Foreign Affairs*. I was not notified about this until the issue had gone to press. Unusually—since I always communicated with *Foreign Affairs* in person, by fax or by e-mail—I received the page proofs by means of inter-office mail at approximately 4:00pm on January 20, 2004. This was the first time I had seen the text *Foreign Affairs* was publishing. With the proofs was an undated cover note from Hoge which read:

Ken, I was under the impression after the Christmas staff party that you would stop by for a look at the Rogers letter, a copy of which I am now enclosing. I have also operated on what you told me on the telephone when I read you the letter and that is that you did not see a cause for further response. I have subsequently said that there would be no further exchange. At this point, the March/April issue, which contains the Rogers letter, has gone to the printers. Jim

I had made no such comment at the Council on Foreign Relations' holiday staff party Hoge referred to. The party had taken place on December 18, 2003. It was at this party in fact that I learnt of the true dimension of the firestorm Kissinger had initiated in the three weeks after my e-mail exchanges with Rogers on December 4. I did not stay at the party long. Yet while I was there Kissinger's interference was the main topic of conversation between Hoge, Peterson and myself, as well as with several other *Foreign Affairs* editors and with Les Gelb—and later, after I had left, among the junior staff. Kissinger, I was told, had not only enlisted Peterson to convey his anger, but also his old friend Maurice ('Hank') Greenberg, the vice chairman emeritus of the Council's board and the powerful head of the giant American International Group (AIG) insurance conglomerate, the largest commercial underwriter in the United States. On leaving the party I went up to my office and typed up my quick reaction in an email to a colleague,<sup>38</sup> and the next morning I wrote up more fully what had been said.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Glenn, "*Foreign Affairs* Loses a Longtime Editor."

<sup>38</sup> Author's e-mail message to Tomás Amorim, December 18, 2003: "well I heard it all - from pete p [Peter Peterson], jim h [James Hoge], les g [Les Gelb] rh [Richard Haass] ....quite a story... hank greenerg [Maurice Greenberg] etc...anyhow it is 'contained' according to them..I wonder...."

<sup>39</sup> Author's diary annotations: "KM [party] conversations with Dan [Daniel Kurtz-Phelan], Jim [James Hoge], Pete [Peter Peterson] and Les Gelb, all on topic – major effort by HK [Kissinger] and Hank Greenberg to pull [*Foreign Affairs*] issue – too late for this. Swearing [on the phone] from Greenberg at Jim; [Greenberg, according to Hoge] claimed KM [Maxwell] accused HK of "killing babies" – Jim told him [Greenberg] to read piece! No satisfaction with FA [*Foreign Affairs*] then must have gone to Haass. Threatened resignation [from Council membership]; threatened to pull out all funders to his chair (i.e. Mead!) [Walter Russell Mead, who holds the Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow Chair in U.S. Foreign Policy] Must have called Les [Gelb] – All read pieces and thought it was reasonable. All thought HK counterproductive. Pete [Peterson] said 'I was in that Administration; I know what sort of things HK said' Jim hopes KM [will] not respond; but up to him. KM said depends on what Rogers said, but any response would be very short! KM met Haass morning of [December] 19 at 8AM arriving at CFR. Haass said: "this is issue that still gets under everyone's skin 30 years later!"

In light of my discussion with Hoge at the party and since my own deadline for the Western Hemisphere book reviews was approaching, I inquired again on January 16 as to the status of the Rogers letter.<sup>40</sup>

On receiving Hoge's note on January 20 and presented with the *fait accompli* that Rogers' letter was to be published without any rebuttal from me, I immediately called him. There was no pickup. I left a phone message on Hoge's voice-mail and also followed up by e-mail, with a copy to Gideon Rose:

Dear Jim: I just got your note and copy of Rogers' letter. I immediately tried to call but couldn't get through to you or Rosemary [Hoge's assistant]. I must assert my right to reply. All we need is one line of type in this March/April issue that says: "Mr. Maxwell will reply in the next issue."<sup>41</sup>

I also called and left a message with Gideon Rose. Hoge did not respond to either my voice-mail or e-mail. Rose did return my call on January 23 and said Hoge was handling this affair personally and exclusively. Hoge was incommunicado in Davos. I was able, however, to trace Hoge to the Hotel Rinaldi in Davos and faxed him a printout of the following e-mail:

Dear Jim and Gideon: I have now tried several times to reach you both by phone and e-mail over the last three days requesting that a small line be inserted at the end of the Rogers letter in the March/April issue to say that "Mr. Maxwell will reply in the next issue." If there is extra cost to the magazine in doing this I will be glad to cover it.

I wrote not as an individual in this case; I wrote as a reviewer for *Foreign Affairs*. I subsequently wrote to Jim twice to reserve the right to respond. I should be accorded the normal right of a reviewer to answer criticism. I take this matter extremely seriously. Rogers has chosen to make an ad hominem personal attack on me with unfounded accusations of bias.

Questions of reputation are at stake here and not least for the magazine. I realize heavy pressure has been brought to bear but I should not be denied the right of reply. I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.<sup>42</sup>

I received no response.

There is a parallel development which deserves mention at this point. In 2003 Kissinger had published a book composed of the telephone transcripts of his conversations during the 1973 Yom Kippur war and the final U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam in 1975.<sup>43</sup> It did not include, needless to say, the contemporaneous transcripts of his conversations on Chile during 1973. In fact, Kissinger had strenuously fought to prevent the release of these documents. It was not until May 26, 2004, that they became publicly accessible as a result of legal actions taken by the National Security Archive under the Freedom of Information Act. Kissinger was promoting his book throughout the fall of 2003 in a series of televised "Conversations," including a session with James Hoge held on September 14 at the 92nd Street Y focused on Kissinger's foreign policy actions in the mid-1970s.<sup>44</sup> Kissinger and

---

<sup>40</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, January 16, 2004: "Dear Jim: Did Rogers decide to respond again or let the matter drop? If former, I do need to be sure it is [*sic*] does not require comment."

<sup>41</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, January 20, 2004.

<sup>42</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge and Gideon Rose, January 22, 2004.

<sup>43</sup> Henry Kissinger, *Crisis: The Anatomy of Two Major Foreign Policy Crises* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003).

<sup>44</sup> The 92nd Street Y is a famous forum in New York City for hosting prominent public figures in debates, among other events.



Hoge were to hold another public event at the Council on Foreign Relations in an HBO-sponsored series called “Historymakers,” scheduled for January 27, 2004. This was first rescheduled and then cancelled indefinitely. In this period Kissinger was also co-chairing a Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on U.S.-Europe relations with Harvard President Lawrence Summers.

On his return from Davos, Hoge had called me on January 26. He did not want to discuss the Kissinger-Rogers matter on the phone, he said, and insisted on a personal meeting. We met on Friday, January 30 in his office at the Council. We were alone and I was conscious of the fact he wanted it this way.<sup>45</sup>

Hoge explained he had been subjected to great pressure from Henry Kissinger. He said that “Henry will not speak to me or shake my hand.” He again told me Peterson had called on Kissinger’s behalf. He said he was called and “sworn at for half an hour” by Greenberg. He said of Kissinger: “Henry has a very dark side,” and that Kissinger had sought to interfere before in *Foreign Affairs* during the editorship of his predecessor William (“Bill”) Hyland. He said that he did not think that the breach that resulted between Kissinger and Hyland, who were old friends, had “ever been fully repaired.”<sup>46</sup> Very much on his mind, it seemed to me, was how far he could go in criticizing Kissinger without having a similar breach.

It was at this meeting that Hoge told me for the first time that he had committed to Rogers “not to have the correspondence go on.” This, he said, was his call. He also told me for the first time that Kornbluh had also wished to respond to Rogers and had been denied the opportunity to do so.<sup>47</sup>

I reminded Hoge that when we spoke on the phone in early December he had told me he would not permit Rogers to attack me personally. In addition, the letter he had published linked my role at *Foreign Affairs* to my employment at the Council. I said this was unacceptable and that I believed matters of principle were at stake. I told Hoge that the

---

<sup>45</sup> Excerpt from my diary annotations made shortly after the meeting: “Hoge clearly avoiding any record; one-on-one/anyone can interpret or spin what was said. [Hoge] said I had undermined him by agreeing that I had implied complicity; I said I had not done this. He asked me if I was implying the Letelier assassination could have been avoided; I said I was not implying—I had written this in the response he had published. [I] Said personal attack & factual inaccuracies in Rogers’ response need rebuttal /and/or correction. I had requested right to respond day after our conversation and again in writing. I had not written as an individual but as FA [*Foreign Affairs*] book reviewer and at his request post rejection of Falcoff plant.”

<sup>46</sup> Hyland subsequently denied the accuracy of Hoge’s comments. In the course of this conversation Hoge also recounted Kissinger’s behavior at a recent meeting by teleconference of the board of Conrad Black’s Hollinger Group, where the vote had gone against Black. Conrad Black’s old friends were abandoning him as the Hollinger scandal deepened. “Henry, I did not hear your vote,” Black asked. Imitating his voice, Hoge said Kissinger repeated, “Yes, I voted against you.” Black had said to Kissinger: “Et tu, Brute?” It was not clear to me at the time, or since, what relevance any of this had to the matter we were discussing, though the *Chicago Sun-Times*, of which Hoge had been editor-in-chief and publisher, was part of Black’s Hollinger Group. Black was and remains a member of the Council on Foreign Relations’ International Advisory Board.

<sup>47</sup> Peter Kornbluh had alerted me to this in an e-mail message on January 25, 2004: “I thought the editor probably should have alerted me to Bill’s letter, which was as much an attack on me as on your review. I did write to Gideon Rose to ask for a small amount of space to respond. But I got back a letter from Mr. Hoge saying that even though MORE space was going to be given to Bill in the next issue for yet another rebuttal to your rebuttal, no space would be available to me.”

Chile issue would not go away. He asked why this would be the case. I reminded him that I had also reviewed John Dinges' book in *Foreign Affairs*.<sup>48</sup> I told him that the story of Operation Condor and the degree of U.S. knowledge would become a major problem for Kissinger as more documents were declassified. Hoge seemed surprised. He also seemed concerned by my answer. The conversation was not hostile. I felt we had both expressed our views frankly and forcefully.

Over that weekend I put my objections into two detailed letters to Hoge. These were sent on February 4, 2004. The first summarized our conversation over Kissinger, expressing my regret that Hoge had been subjected to such pressure, and repeated my view that it was foolish to suppress this matter as it would inevitably at some point become public.<sup>49</sup> The second text I sent him then was a "Letter to the Editor" rebutting Rogers' accusations of bias and pointing out Rogers' inaccuracies and misrepresentations.

Hoge did not acknowledge either of my letters. Nor for that matter did he dispute my comments on Kissinger's intervention, based as they were on his own comments to me the previous Friday. He only took issue with these statements after the whole affair did indeed become public in June. My hope in early February was that Hoge would use the opportunity afforded by my letters to correct the misstatements of fact by Rogers in the subsequent issue of *Foreign Affairs*. I was still acting under the assumption I could persuade Hoge to publish my rebuttal.

---

<sup>48</sup> Dinges, *The Condor Years*, reviewed by the author in *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 1 (January/February 2004): 177-178.

<sup>49</sup> Author's letter to James Hoge, February 4, 2004: "Dear Jim: I very much appreciate our frank conversation last Friday concerning the Rogers letter to be published in the forthcoming (March/April 2004) issue of *Foreign Affairs* and my request that I be given the opportunity to respond. I must say that I know of no other respected publication that would deny a book reviewer the chance to reply to a harshly critical letter about a review. But clearly this is your call.

Since I was not given that opportunity, however, and because it may well be necessary for me to respond to Rogers's accusations publicly in the near future, if not in *Foreign Affairs* then elsewhere, I do think it is important that I pass on to you, for the record, what I had prepared in response to his letter. Particularly as the Rogers's letter you are publishing contains factual errors which otherwise will stand unchallenged. I was surprised to learn when we talked on Friday that Kornbluh was not permitted to comment either. It was after all his book under review. The result unfortunately is that the debate has become unnecessarily personal, diverting attention from the central questions in contention.

I also wanted to say how deeply I regret the intense pressure that has been brought to bear in this matter by Kissinger, directly and indirectly, both on you and *Foreign Affairs* and on my employer, the Council on Foreign Relations. This pressure is chilling to free expression, potentially damaging to the reputation of both institutions, and in the end foolish. Discussion of legitimate issues in U.S. foreign policy—such as the role of the United States in Chile in the 1970s—will not be closed off so easily, nor should it be. I stand completely behind what I wrote."

### **ACT III: COVER-UP**

I had complained to Hoge on January 30 during our conversation in his office that the published version of Rogers' letter had egregiously linked my book review in *Foreign Affairs* to my employment at the Council on Foreign Relations. Rogers' e-mail to Hoge of December 4 had been prefaced as follows:

1. This is what needs saying in response to Ken's article. Better that the damaging parts not appear at all. But this is the minimum in my view: Quote...

And after marking "End Quote" in his e-mail, Rogers observed:

2. Ken is an official of the Council. This, I fear, will give his words in *Foreign Affairs* added weight. (And more regrettable.) Surely the Council and *Foreign Affairs* will at least want to make clear that he is speaking for himself and not for either the Council or *Foreign Affairs*, and that the Council does not endorse and disavows his implications of US complicity in the Chile coup, the two murders and the Pinochet era human rights violations. El [sic?], I fear, the article will be seen as giving institutional endorsement to this pernicious myth[.]<sup>50</sup>

The essence of this statement was included in the published version in *Foreign Affairs*:

... the bias and distortions in Maxwell's reply to my critique of his book review do not give me great comfort in that quarter. One would hope at least that Maxwell's views are understood to be his own and not those of the Council on Foreign Relations, where he is a senior fellow.

There is, it is claimed, a "wall" between the Council on Foreign Relations and *Foreign Affairs*. My role as a book reviewer at *Foreign Affairs*, in fact, was independent from and not linked in any way to my staff position at the Council. The connection Rogers made was ominous enough in his e-mail. For *Foreign Affairs* to publish it was deeply irresponsible since it linked my exercise of free expression to my employment by the Council on Foreign Relations.

Kissinger had chosen his messengers well. In addition to their central roles on the Council's board of directors, Peterson and Greenberg have been highly engaged and generous benefactors of the Council, contributing more than \$34 million between them directly in personal donations and indirectly, via the privately-held Blackstone Group in the case of Peterson, and, in the case of Greenberg, via the Starr Foundation, of which he is chairman. They had both provided major funding for Hoge's endowed chair, the Peter G. Peterson Chair. Peterson had also been a generous contributor to the endowment of the chair I myself held at the Council on Foreign Relations. Neither is a man to be crossed lightly.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> In fact, I was not an "official" of the Council on Foreign Relations. I was an employee. I had served in 1996 as Vice President and Director of Studies of the Council, but this had been a voluntary term appointment, at my insistence.

<sup>51</sup> For Kissinger's personal relationship over the years with Peterson, see Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 147, 358, 365, 367, 720, 737, 744, 757. On the Blackstone Group's "strategic alliance" with Kissinger Associates see <http://www.blackstone.com/mergers/stalliances.html>. For Kissinger's friendship with Greenberg, see Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 739. For background on Greenberg, see Christopher Oster, "Uneasy Sits the Greenbergs' Insurance Crown: Companies Run by the Family, AIG, Marsh & McLennan, Ace, Are Listed in Spitzer Investigation," *Wall Street Journal*, October, 18, 2004, C1. The Council is a 501(c)(03) tax-exempt institution. Its

If it came down to a contest of credibility between my word and Hoge's, I assumed his would be believed, not mine. The burden was very much on me to acquiesce. But this meant living with my conscience, which increasingly bothered me. I appreciated the opportunities the Council on Foreign Relations had afforded me. I enjoyed my job and had invested fifteen years in developing a solid constituency among Council members for an active Latin America Program which I was loathe to abandon. I was also concerned that any dispute would seem petty and overly personal. Yet more fundamental questions were at stake, and three issues were paramount in my mind: the manipulation of the historical record was unacceptable to me as a historian; the suppression of debate was unacceptable to me as a writer in a free society; the evasion of accountability by public officials was unacceptable to me as a citizen.

In his editorial response Hoge claims that Kissinger's and Rogers' unhappiness was prompted by the "damaging implication" in my review that "Rogers and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had contributed to the creation of a permissive environment for political violence by the Chilean government under Augusto Pinochet." This was not the issue at the center of the controversy. In fact, I can think of very few objective historians who would dissent from such an overall assessment. It was the conclusion reached as long ago as the mid-1970s by the special Select Committee of the U.S. Senate chaired by the late Senator Frank Church. The CIA's own heavily hedged official position on the matter can be found in the report drafted in 2000 which has become known as "the Hinchey report" after New York congressman Maurice Hinchey, who had sponsored an amendment to compel the CIA to be more forthcoming on its role in the Pinochet coup and support for the regime. The report reads:

Although the CIA did not instigate the coup that ended Allende's government on 11 September 1973, it was aware of the plotting by the military, had ongoing intelligence collection relationships with some plotters and—because the CIA did not discourage the takeover and had sought to instigate a coup in 1970—probably appeared to condone it.<sup>52</sup>

And it concludes: "There is no doubt that some CIA contacts were actively engaged in committing and covering up serious human rights abuses." William P. Bundy, another of Hoge's predecessors as editor of *Foreign Affairs*, no leftist mythmaker, had a much harsher view of this matter. Commenting on Nixon and Kissinger's policy in Chile, he wrote, "Their actions were not only morally repugnant but ran grave risks of the eventual exposure that damaged the United States in Latin American eyes."<sup>53</sup>

---

financial statements are published in its annual report and its tax returns are publicly available via GuideStar: The National Database of Nonprofit Organization, at <http://www.guidestar.org/index.jsp>. I had been appointed to the Nelson and David Rockefeller Chair at the Council in 1995. The chair was endowed by friends and admirers of the two brothers, in their honor.

<sup>52</sup> Dinges, *The Condor Years*, 46. The Hinchey Report, as well as the Church Committee Report and all the declassified Chile documents, are fully available at the U.S. State Department's FOIA "Electronic Reading Room:" <http://foia.state.gov/SearchColls/Search.asp>.

<sup>53</sup> William P. Bundy, *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon Presidency* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998), 203. On the 1970 Schneider assassination Bundy was even tougher: "In legal terms, a U.S. judicial proceeding would surely have concluded that U.S. agents (acting on presidential authority) had been at least accessories before the fact and co-conspirators in the kidnapping and thus in the killing that resulted from it." *ibid.*

Rogers' complaint in reality was much more targeted and specific than Hoge indicates. The sticking point was Operation Condor. Rogers claimed that I had "implied U.S. complicity" in the assassination of Letelier.

Letelier had been mortally wounded on the morning of September 21, 1976, as his car approached Sheridan Circle on Washington's Embassy Row, the victim of a remote-controlled car bomb placed by Chilean agent Michael V. Townley. In modern times it was the most serious terrorist attack in the nation's capital before September 11, 2001. I did not in fact make any charge of "U.S. complicity," although others have made such charges. I said that "these are arguments best left to lawyers, not historians." What I wrote in my review essay was as follows:

The planned assassination of Pinochet's critics living abroad under Operation Condor—an international state-sponsored terror network set up by the Pinochet regime (in consort with Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and, later, Brazil, Peru, and Ecuador) to track and eliminate opponents—was also known to U.S. intelligence operatives and reported to the White House. Policymakers even knew that a Chilean assassination team had been planning to enter the United States. Kissinger intervened a month before the killing of Letelier, ordering that the Latin American rulers involved be informed that the "assassination of subversives, politicians and prominent figures both within the national borders of certain Southern Cone countries and abroad ... would create a most serious moral and political problem." This demarche was apparently not delivered: the U.S. embassy in Santiago demurred on the ground that to deliver such a strong rebuke would upset the dictator. The U.S. ambassador to Chile, David Popper, wrote to Washington, "In my judgement, given Pinochet's sensitivity regarding pressures by the USG [U.S. government], he might well take as an insult any inference that he was connected with such assassination plots." On September 20, 1976, the State Department instructed the ambassadors "to take no further action" with regard to the Condor scheme. Letelier and his American assistant, Ronni Moffitt, were killed the following morning.<sup>54</sup>

In his first published response to my review, Rogers wrote:

Maxwell and Kornbluh give little weight to the stern human rights warning Kissinger delivered directly to Pinochet at their only meeting, in Santiago in June of 1976. (Full disclosure: I was there, as Kissinger's undersecretary for economic affairs and, as some of Kornbluh's documents suggest, his human rights gadfly.) They dismiss Kissinger's statement, made in an address to the region's foreign ministers, that the regime's human rights violations "[had] impaired our relationship with Chile and [would] continue to do so." And they skip lightly over Kissinger's personal order to the four U.S. ambassadors in the Southern Cone to tell the heads of their respective governments that political assassination and human rights violations would irreparably damage their relations with the United States and cost them dearly in aid. Despite what Kornbluh and Maxwell claim, Kissinger's warning was delivered in robust fashion to the Argentine president—there are cables to prove it, although Kornbluh does not reprint them—and probably to Pinochet's underlings in Santiago. In any event, after Kissinger's meeting with Pinochet there could have been no misunderstanding as to Washington's views on state-sponsored political assassination. The relationship with Chile (and the

---

Thomas Powers in his book *The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms & the CIA* (New York: Knopf, 1979) discusses the Schneider affair and U.S. involvement in great detail. His conclusions: "If the CIA did not actually shoot General Schneider, it is probably fair to say that he would not have been shot without the CIA," 237.

The most stringent critique of Kissinger's role is of course Christopher Hitchens' book, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger* (London; New York: Verso, 2001), which was the basis for Eugene Jarecki's and Alex Gibney's 2002 documentary *The Trials of Henry Kissinger*.

<sup>54</sup> Maxwell, "The Other 9/11," 148-149. Although Brazil collaborated in information exchanges, it did not, it seems, collaborate on matters of political assassinations. See Elio Gaspari, *A Ditadura Encurralada* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004), 381-382.

other Southern Cone countries) went into a deep freeze in the remaining months of Kissinger's term as secretary of state—and under President Jimmy Carter as well.

Finally, Maxwell cites a maddeningly ambiguous cable from Kornbluh's collection as somehow relevant to an ominous "third event" in "the case against Kissinger": the June [sic] 1976 assassination of former Chilean Foreign Minister Orlando Letelier by Chilean agents in Washington, D.C. This is mischievous nonsense. Kissinger had nothing to do with the cable. So far as the record shows, he never saw it. The cable was not a Washington instruction to the field. It was not sent to Santiago. The bomb had already been strapped to the underside of Letelier's car when the cable, whatever it meant, was sent. It could not conceivably have been a link in the chain of causation leading to Letelier's death.

But it is of such stuff that myths are made.<sup>55</sup>

In answer, I had pointed out the following facts:

As for Kissinger's June 1976 speech to the Organization of American States (OAS) in Santiago and his August 1976 demarche on Operation Condor, the evidence is clear. Yes, Kissinger made his human rights speech, but he had personally assured Pinochet that he was giving it for U.S. domestic consumption. Let me quote directly from a "document of undoubted authenticity" as to what Kissinger said privately to Pinochet on that occasion: "The speech is not aimed at Chile. I wanted to tell you about this. My evaluation is that you are a victim of all left-wing groups around the world, and that your greatest sin was that you overthrew a government which was going communist." (The record shows that Assistant Secretary of State Rogers was present during this conversation.)

The central point regarding Kissinger's demarche, meanwhile, is that it was not delivered, out of concern that it would upset Pinochet. In the 27 days between the sending of Kissinger's cable and the assassination of Letelier, Kissinger's instructions (to warn Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina not to follow through with planned international assassination) were not carried out in the most critical case—Chile. It is a cruel coincidence that on the day before a car bomb killed Letelier, the ambassadors were told "to take no further action." This declassified cable is reproduced in full in Kornbluh's collection (Chapter 6, Document 17). It is specifically headed "Operation Condor" and is addressed to "secstate washdc." These are facts, not questions of opinion, much less of mythology.

The point is that this was a tragedy that might have been prevented. Other assassinations of opposition figures planned by Condor in Europe were in fact prevented because the United States tipped off the governments in question (France and Portugal) in advance. And George H.W. Bush, then director of the CIA, personally warned a Democratic U.S. member of Congress that he was a target. But by then, even Kissinger had recognized that a monster had arisen and needed to be contained. It was this that led to the change in U.S. policy.<sup>56</sup>

I also wrote that:

Kornbluh's dossier also shows how agonizing Kissinger's policy decisions often were for those professionals who had to carry them out—and how well aware these professionals were of the moral dilemmas they faced. Among them, notably and honorably, was William Rogers. In anticipation of the 1976 OAS meeting in Santiago, Rogers, then assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, had written in his briefing paper for Secretary Kissinger that Chile had become "a symbol of right-wing tyranny." He advised, "Like it or not, we are identified with the regime's origins and hence charged with some responsibility for its action. This accents our strong interest in getting the GOC [Government of Chile] to pursue acceptable human rights practices." We know that Rogers took this position thanks to the very declassified documents that Kornbluh publishes in his dossier and that Rogers now seeks to discredit.

---

<sup>55</sup> Rogers, "Mythmaking and Foreign Policy," 162-163.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., "Maxwell replies," 164-165,

Rogers' loyalty to his former boss and current business associate is commendable, but it was not reciprocated at the time. In closed meetings with Patricio Carvajal, Pinochet's foreign minister, Kissinger said, "The State Department is made up of people who have a vocation for the ministry. Because there are not enough churches for them, they went into the Department of State." (With respect to human rights, he told Carvajal that he "did not intend to harass Chile on this matter.") Rogers has said that when he was invited by Kissinger, soon after Nixon's resignation, to run the Latin America bureau, "I also told him I'd heard rumors that the U.S. government had destabilized Chile through the CIA. I said that if there were any covert operations going on during my watch I would resign and denounce the operation." But Condor did go on during his watch.<sup>57</sup>

This rebuttal stimulated Rogers' e-mail to me of December 3 demanding sources, and my response to him of the following day providing them. Kissinger also evidently was told of what I had written prior to its publication, presumably passed on by Rogers, since it provoked Kissinger's "unhappiness" and the calls made by Peterson and Greenberg in December which conveyed Kissinger's displeasure to Hoge. In his published letter, based on this e-mail, and to which I was not permitted to respond, Rogers wrote:

Kenneth Maxwell's bias is clear in his reply to my criticism of his review of *The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability* ("Fleeing the Chilean Coup," January/February 2004). He finds a "cruel coincidence" between a September 20, 1976, State Department cable and Orlando Letelier's murder at the hands of Chilean intelligence agents the very next day. This "cruel coincidence" leads Maxwell to conclude that "this was a tragedy that might have been prevented."

By whom, one might ask? Who does he think could have "prevented" Letelier's killing? Secretary of State Henry Kissinger? Assistant Secretary Harry Shlaudeman? Me? The implication is outrageous, and the facts are otherwise. Maxwell misreads the cable: it was not an instruction to ambassadors in the field, but a cable from Shlaudeman, then in Costa Rica, to the State Department in Washington. And it had no consequence. The State Department sent no instruction to the field implementing it. Even if it had passed Shlaudeman's message on to Santiago, it could not conceivably have "prevented" the murder. The bomb was already strapped to Letelier's car.

Furthermore, Shlaudeman counseled "no further action," thus suggesting—the message to which he was responding is nowhere to be found—that the embassy in Santiago had already carried out Kissinger's order to warn the Chileans about political assassinations. And finally, the notion that an assistant secretary of state—particularly one as distinguished and responsible as Shlaudeman—would have had the temerity to countermand a direct, personal instruction from Kissinger, and to do it behind his back (Kissinger and I were in Africa trying to end the role of the white regime in Rhodesia) bespeaks no sense of Kissinger's stewardship at the State Department. Such are the absurdities of this myth—but they are absurdities that strike at the heart of character and reputation.

I was assistant secretary of state from 1974 to 1976. Late 1976 was the time of the Letelier murder and Operation Condor. Kissinger brought me into the State Department aware of my background in human rights and civil liberties. So I found Maxwell's reference to the existence of Operation Condor on my watch gratuitous. I would like to assume that he did not mean to imply that I was therefore somehow responsible for Condor or that the United States was complicit in that appalling program. But the bias and distortions in Maxwell's reply to my critique of his book review do not give me great comfort in that quarter. One would hope at least that Maxwell's views are understood to be his own and not those of the Council on Foreign Relations, where he is a senior fellow.<sup>58</sup>

Hoge claims that my rebuttal to Rogers' second letter to the editor, which is published in full for the first time later in this paper, adds no "fresh" information and has "no hard facts." In reality, my letter discusses a central declassified document in the Letelier case, a cable that is in no way "redacted" and is entirely clear as to subject. Rogers called this

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 165.

<sup>58</sup> Rogers, "Crisis Prevention," 179-180.

cable “maddeningly ambiguous.”<sup>59</sup> It is not. No one I am aware of has ever challenged its authenticity. It is a document Rogers totally misrepresents in his attack on me for supposed “bias.” Rogers also distorts the chronology of Operation Condor. Nor does the evidence support Rogers’ assertion that Kissinger’s warnings on human rights violations were “robust.” Again, to understand the events described in this letter a review of the chronology is helpful.<sup>60</sup>

**September 29, 1974:** General Carlos Prats, Pinochet’s predecessor as army chief-of-staff, and his wife are assassinated by remote-controlled car bomb in Buenos Aires. Prats had opposed the 1973 coup and was living in exile in Argentina. The bomb was placed by Michael V. Townley, an American-born Chilean agent.

**October 6, 1975:** Attempt to assassinate Chilean Christian Democrat leader Bernardo Leighton and his wife in Rome. Both were wounded but survived. Assassination hit team coordinated in Italy by Townley.

**March 24, 1976:** Military coup in Argentina which ushers in Argentina’s “dirty war.”

**June 8, 1976:** Kissinger in Santiago makes public speech on human rights, but assures Pinochet privately that “the speech is not aimed at Chile.” Pinochet complains twice about Letelier’s activities in Washington and his access to the U.S. Congress.

**June 10, 1976:** Kissinger meets Argentina foreign minister Admiral César Augusto Guzzetti in Santiago and tells him “We have followed events in Argentina closely. We wish the new government well. We will do what we can to help it succeed.”

**June 16, 1976:** Kissinger is furious that U.S. diplomats in Santiago have criticized Chile. Kissinger tells Rogers: “I think I have made clear what my strategy is. I have not become a super liberal. This is not an institution that is going to humiliate the Chileans.”

**June 30, 1976:** Kissinger is angry that the U.S. ambassador in Argentina, Robert Hill, has protested human rights violations. Hill had told Guzzetti: “murdering priests and dumping forty-seven bodies in the street in one day could not be seen in the context of defeating terrorists quietly.” On hearing this Kissinger rebukes his deputy, Harry Shlaudeman: “In what way is it compatible with my policy?”

**July 9, 1976:** Shlaudeman tells Kissinger: “Their theory [in Argentina] is that they can use the Chilean method, this is to terrorize the opposition even killing priests and nuns and others.”

**July 30, 1976:** The CIA informs Shlaudeman that Chile and Argentina and other Southern Cone nations have formed Operation Condor and that there are “disturbing developments in its operational attitudes.” State Department officials are briefed on Condor’s plans for “identifying, locating and ‘hitting’” leaders of the opposition to their regimes.

**August 3, 1976:** In a 12-page memorandum Shlaudeman briefs Kissinger on how military regimes in the Southern Cone “have established Operation Condor to find and kill terrorists ... in their own countries and in Europe.”

**August 5, 1976:** U.S. ambassador in Paraguay, George Landau, alerts Washington that two Chilean agents had attempted to obtain U.S. visas on false Paraguayan passports.

**August 23, 1976:** Kissinger issues demarche on Condor. In a secret cable U.S. ambassadors in the Southern Cone are instructed to meet with the heads of state and express “our deep concern” about “rumors that this cooperation may extend beyond information exchange to include plans for the assassination of subversives, politicians and prominent figures both within the national boundaries of certain Southern Cone countries and abroad.”

**August 24, 1976:** U.S. ambassador in Chile, David Popper, balks at order. Landau acted immediately and delivered demarche personally to General Stroessner.

---

<sup>59</sup> Rogers, “Mythmaking and Foreign Policy,” 163.

<sup>60</sup> This chronology is based on the record, as we now know it, from Kornbluh’s and Dinges’ books, the declassified documents posted by the National Security Archive and the State Department, as well as John Dinges and Saul Landau, *Assassination on Embassy Row* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).



**August 30, 1976:** Shlaudeman, quoted in heavily redacted report of meeting, says: “we are not making a representation to Pinochet as it would be futile to do so.”

**September 9, 1976:** Townley enters the United States under an assumed name.

**September 18, 1976:** Townley straps car bomb under Letelier’s car.

**September 19, 1976:** Shlaudeman deputy, William Luers, anticipating Hill’s scheduled visit to see Argentine president General Videla on September 21, cables Shlaudeman apparently to ask “how should we proceed [on Condor demarche].”<sup>61</sup>

**September 20, 1976:** Shlaudeman cables from Costa Rica, where he is traveling, instructing Luers to tell the ambassadors to take no further action on Condor.

**September 21, 1976:** Letelier and Moffitt killed in Washington when bomb is detonated by remote control. Hill meets with General Videla in Buenos Aires and subsequently sends two reports to Washington on their conversation. Neither cable contains any reference to Operation Condor or the Kissinger demarche.

**September 23, 1976:** CIA director George H. W. Bush makes the connection between Letelier’s assassination and the warning from Landau, but the official story put out by the U.S. government is that Letelier was probably victim of leftist terrorists intending to create a martyr.<sup>62</sup>

**October 19, 1976:** Hill reports that Guzzetti returned from the United States, after meeting with Kissinger on October 7, convinced that if the Argentine government “has any problems with the U.S. over human rights they are confined to certain elements in the U.S. Congress and what it regards and/or uninformed minor segments of public opinion. While that conviction lasts, Hill complains, it will be unbelievable for this embassy to press representation to the GOA (Government of Argentina) over human rights violations.”<sup>63</sup>

It is within the context of these events that the Shlaudeman cable discussed in my letter was sent. My letter to Hoge of February 4, 2004, reads as follows:

---

<sup>61</sup> The content of this cable is based on Luers’ interview with Kornbluh. According to Kornbluh, the cable number was 231654, but it has not been recovered. See Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File*, 352. According to Dinges, the cable remains classified. See Dinges, *The Condor Years*, 290, note 189.

<sup>62</sup> For discussion of the date of this memorandum, see Dinges, *ibid.*, 192.

<sup>63</sup> Shlaudeman told Kissinger: “Bob Hill has registered for the record his concern for human rights in a bitter complaint about our purported failure to impress on Foreign Minister Guzzetti how seriously we view the rightist violence in Argentina.” Shlaudeman also tells Kissinger “I propose to respond for the record.” He then told Hill “...Guzzetti’s interpretation is strictly his own.” In an oral history interview in 1993 Shlaudeman said “Bob Hill, who was Ambassador then in Buenos Aires, a very conservative Republican politician—by no means liberal or anything of the kind, began to report quite effectively about what was going on, this slaughter of innocent civilians, supposedly innocent civilians—this vicious war they were conducting, underground war. He, at one time in fact, he sent me a back-channel telegram saying that the Foreign Minister, who had just come for a visit to Washington and had returned to Buenos Aires, had gloated to him that Kissinger had said nothing to him about Human Rights. I don’t know—I wasn’t present at the interview.” See Dinges, *ibid.*, 204.

In fact, Guzzetti was right and Shlaudeman had misinformed Ambassador Hill. Guzzetti’s interpretation was not “strictly his own.” He had correctly understood Kissinger’s point of view. Kissinger on October 7 had told Guzzetti: “Look, our basic attitude is that we would like you to succeed. I have an old-fashioned view that friends ought to be supported. What is not understood in the United States is that you have a civil war. We read about human rights problems but not the context. The quicker you succeed, the better.” Rogers’ assertion that “Kissinger’s warning was delivered in robust fashion to the Argentine president—there are cables to prove it, although Kornbluh does not reprint them...” is a truly astonishing claim. In reality, as the documents prove beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt, Kissinger consistently disparaged Ambassador Hill’s representations over human rights abuses and contradicted him behind his back directly with the Argentine government during the period of its worst human rights violations.

To the editor:

In his letter in the March/April issue, William D. Rogers accuses me of “bias” in my reply to his criticism of my review of Peter Kornbluh’s *The Pinochet File*. He does so, he says, because in my reply I cited the September 20, 1976, cable of Assistant Secretary of State Harry Shlaudeman from Costa Rica, where he was then traveling. The cable is addressed to “SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE...” and it indicates it is “for” the attention of Shlaudeman’s then deputy, William H. Luers.

To understand Mr. Rogers’s confusion the relevant part of the cable must be quoted:

SUBJECT: OPERATION CONDOR...

UNLESS THERE IS SOME COMPLICATION I AM UNAWARE OF, THERE WOULD SEEM TO BE NO REASON TO WAIT MY RETURN. YOU CAN SIMPLY INSTRUCT THE AMBASSADORS TO TAKE NO FURTHER ACTION, NOTING THAT THERE HAVE BEEN NO REPORTS IN SOME WEEKS INDICATING AN INTENTION TO ACTIVATE THE CONDOR SCHEME.

Mr. Rogers comments: “Even if State had passed the Shlaudeman message on to Santiago, it could not conceivably have ‘prevented’ the murder” of Orlando Letelier on September 21. This comment shows a complete misunderstanding of the cable. As is clear both from Kornbluh’s book and from the article by him and John Dinges in the September 22, 2002, *Washington Post*, the cable was intended to *rescind* prior instructions, given in August, by Kissinger to U.S. ambassadors to “make representations” to the South American military regimes that planned Condor assassinations were of “deep concern” to the United States.

Clearly those previous instructions should not have been rescinded; and it is hard to believe that Shlaudeman would have sent a cable rescinding them without the approval of the Secretary of State who had authorized them in the first place. But it is ironic, in light of Rogers’s assertions to the contrary, that I made it clear that I was not drawing accusatory conclusions in this case. What other construction can be put on my phrase that the Letelier assassination was a “cruel *coincidence*”? Or on my comment regarding General Schneider’s assassination where I wrote that it was “probably *not* what the Americans wanted.” (my italics) Once more Rogers imputes meaning by citing half sentences out of context.

Rogers now says he and Kissinger were “in Africa trying to end the white regime in Rhodesia.” Again we have the “too busy to pay attention” defense wrapped up, as before, in a litany of angry ad hominem aspersions.

As to the chronology of Operation Condor, it did not begin in “late 1976,” as Rogers claims. Condor began formally in 1975 and continued until 1977. Its coordinator, Colonel Manuel Contreras of the Chilean Secret Police DINA, visited Washington, D.C., for consultations in January 1975. Rogers had taken office as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs on October 7, 1974, and moved on to become Under Secretary of State for Economic and Agricultural Affairs on June 18, 1976. Washington’s knowledge about the Condor system and its activities during this period has been cautiously and carefully documented in John Dinges’s book *The Condor Years*, especially chapters 7-10, and in chapter 6 of Kornbluh’s *Pinochet File*. This period also saw the March 24, 1976, military coup in Buenos Aires which ushered in the worst bloodletting of Argentina’s “Dirty War.” As Larry Rohter pointed out recently in the *New York Times* (December 28, 2003), Henry Kissinger, anticipating human rights protest in the U.S. Congress, told the Argentine Foreign Minister, Adm. César Augusto Guzzetti, on October 7, 1976: “The quicker you succeed the better.”

Rogers cannot have it both ways. If he knew none of this, well and good. But if this is so, he cannot also claim categorically that charges of U.S. complicity or neglect are false. In any case, I am not the issue here; Chile, Condor, and Kissinger are. It would be helpful if Kissinger himself would comment on the statements I have quoted. Rogers cannot forever provide a shield for his boss to hide behind. As he says “no one would have had the temerity to countermand a direct, personal instruction from Kissinger...” The way to clarify the record is to release it in full; not to close off debate, first by accusations of “mythmaking,” now by accusations of “bias.”

The statements in my letter have been all fully sustained subsequently by the recent additional release of declassified documents.<sup>64</sup>

To reemphasize the key point here: Rogers says that the Shlaudeman message of September 20 could not conceivably have “prevented” the murder of Orlando Letelier. On this we are in agreement, above all because the message was not intended to prevent it, and the bomb in any case was already strapped under Letelier’s car. The telegram was intended to put on hold an initiative by the U.S. government that might have impeded several assassination plots, among them that which was aimed at Letelier in Washington. The August 23, 1976, cable had instructed the U.S. ambassadors to seek a meeting with the heads of state of Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay, and to tell them that the American government knew of their Condor assassination plans and condemned them wherever they might take place.<sup>65</sup> Was there a guarantee that this would stop the plots? No, but it might well have done so had the message been unequivocal, had it been delivered in a prompt fashion where it mattered, and had Kissinger not systematically before and afterwards undermined the credibility of his own ambassadors in private conversations with the Chileans and Argentines. Most remarkably, in discussing Uruguay the August 23 cable reads: “for Montevideo, we assume your best approach is to General Vadora rather than to either acting president or president designate, who apparently know nothing about Operation Condor...” Since Pinochet has denied knowledge of Condor, it is highly significant that Kissinger in August of 1976 appears to have been in no doubt whatsoever that the heads of state to whom his demarche was directed in Chile (Pinochet) and Argentina (Videla) did.

Perhaps we have become numb to atrocity. But let’s be very clear about what sort of regimes we are speaking of here. The official report of the Chilean National Commission on Political Imprisonment and Torture, led by Monsignor Sergio Valech, the bishop emeritus of Santiago, completed in November 2004 based on testimony from 35,000 victims and their relatives and covering the period of General Pinochet’s rule from September 11, 1973 through 1989, concludes that “torture was a policy of state, meant to repress and terrorize the population.” The report, according to Larry Rohter in the *New York Times*, identifies

---

<sup>64</sup> “Newly declassified document shows Secretary of State gave strong support early on to the military junta,” edited by Carlos Osorio and Kathleen Costar, *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book* No. 133, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB133/index.htm> (posted August 27, 2004). See also Diana Jean Schemo, “Papers Show No Protest By Kissinger On Argentina,” *New York Times*, August 27, 2004, sec. A. John Dinges has commented on Rogers’ misstatements in a letter to Diana Schemo available at <http://www.johndinges.com/condor/CFR.htm>.

It seemed to me ironic, though I did not make the point in my letter at the time, that Rogers should chose to bring in the story of Kissinger in Africa to divert attention from the story of Kissinger in Latin America. In fact, as Nixon’s National Security Advisor, Kissinger had embraced the white regimes in Africa. The U.S. debacle during the collapse of the Portuguese African empire between 1974 and 1975 was a direct consequence of this policy. Kissinger then encouraged the apartheid regime in South Africa to intervene clandestinely in Angola. It was the arrival of Cuban forces in Angola, a military intervention neither he nor Rogers had anticipated, and the success of the Cubans in thwarting the South African advance on Luanda, which dramatically shifted the balance of forces in Southern Africa. This new vulnerability, not any commitment to majority rule by Africans, led to Kissinger’s sudden interest in the fate of the white regimes there. See Piero Gleijeses, *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa, 1959-1976* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002) and Witney W. Schneidman, *Engaging Africa: Washington and the Fall of Portugal’s Colonial Empire* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004).

<sup>65</sup> The facsimile of the complete original document is reproduced in Kornbluh, *The Pinochet File*: Chapter 6, Doc. 15.

fourteen main forms of torture employed: “physical abuse, like beatings, burns, submersion in water, electrical shock, the extraction of fingernails and sexual violations, and psychological methods, like mock executions, long periods of solitary confinement and compulsory attendance at sessions where others were tortured.”<sup>66</sup>

In Argentina, out of the over 22,000 people killed by the regime’s death squads, 18,400 were “disappeared” in 1976 and 1977, and many thousands more were tortured.<sup>67</sup> Between 1976 and 1977, 1,500 to 2,000 detainees were drugged, stripped of their clothing, and thrown alive from airplanes into the Atlantic Ocean. And this was a regime which perfected the grotesque art of stealing babies born to mothers held in secret detention and arranging for their illegal adoption and the substitution of their civil identity. These practices have been shown to have been part of a centrally coordinated plan ordered by General Videla.<sup>68</sup> Argentina’s General Ibérico Saint-Jean said in 1977: “First we’ll kill all the subversives. Then we’ll kill the collaborators, then the sympathizers, then the undecided. And finally, we’ll kill the indifferent.”<sup>69</sup>

Journalist Rodolfo J. Walsh, in March 24, 1977, wrote in an “Open Letter from a Writer to the Military Junta:”

Between fifteen hundred and three thousand people have been secretly massacred since you forbade the publication of information about the discovery of corpses ... Twenty-five mutilated bodies washed up on the Uruguayan coast between March and October of 1976, a small part, perhaps, of the number of those tortured to death at the Navy School of Mechanics ... the Junta you men preside over is not the needle on the scale between “two opposing violent factions,” nor the just arbitrator between “two terrorisms,” but the very source of terror that has lost its way and can only stammer out the discourse of death.<sup>70</sup>

The next day Walsh was ambushed and killed. Lt. Col. Hugo Pascarelli said in May 1977: “The struggle we engage in does not recognize moral limits: it is beyond good and evil.”<sup>71</sup>

I may be naïve, but to me it is deeply shocking that Kissinger, who found refuge in the United States when his family escaped the Nazis, should as U.S. Secretary of State undermine the human rights protests of his own diplomats and of the U.S. Congress in private conversations with representatives of the murderous regimes of the Southern Cone, one of which (the Argentine) was virulently anti-Semitic. And it is no less shocking for Rogers to assert that Kissinger’s defense of human rights was “robust,” and to claim for

---

<sup>66</sup> Larry Rohter, “A Torture Report Compels Chile to Reassess Its Past,” *New York Times*, November 28, 2004, sec. 1. On December 3, 2004, the Chilean Court of Appeal lifted Pinochet’s immunity on the Carlos Prats case. His legal immunity had also been stripped by this court on May 28, 2004, in connection with Operation Condor.

<sup>67</sup> John Dinges, based on Argentine intelligence documents, gives the following figures for the disappeared between 1975 and 1978: 903 in 1975; 10,251 in 1976; 8,207 in 1977; and 2,639 in 1978 (22,000 total). See Dinges, *The Condor Years*, 139.

<sup>68</sup> Human Rights Watch, *Reluctant Partner: The Argentine Government’s Failure to Back Trials of Human Rights Violators* (December 2001). Available at: [http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/argentina/argen1201-01.htm#P53\\_4982](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/argentina/argen1201-01.htm#P53_4982).

<sup>69</sup> Brian Loveman, *For la Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America* (Wilmington: SR Books, 1999), xi.

<sup>70</sup> Horacio Verbitsky, *The Flight: Confessions of an Argentinian Dirty Warrior*, trans. Esther Allen (New York: New Press; Norton, 1996), 81.

<sup>71</sup> Donald C. Hodges, *Argentina’s “Dirty War”: An Intellectual Biography* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 125.

Kissinger the initiation of a human rights policy that was in fact begun and sustained by his Democratic and Republican successors and by the continuing pressure of U.S. Congress, if only for one very simple reason: subsequent U.S. policy saved lives. Kissinger's evidently did not, not Letelier's, nor many thousands other less notable victims of state terror. It is sad that an editor who I respected—especially one who is the vice chair of the board of Human Rights Watch—should let these misrepresentations and obfuscations stand without challenge.

Kissinger will not deal with these issues now. He relies on Rogers to convey his public denials and rejoinders. But in his memoirs he did say the following about the fall of Allende and rise of Pinochet:

The Nixon Administration was not so insensitive to the Chilean junta's clumsy and occasionally brutal practices as our critics alleged. But we considered that the change of government in Chile was on balance favorable – even from the point of view of human rights.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982): 411.

## ACT IV: DENIAL

In the end this is a very odd story of damage that could so easily have been avoided, and on numerous occasions. I would like to think my *Foreign Affairs* reviews of books on the Western Hemisphere were read over the years. It is inconceivable, however, that the attention paid to my review essay of *The Pinochet File* would have been anything out of the ordinary without the reaction and interference by Henry Kissinger and William Rogers, who only brought more attention to the very events they were seeking to bury.<sup>73</sup>

Many people have asked if the post-9/11 climate in the United States limited the space for free debate and had an impact on the behavior of the Council on Foreign Relations and *Foreign Affairs* in this matter. I do not think so. My best guess is that these missteps are much more linked to the complexities of Kissinger's particular relationship to Chile, *Foreign Affairs*, and the Council, and probably to the fact that none of the principals involved at *Foreign Affairs* and the Council knows or cares much about Latin America, and thus underestimated the potential damage involved in suppressing a debate about Kissinger's role thirty years ago in the whole Chile-Operation Condor-Pinochet drama. I have also been asked if there had been precedents for such suppression of debate. My impression from several people involved over many years at *Foreign Affairs* and at the Council on Foreign Relations is that such interferences had indeed been attempted on occasion in the past, but were all strenuously resisted.<sup>74</sup>

As I had warned Hoge, the controversy did not remain behind closed doors. The publication of Rogers's letter in the March/April issue of *Foreign Affairs* became a matter of concern to several colleagues in the academic world. I felt I needed to try a final time to get Hoge to publish my rebuttal and asked him again on May 5, 2004, to reconsider his denial.<sup>75</sup> I again received no reply from him.

I had been invited to give the address at the annual meeting of the John Carter Brown Library Associates at Brown University on May 7, and afterwards I went up to

---

<sup>73</sup> Kissinger's reaction does fit a pattern of behavior over the years. Walter Isaacson dates the beginning of the long feud between Kissinger and Paul Nitze to Nitze's unfavorable review of Kissinger's first book, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*. Isaacson also points out Kissinger's habit of having "researchers hunt for inaccuracies" in books about him, and how he had become "furious at Stanley Hoffmann for giving [Seymour Hersh's *The Price of Power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House*] mildly respectable treatment in the *New York Times Book Review*." See Isaacson, *Kissinger*, 85, 713. Apparently Kissinger also had taken strong exception to *Foreign Affairs* running a review of Walter Isaacson's book.

<sup>74</sup> Several close observers of the dispute, puzzled by the disproportionate and escalating reactions of Kissinger and Rogers, which only served to draw more attention to questions which otherwise may have passed without comment, attribute it to my comment that: "There is a way to clear the air. Some countries have established 'truth commissions' to look into such matters. In the United States, however, the record has been extracted painfully, like rotten teeth. Accusations of 'mischievous nonsense' do not help. Whether or not these difficult legacies should be buried or debated is, of course, a matter of judgment. Rogers evidently believes they are best left undisturbed. My own belief is that we should seek to learn from the past if we have the wisdom to do so." In "Maxwell replies," 165.

<sup>75</sup> Author's e-mail message to James Hoge, May 5, 2004: "Since no correction of William D. Rogers' inaccuracies appears in the current issue of *Foreign Affairs*, and since I did not receive an acknowledgement from you of my letter to you of February 4, 2004 (appended), I take it you have nothing further to say on the question. Am I right to think this?"

Cambridge to speak to Professor John Coatsworth, Director of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard. He told me that he intended, together with several colleagues, to write a letter protesting the closing off of debate. I told him I had made up my mind to resign over the issue and would do so very shortly to give *Foreign Affairs* time to select a new reviewer before the next issue. I also wanted to take measures to ensure that my immediate staff, who had stood by me loyally throughout, should not be vulnerable to retribution. Coatsworth very kindly offered to speak to his faculty committee about offering me a fellowship. I asked him to pursue the idea.

I sent my letters of resignation to Hoge and Haass on May 13. Hoge replied to my letter of resignation via e-mail on the following morning setting out his “differing views of the precipitating events.” Rogers, he wrote, had called to complain that my first letter of response contained an:

implication of complicity by him and other State Department officials, including Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in Chilean secret police political violence. I expressed doubt but said that I would check with you. When I called, you said that is indeed what you implied. I said that since the assertion was based on surmise, not hard facts, that I felt Rogers should be given an opportunity to address that specific issue. I also said that I did not want a continuing round of exchanges, and you agreed the Rogers’ second letter should end the matter. Having transmitted that message to Rogers, I felt I could not change the ground rules when later you changed your mind.<sup>76</sup>

Hoge added, “Your May 13 letter contains speculation about supposed pressures from Mr. Kissinger. As I have previously told you, Mr. Rogers is the only involved person with whom I have discussed this matter. During our telephone exchanges, he made clear that he was representing only himself in the interest of his own reputation.”

As to his lack of response to my letter of February 4, Hoge wrote that because it “stated that it was ‘for the record.’ I took it as such and therefore not requiring an answer...” And on his lack of reply to my final inquiry on May 5, he wrote, “[your e-mail] came during close period of *Foreign Affairs*’ next issue and was put with other correspondence to be answered as soon as the issue was sent to the printers.”

---

<sup>76</sup> James Hoge, e-mail message to author, May 14, 2004. Hoge’s mention that Rogers had complained that “other State Department officials” were implicated in my supposed accusation of “complicity” is worth comment. No other officials were mentioned in either my review essay or in my response to Rogers’ first intervention. In fact, I had pointed out the principled opposition to Kissinger’s policy from officials in the State Department, and Kissinger’s contempt for them and his propensity to criticize their defense of human rights behind their backs privately with representatives of the repressive regime in the Southern Cone as well as to criticize the U.S. Congress. The names of officials are mentioned in the declassified document I discussed in the letter *Foreign Affairs* refused to publish. Over the course of my years at the Council I have come to know all of them. I felt that if they wished to speak or not to speak on this question it was up to them. Since the dispute became public, several of the principals involved have sought me out and spoken to me. Rogers apparently did attempt to get them to sign on to his complaint, but was rebuffed. It seems Hoge was also sufficiently concerned after my conversation with him on January 30 about Condor that he called one of them to ask “who is right—Maxwell or Rogers?” He was told that was not the issue. The official who warned Washington that Chilean secret agents had tried to enter the United States clandestinely also told me he believes that, had Washington listened to him, the Letelier murder might have been prevented. He also saw the dispute in *Foreign Affairs* as a clash of cultures of historian versus defense attorney, though, as I pointed out to him, Rogers claims he is not acting as an attorney for the defense in this case.

Kissinger was by now speaking to Hoge again. When Hoge had denied to Brazilian reporter Rafael Cariello that Kissinger even knew about the exchange of letters, Cariello inquired as to how Hoge knew this. Hoge said “he had called the former Secretary [of State] a week before to discuss the matter.”<sup>77</sup>

My letters of resignation went to Hoge, Haass, and only those people specifically mentioned in the texts. I met with Haass on the morning of May 14 and we had a brief conversation. He followed up with a letter in which he stated for the record that:

I was never approached or pressured by anyone to take any action with respect to your review (that appeared in the November/December issue) and the subsequent exchange of letters in *Foreign Affairs*. For the record, I would not have been influenced by any such intervention had it taken place....<sup>78</sup>

The announcement of my appointment as a senior fellow at the David Rockefeller Center was made at Harvard that evening.

The public departure announcement I sent to the Council staff and my friends and colleagues only mentioned my new appointment, the date of departure from the Council as being July 1, and my resignation from *Foreign Affairs* as being effective immediately. Later I discovered Haass had distributed my letters of resignation more widely, together with his and Hoge’s denials of any interference of Kissinger.<sup>79</sup> The dispute became public early June.<sup>80</sup>

Richard Haass should have steered clear of the controversy internally, as he did externally by ducking questions from reporters. When Scott Sherman of the *Nation* called, he was told Haass was traveling and unavailable for comment.<sup>81</sup> When Diana Jean Schemo of the *New York Times* called Kissinger’s office for comment, she was told by an assistant that Kissinger was traveling and could not be reached for comment.<sup>82</sup> Both Kissinger and Haass were at the Grand Hotel des Iles Borromees attending the Bilderberg conference (June 3-6).

---

<sup>77</sup> Cariello, “Rixa com Kissinger afasta brasilianista.”

<sup>78</sup> Richard N. Haass, letter to author, May 14, 2004.

<sup>79</sup> Richard N. Haass, memo to Carla Hills, Robert Rubin, and Maurice R. Greenberg [and circulated to others], May 14, 2004: “...The background [to Maxwell’s resignation] is more than fully covered in his letters to me and Jim Hoge and in our responses. All four letters are attached, along with my and Ken’s e-mails to the CFR staff. I wanted you to be aware of all this as it is quite possible there will be some public attention given the subject to the heart of the matter (an exchange over Ken’s review of a book dealing with Henry Kissinger and Chile) and Ken’s allegations (unfounded in Jim’s and my view) that he received insufficient chance to make his case given “external” pressures on *Foreign Affairs* and the Council....”

<sup>80</sup> The first public comment appeared in Scott Sherman’s article on the *Nation*’s online edition on June 3, 2004. Diana Jean Schemo’s first piece appeared in the *New York Times* on June 5. The National Security Archive on June 10 posted a comprehensive dossier of declassified documents relating to the dispute in *Foreign Affairs* as well as the text of a joint letter by Kornbluh and Dinges in response to Rogers’ criticism: “Lifting of Pinochet’s immunity renews focus on Operation Condor; Documents indicate 1976 terrorist attack in Washington might have been prevented,” <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB125/index.htm> On June 11 Dinges himself posted on his website a letter to the *Nation* amplifying Sherman’s story, available at <http://www.johndinges.com/condor/Letter%20to%20The%20Nation.htm>.

<sup>81</sup> Sherman, “The Maxwell Affair,” 23.

<sup>82</sup> Diana Jean Schemo, “Kissinger Accused of Blocking Scholar.”



As Jack Shafer observed in *Slate*, “Will somebody please buy Henry Kissinger a cell phone?”<sup>83</sup>

Haass was in his first year as president of the Council on Foreign Relations. He succeeded Les Gelb in July 2003, previously having served as Director of Policy Planning at the State Department. He remained for a time Special Envoy to Northern Ireland for the George W. Bush administration, an overlap of government and private role which the Council had for decades strenuously avoided. In any case, the supposed firewall between Haass and Hoge was of course irrelevant if the chairman of the Council (Peterson, to whom both reported) and a current board member and former vice-chairman (Greenberg) felt no qualms about acting as Kissinger’s messengers on a matter of opinion. Whether Peterson and Greenberg spoke of their roles as Kissinger messengers at the meeting of the Council’s board of directors when the matter was discussed I do not know. They should have; and they should have recused themselves from discussion of the matter.

I assume the arguments Hoge made in his e-mail to me of May 14 and in his editor’s note in *Foreign Affairs* are the arguments he made to his editorial advisory board and which Haass made to the Council’s board of directors meeting on June 10. My view of the matter was not solicited by either board. Both Haass and Hoge emerged emboldened from these meetings with a concerted position. Haass used the occasion of the traditional end-of-program-year all-staff meeting of the Council to reinforce the official line. Less than an hour before the meeting, which took place on June 15, I was warned confidentially that Haass intended to make a comment on the two *New York Times* articles where the Council on Foreign Relations had been criticized, one of which had discussed my resignation and the causes.<sup>84</sup> I suspected an ambush. Should Haass use the occasion, as was customary, to bid farewell to those leaving, all would be well and good. If not I was ready to respond. I prepared a brief written comment in case I needed to defend my actions.

At the meeting Haass insisted vehemently that the *New York Times* was wrong in both cases. No pressure whatsoever, he claimed, had been brought to bear on him or on Hoge, who had made an “editorial judgment.” Haass also said there was a “church-state separation” between the Council on Foreign Relations and *Foreign Affairs*, and that Hoge was an “extraordinary editor” and he “stood behind him completely.” He said this is what he had told the Council’s board of directors. He was not concerned about Latin America Studies at the Council with my departure because he “knew the region and would deal with it.” Since the meeting was attended by the full staff of the Council in New York and was being video-conferenced to the staff in Washington, and Haass’ statement was a complete misrepresentation of what had occurred and a direct assault on my credibility, I asked to speak and did so from my prepared statement:

---

<sup>83</sup> Jack Shafer, “Kissinger’s Con: ‘Henry can’t come to the phone right now...’” *Slate*, June 16, 2004, <http://slate.msn.com/id/2102498>.

<sup>84</sup> The report by Diana Jean Schemo was not the only critical piece to appear about the Council on Foreign Relations that month in the *New York Times*. On the following Saturday it had been reported that a Council Task Force on Terrorist Financing headed by Maurice Greenberg had bowed to pressure from the White House and toned down its finding as a consequence. See Timothy L. O’Brien and David D. Kirkpatrick, “Nonpolitical Study of Terror Is Caught Up in Politics,” *New York Times*, June 12, 2004, sec. A. For the Task Force report, see [http://www.cfr.org/pdf/Revised\\_Terrorist\\_Financing.pdf](http://www.cfr.org/pdf/Revised_Terrorist_Financing.pdf).

- I have had fifteen very happy years at the CFR. It seems obvious that I would not have resigned at this stage in my career unless I had very good reasons for doing so.
- I stand by everything I have written.
- There is a simple way to end the controversy – that is for *Foreign Affairs* to publish my rebuttal.
- I see no reason why a promise made to the Vice Chairman of Kissinger Associates should outweigh common sense in this manner given continuing damage to the reputations of *Foreign Affairs* and the CFR. Publication of my rebuttal to Rogers' letter would end the matter as far as I am concerned.

Book reviewing is not a popularity contest. Readers look to reviewers for informed and honest judgment. It is hardly a surprise that authors are often angry at reviewers. Over my eleven years as the Western Hemisphere book reviewer for *Foreign Affairs* I wrote more than 300 reviews. Several distinguished Latin Americanists have complained vociferously at various times about what I have written about their books.<sup>85</sup> None of these angry authors were ever accorded the “last word” granted to Rogers.<sup>86</sup> *Foreign Affairs* violated a fundamental principle of journalistic ethics: when an editor commissions a review and decides to publish it, he has an obligation to allow the reviewer to reply to criticism. That obligation becomes all the more consequential when the reviewer can show that his critic made serious factual errors.

Hoge's misleading “The Editor Replies” is a sad indication of what happens when editors give more weight to the grumbles of their proprietors and their powerful friends than they do to their sacred duty in a free society of defending the right to free expression of their own writers. It is ironic that the occasion for this dispute was Chile. As a Chilean commentator observed:

Perhaps one of the newest symptoms of the change [that has taken place in Chile] has been the way that the media and academic and political circles treated the thirty-year anniversary of the Pinochet coup. The anniversary stimulated a debate without fear and with free expression of differences, hatred, suffering and remorse. As never before, Chile can now look at one of the darkest periods of its history with honesty and calmness.<sup>87</sup>

What a pity *Foreign Affairs* cannot do the same. Or Mr. Kissinger.

---

<sup>85</sup> Irving Louis Horowitz, for example, vigorously complained about the first review I ever wrote for *Foreign Affairs* as the Western Hemisphere reviewer [about his book *The Conscience of Worms and the Cowardice of Lions: Cuban Politics and Culture in an American Context* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1993)].

<sup>86</sup> It is a precedent Hoge and *Foreign Affairs* will soon come to regret. In fact, Samuel P. Huntington avails himself of the magazine's new “ground rule” in the September/October 2004 issue to have the “last word” in response to criticism of his controversial new book *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004).

<sup>87</sup> Pedro E. Güell, “Chile Has Changed ... but in what ways has it changed?” *ReVista: Harvard Review of Latin America* (Spring 2004): 4-7. Güell is Executive Coordinator of the Reports on Human Development of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-Chile.



DAVID ROCKEFELLER CENTER FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES  
**Working Papers on Latin America Series**



**DRCLAS introduces its latest working paper:**

*The Case of the Missing Letter in Foreign Affairs: Kissinger, Pinochet and Operation Condor*

by Kenneth Maxwell (Paper No. 04/05-3)

**Previously Published Working Papers:**

*Giving Voice to a Nascent Community: Exploring Brazilian Immigration to the U.S. through Research and Practice* edited by Clémence Jouët-Pastré, Megwen Loveless and Leticia Braga (04/05-2)

*Mexico's Market Reforms in Historical Perspective* by Juan Carlos Moreno Brid and Jaime Ros (04/05-1)

*Beyond Armed Actors: Carving a Stronger Role for Civil Society in Colombia*, Proceedings from a conference at DRCLAS (03/04-2)

*Venezuela responde a sus retos* by Ana Julia Jatar, Alesia Rodríguez, and Reinier Schliesser (03/04-1)

*Seminar on Cuban Health System: Its Evolution, Accomplishments and Challenges; US-Cuba Relations at the Turn of the 21st Century: 3 Perspectives on Improving Bilateral Ties* edited by Lorena Barberia, Dan Nemser and Arachu Castro (02/03-4)

*Iatrogenic Epidemic: How Health Care Professionals Contribute to the High Proportion of Cesarean Sections in Mexico* by Arachu Castro, Angela Heimburger, and Ana Langer (02/03-3)

*The Politics of Educational Inequality: The Struggle for Educational Opportunity in Latin America* by Fernando Reimers (02/03-2)

*Institutions and Long-Run Economic Performance in Mexico and Spain, 1800-2000* by John H. Coatsworth and Gabriel Tortella Casares (02/03-1)

*Environmental Sustainability of Argentine Agriculture: Patterns, Gradients and Tendencies 1960-2000* by Ernesto T. Viglizzo, Aníbal J. Pordomingo, Mónica G. Castro, Fabián A. Lértora, and Otto T. Solbrig (01/02-2)

*Something to Hide? The Politics of Educational Evaluation in Latin America* by Fernando Reimers (01/02-1)

*La Política de Estados Unidos hacia Cuba durante la Segunda Presidencia de Clinton* by Jorge Domínguez (00/01-3, in Spanish)

*Impact of Globalization on the Grasslands in the Southern Cone of South America* by Otto T. Solbrig and Raúl R. Vera (00/01-2)

*The Role of Restructuring in Recovering from Crises: Mexico 1995-98* by Anne Krueger and Aaron Tornell (00/01-1)

*Why Was Brazil Different? The Contexts of Independence: John Parry Memorial Lecture, April 25, 2000* by Kenneth Maxwell (Special Paper)

*Under Two Flags: Dual Nationality in Latin America and its Consequences for the United States* by Michael Jones-Correa (99/00-3)

*Virtual Legality: the Use and Reform of Military Justice in Brazil, the Southern Cone, and Mexico* by Anthony W. Pereira (99/00-2)

*Strategies for Addressing Corruption in the Americas*, Proceedings from a Conference at Harvard Law School in Cambridge, MA, March 11, 1999 (Special Paper)

*Sustainable Farming in the Argentine Pampas: History, Society, Economy, and Ecology* by Otto T. Solbrig and Ernesto Viglizzo (99/00-1)

*Exorcising the Demons of War: Memory, Identity and Honor in the Ecuador-Peru Peace Negotiations* by Carlos Espinosa (98/99-2)

*Prospects for Compliance: The Guatemalan Military and the Peace Accords* by Jennifer Schirmer (98/99-1)

*The Social Agenda and the Politics of Reform in Latin America* by Merilee S. Grindle (97/98-3)

*Regionalism in World Trade: Europe and the Americas in Perspective* by Rosario Santa Gadea (97/98-2)

*Andrés Bello and the Problem of Order in Post-Independence Spanish America* by Ivan Jaksic (97/98-1)

Proceedings of a Conference on Law and Democracy in Colombia held in Cambridge, MA, May 7, 1997 (Special Paper)

*Democratization and the Ghost of Zapata: Mexico from 1959 to 1991* by David L. Leal (96/97-9)

*Identity, Personhood and Religion in Caribbean Context* by Abraham H. Khan (96/97-8)

*Law Under Siege: The Origins and Transformation of Brazil's Political Trials, 1964-1979* by Anthony W. Pereira (96/97-7)

*Towards a Sustainable Pampa Agriculture: Past Performance and Prospective Analysis* by Otto T. Solbrig (96/97-6)

*Mexico's New Foreign Policy: States, Societies and Institutions* by Jorge I. Domínguez (96/97-5)

*Participation and Educational Change in Latin America* by Fernando Reimers (96/97-4)

*A Strained Alliance: Continuity and Change in Mexican Labor Politics* by M. Victoria Murillo (96/97-3)

*Proceed with Caution: A Rhetoric of Particularism* by Doris Sommer (96/97-2)

*Widening Scholarly Horizons: Theoretical Approaches or the Study of U.S.-Mexican Relations* by Jorge I. Domínguez (96/97-1)

*Hidrovia: Bright Future or Development Nightmare?* Proceedings of an International Conference held in Cambridge, MA, April 3 and 4, 1996 (Special Paper)

Working papers are available for pick-up at DRCLAS, 61 Kirkland St., Cambridge, MA for \$5 each. Papers can be mailed for \$6 each (including postage and handling).

Papers are available online for free at <<http://drclas.fas.harvard.edu>>.

Contact: June Erlick, Publications Director, DRCLAS, Harvard University, 61 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617-495-5428 • Fax: 617-495-2802 • e-mail: <[jerlick@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:jerlick@fas.harvard.edu)>.