

April 5, 2023

Patricia S. Connor, Clerk  
United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, 1100 E. Main Street, Suite  
501  
Richmond, Virginia 23219-3517

Case No: 23-1049 / The 1st Amendment, the National Defense University /  
Defense Security Cooperation Agency & the Henry A. Kissinger Connection

Dear Ms. Connor,

May it please the Court, below please find the article, “Kissinger’s Culpability,” published this month in *The Progressive* magazine. The story admirably fleshes out the Petitioner’s arguably most important disclosures regarding a far-right and/or neo-Nazi cabal and a systemic pattern of self-protecting reprisal running through National Defense University (NDU) and Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) decisions against an already decorated national security whistleblower; efforts sustained by collaborationist [kapos](#) of the U.S. Merit System Protection Board (MSPB), themselves rightful owners of a quota of guilt.

In the Petitioner’s initial 01/22/2023 Petition before the Court he noted that “[m]yriad federal false statements made to and parroted by” the MSPB included claims that he had promoted “damaging conspiratorial theories of wrongdoing by the agency,” ie: the NDU and DSCA. (P.5) The Petitioner noted (Pp. 6-7) that “key details” that he had provided in three classified Congressional Disclosures before

the Intelligence Community Office of Inspector General (IC OIG) also “directly relate(d) to the clandestine and bloody efforts” that were the focus of the Brennan Center for Justice Liberty and National Security Program. In a critical report last year, the Brennan Center in excruciating detail found [22 examples of U.S. secret wars](#) “contraven(ing) our constitutional design ... invit(ing) military escalation that is unforeseeable to the public, to Congress, and even to the diplomats charged with managing U.S. foreign policy.” It continued:

Despite a series of Cold War–era executive orders that prohibit assassinations, the covert action statute has been used throughout the war on terror to conduct drone strikes outside areas of active hostilities.

*But there is a third class of statutory authorities that enable undisclosed hostilities yet have received little public attention: security cooperation authorities. Congress enacted these provisions in the years following September 11 to allow U.S. forces to work through and with foreign partners. One of them, now codified at 10 U.S.C. § 333, permits the Department of Defense to train and equip foreign forces anywhere in the world. Another, now codified at 10 U.S.C. § 127e, authorizes the Department of Defense to provide “support” to foreign forces, paramilitaries, and private individuals who are in turn “supporting” U.S. counterterrorism operations. (Italics added.)*

It was on 11/09/2022 that the Petitioner clearly informed the MSPB,

[another Pleading will be submitted shortly that shows how a much-ballyhooed U.S. Secretary of State](#) who received the NDU Foundation's prestigious American Patriot Award in 2008 (the same year the Petitioner began investigating [his] NDU colleagues guilty of torture, murder and association with international terrorist in their previous roles as senior officials in the Argentine and Chilean military dictatorships promoted by the American), can in fact actually be accused of treason. New revelations show how PhD dissertation research based on (the Petitioner's) insider knowledge (*and paid for as part of [his] DoD stipend at NDU*) was close to uncovering critical evidence in this historic case. No wonder vice ADM. Ann Rondeau, at the time angling for appointment as the head of U.S. Southern Command, rushed to falsify the case against [him]. (Italics added.)

This Petition further shows how the "Nonprecedential ... Final Order" (NFO) made by Ms. Cathy A. Harris, et. al on November 17, 2022 (barely a week after the Petitioner's disclosures to them) evidenced a gross and coordinated reprisal by a federal agency supposed to protect whistleblowers, as the MSPB decision was posted *within days of new information* (literally less than a week) proffered to it by the Petitioner on how the *palpable treason* of former Secretary of State Kissinger,

already known for committing crimes against humanity, directly affected the Petitioner's (to that point spotless) federal career, as well as the welfare of his family.

*It was Kissinger who, while in office, orchestrated one of the original clandestine wars (Cambodia) cited by the Brennan Center study, the eventual revelation of which resulted in Congressional passage of the War Powers Resolution (WPR).*

One of the WPR staff authors<sup>1</sup> went on to be a senior official in President Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton administrations and was a former employer of mine. When he offered the Petitioner the job (working for former Vice President Walter Mondale), he told me it was largely due to his investigative reporting about another clandestine war about which the Petitioner had written an exposé just prior to his being hired. (Literally a month before the Petitioner was brought onboard by the WPR expert, the former had exposed Mr. Kissinger for giving a “green light” to neo-Nazi military coup mongers for their secret war in Argentina.)

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Brian Atwood, “Opinion: Sharing War Powers,” *The New York Times*, October 14, 1987. <https://www.nytimes.com/1987/10/14/opinion/sharing-war-powers.html>

The Atwood article ran less than two months before he hired me; in it he referred to “a growing realization that no war powers law is strong enough to withstand a President who insists that his powers as Commander in Chief override any Congressional role. In such circumstances, confidence in Government is the lost commodity.”

Former Secretary of State Kissinger not only pointedly referred to military men as “dumb, stupid animals to be used” as pawns in his clandestine machinations; in 2008 he was given the National University Foundation’s coveted “American Patriot Award” the same year the Petitioner began, (supposedly protected) disclosures at NDU about fellow professors and others who later were convicted for “crimes against humanity” in lawless regimes promoted and protected by the former most senior diplomat.

Not only were Kissinger’s minions intimately involved in the wrongdoing that was part of the Petitioner’s subsequent NDU/DSCA whistleblowing disclosures as well as the hyperbolic and wrongful reprisals against him. The Petitioner found out that Mr. Kissinger also privately told the foreign minister of another far-right military dictatorship he supported and protected (that of international terrorist General Augusto Pinochet’s Chile), that a good friend (and news source) of the Petitioner’s, who at the time of the conversation in question was President Carter’s point person on international human rights issues, was a “stupid” woman “who should receive rough treatment.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Zach Dorfman, “How Henry Kissinger Conspired Against a Sitting President,” *Politico Magazine*, January 16, 2017.

<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/01/henry-kissinger-jimmy-carter-chile-214603/>

(C) Kissinger's Memoirs

He said his memoirs, to be published next week, will cause great discomfort among liberal circles in the United States, and among communists and their friends. When he mentioned the aspects of the memoirs that touch on the Chilean situation, he said ironically that it was a dishonor to Allende that he should continue to be known as democratic, when in truth he was really a communist. Later he referred in detail to mistakes made by the United States during the process prior to Allende's election. He said Ambassador Korry had given the impression that Alessandri was winning, and that the United States was frightened when Allende's victory was predicted, but did nothing since it was already too late.

(D) Chile-United States Relations

I asked him how we should handle our relationship with the United States. He said that was a very difficult question to answer, since the Carter government has "begun making enemies of all its friends and making friends of all its enemies." When I mentioned the Letelier case and indicated our puzzlement at the fact that the United States did not respect Latin America's legal institutions, he admitted we were right: that the Chilean legal decision was correct, but that this was not a legal problem so much as a political one. "It needs to be managed," he said, "with political criteria." Apologizing for his frankness, he said this was a bad case for us, and had been badly managed politically. He added that his only advice was that we treat the current U.S. administration with "brutality." He suggested "this is the only language they understand." He repeated this same idea several times during the conversation. He later said we should make our positions public, and move forward decisively. However, he emphasized that until the election process was complete in the United States and a new administration elected, there was nothing we could do to improve our relations with the United States, given that the problem was being treated as a political one. He said, and I quote, "You will have to tough it out until then." Kissinger immediately gave an account of the position of several figures on Chile, to wit: Kennedy and Church hate Chile. There are no problems with Vance. He considers Vaky a very dangerous element and dubbed him a fanatic. He added that he knew him well because he had worked under him. He stressed that Vaky wanted to put Christian-Democratic governments everywhere. He added that Vaky was worse than Christopher. Regarding Pat Derian, in charge of humanitarian matters in the State Department, he said she was "stupid" and should receive tough treatment. He also spoke harshly of Marc Schneider and the State Department bureaucracy, which makes statements and sends cables with no control from above.

He said he had a very good impression of Landau, and asked me to send him his best wishes. He also said he had a good impression of Elliot Richardson and that he knew he had made favorable comments on the economic situation in Chile. Of

2

The conversation Kissinger had with the representative of [a heinous regime with a Nazi mentality](#) came just two years after an exiled Chilean foreign minister and his American aide were killed at Pinochet's direction in [a car bomb attack less](#)

[than a mile from the White House](#) in the worst modern terrorist attack on American soil before September 11, 2001.



**Carter Cornick**, the FBI agent assigned to the case.

---

**Cornick:** This was the first case of international terrorism, state-sponsored terrorism in Washington. I was involved in a specialty that did not exist in the mid-'70s. Terrorism was a Category 3 priority in the FBI. You cannot compare then and now.

In the case before the Court, what the Petitioner offers below goes well beyond a preponderance of evidence and into the territory of beyond a reasonable doubt. The case of orchestrated reprisal against the Petitioner involves not only NDU/DSCA protection and promotion of federal (non-citizen) employees of a neo-Nazi stripe later indicted and convicted in civilian courts in their own countries; banana republic-style impunity for torture advocates and practitioners, foreign death squad leaders, narcotics traffickers and a palpable traitor; racism; sexism; homophobia, and gross common corruption. Those involved now claiming they were ignorant of what

it was that they were party to means they are fools; those who knew, but looked the other way, are cowards, and those who knew, and took part, are criminals.

On October 31, 1987 the Petitioner published the exposé in *The Nation* magazine that showed how one Henry Kissinger in 1976 knowingly gave a green light for the far-right Argentine military dictatorship's neo-Nazi "dirty war" against [a highly exaggerated threat](#) (as reported by the FBI) by leftwing terrorists and other dissidents.

Key evidence came in the form of a [memorandum of conversation](#) President Carter's State Department human rights czar Patricia Derian had in 1977 with Ambassador Robert C. Hill, in which the outgoing Republican envoy told her what Mr. Kissinger had done. It was Ms. Derian, wife of the then State Department Spokesperson Hodding Carter, who Mr. Kissinger informed the Chilean dictatorship's foreign minister in 1978 was "stupid" and "who should receive rough treatment."<sup>3</sup> She was one of the three people to whom the Petitioner dedicated

---

<sup>3</sup> Andersen, M. E. (2022). Henry A. Kissinger: A Premortem on the Real Friend of Enemies. *A Contracorriente: Una Revista De Estudios Latinoamericanos*, 19(3), 345–378. Retrieved from

<https://acontracorriente.chass.ncsu.edu/index.php/acontracorriente/article/view/224>




*Dossier Secreto*, [a work publicly praised](#) by – among others – Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

(In *Dossier Secreto*, Pp. 228, 231, the Petitioner revealed that another far-right military dictatorship supported by Kissinger, that of [Uruguay, conspired to kill Congressional critic -- and later mayor of New York City -- Ed Koch](#), a [disclosure later fully substantiated](#) in declassified U.S. intelligence agency documents. Koch called Uruguay “the Torture Chamber of Latin America.”)<sup>4</sup>

AA archive.nytimes.com

NEW YORK

 **City Room**  
Blogging From the Five Boroughs

**Newly Released C.I.A. Letter Details Threat on Koch's Life**

BY SEWELL CHAN JUNE 26, 2007 12:33 PM

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505 (b) (3)

Office of General Counsel

26 September 2001

Edward I. Koch  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104

APPROVED FOR RELEASE  
DATE: NOV 2004

Dear Mr. Koch:

In response to your letter of 9 July 2001 and its attachment, the Agency conducted additional searches for information concerning an alleged threat on your life in the 1976-1977 timeframe. This new search retrieved information

A detail of the 2001 letter from the C.I.A. to Edward I. Koch. [Read the full letter.](#)

*The Nation* publication came after the fabled former FBI legal attached in Buenos Aires, at the time the Bureau's chief of records, explained in writing to the Petitioner how the generals created a supposed national security threat to take power and engage in [a secret so-called "war" that included at least 340 concentration camps in which thousands of men, women and children were tortured by admirers of Adolf Hitler](#), before they were clandestinely murdered, their bodies dropped into the Atlantic Ocean and its estuaries, [or buried in mass graves](#).<sup>5</sup> Kissinger and his minions, including a top aide who later became a senior NDU official during the Petitioner's time there, denied the scoop's veracity and engaged in a not-so-subtle campaign against the Petitioner. Kissinger even complained to *The Nation* publisher that "a short article in an obscure journal such as yours" had resulted in 60 people protesting his visit to Denmark when he got off the plane in Copenhagen.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Martin Andersen, "Major Argentine Mass Grave Begins Yielding Bodies," *The Washington Post*, March 4, 1984.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1984/03/04/major-argentine-mass-grave-begins-yielding-bodies/621ab710-2277-4eb8-a454-1a67c621e4f9/>

<sup>6</sup> Victor S. Navasky, *A Matter of Opinion*, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2005, page 298.

The publisher, Mr. Victor Navasky, revealed the exchange in 2005, the same year the Petitioner served as an expert witness in the Italian government's case against Chile's Pinochet, a tyrant much cuddled by Mr. Kissinger.<sup>7</sup> That year the Petitioner was recruited to work for the DSCA at the NDU and began his doctoral studies at The Catholic University, with his studies partially financed by DSCA/NDU and his dissertation focused on whistleblowing Ambassador Hill. Kissinger aide [Luigi Einaudi, whose long-time relationship with the CIA](#) was later made public and who had lied about *The Nation* article, was by that time at the NDU, where he continued to treat the Petitioner with disdain and contempt while maintaining close working relationships with several focuses of the Petitioner's disclosures, including the Chilean NDU professor later convicted of torture and

---

<sup>7</sup> Since the 1987 article in *The Nation*, the National Security Archive (NSA) has been able to amass a mountain of declassified federal documents that shows that Kissinger "gave strong support early on" to the deeply antisemitic military junta (Argentina has Latin America's largest Jewish community). The NSA has kindly acknowledged, in their own words, that the Petitioner was "the first to report on Secretary Kissinger's 'green light'" for the unfolding massacre.

<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB133/index.htm> More recently, Pulitzer Prize winning historian Kai Bird cited my article authoritatively in *The Outlier: The Unfinished Presidency of Jimmy Carter*, Penguin/Random House, 2021, page 230 and footnote 230, page 689.

murder in Pinochet's Chile while working for an international terrorist organization.

Approximately a year before the Petitioner went public with his whistleblowing, and having already begun research on my dissertation, the Petitioner sought to interview Ambassador Einaudi, who claimed that Ambassador Hill was the "sleaziest" public employee that he had ever met and promised to share with documentation he had stored at home to prove it. He later claimed 1) not to remember his colleague Hill and 2), in self-contradiction, said that he could not find documents that he had promised.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Please note that the Petitioner has in his possession a copy of an undated letter (which he believes was sent in 2010) thanking former National Security Advisor Richard V. Allen, who was also involved in treasonous 1968 pre-election effort to derail the peace talks with North Vietnam (along with President Nixon, Secretary Kissinger, and Ambassador Hill), for agreeing to talk with me. In the missive, the Petitioner specifically asked Mr. Allen, who was Deputy National Security Advisor under Mr. Nixon, about the backchannel and Mr. Hill's role. In an oral history conducted by the Miller Center of the University of Virginia on May 28, 2002, [Allen admitted](#): "We had some interference at the last minute, an attempt to sabotage the Paris peace talks. That's been written about. Seymour Hersh's rendition of this is correct. Henry Kissinger, on his own, volunteered information to us through a spy, a former student, that he had in the Paris peace talks, who would call him and debrief, and Kissinger called me from pay phones and we spoke in German."

Shortly before he died in 2013, Ambassador Hill's son, Graham, who the Petitioner had interviewed many times and who earlier promised to reveal what was his father's key role in the pre-1968 presidential elections in which Richard M. Nixon was elected, told the Petitioner that the reprisals unleashed against the Petitioner at the NDU and the Hill story were intimately related.

It was not until several years ago that other academics with focuses mostly outside Latin America were able to nail down the fact that Mr. Hill had in fact worked intimately with then presidential candidate Nixon to scuttle President Lyndon B. Johnson's nascent peace talks with the North Vietnamese. Although a few other academics suggested, mostly in footnotes, that Mr. Kissinger was also involved in a subterfuge President Johnson called "treason," in October of last year the Petitioner was able to pull together [the full story in an academic journal](#) about how what happened nearly nine years earlier helped explain how the five-time Republican envoy spilled the beans, to an incoming Democratic Party political appointee, on a former GOP Secretary of State with whom he had worked closely and had come to detest.

The article in question had been permitted by the MSPB to be provisionally included for the Record. However, its publication intrinsically tied – appropriately – the Kissinger story to the secret wars outlined by the Brennan Center in the Petitioner's request to the Board. Apparently after realizing the size of the scandal

and in the wake of the MSPB scandal involving my whistleblower colleague and supporter Mr. MacLean, Ms. Harris and her Board underlings quickly sent the Petitioner's case to what they must have assumed was bureaucratic Siberia.

It was the celebrated Watergate journalists and historians, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein [who broke the story about Mr. Kissinger](#) calling the American military as [“dumb, stupid animals to be used” as pawns](#). With all the information the Petitioner has laid out before the Court, one might use the diplomat's dictum to plead ignorance and/or innocence on the part of VICE ADM (ret.) Ann E. Rondeau, Col (ret.) Richard D. Downie, Col. (ret.) Kenneth LaPlante, Lt. Col.(ret.) Craig Deare, et. al (and those who sought to protect them from justice, such as DoD Inspector General Glenn Fine and DSCA / NDU rising star “better call Saul” Bracero) and all their violations of federal rule, regulation, law and common decency.

The other, far less vapid and excusatory, view is to see their operations as part and parcel of the “secret wars” of DSCA and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) in which the scandalous war against whistleblowers, and Constitutional design, is weaponized.

In 2008, as the Petitioner was just beginning to pull back the veil on NDU/DSCA operations involving neo-Nazis and former leaders of death squads, his longtime friend and colleague, former National Security Advisor for Latin

American Robert Pastor urged the Petitioner to focus on the DIA, rather than the [rancid CIA of old](#),<sup>9</sup> as the former's world reach was, he said, actually far greater and their civilian oversight comparatively nonexistent. Pastor later did the Foreword on my last book, [Peoples of the Earth](#), an ethnonationalist analysis of indigenous peoples in Latin America, one that challenged Marxist interpretations and won the public praise, among others, of Walker Connor, one of the founders of the interdisciplinary field of nationalism studies and an occasional consultant with U.S. intelligence agencies.

The toxic culture within the Defense Intelligence Agency, the former stomping grounds of both Lt. Col. Deare and his National Security Council boss (and QAnon follower) Michael Flynn, is, in particular, a threat to national security and a propaganda bonanza for America's foes.

On February 21, 2022, [in a filing \(later rejected by the MSPB\) the Petitioner pointed out](#) that the *Wall Street Journal* had two days earlier produced 30 witness statements and complaint provided to the House and Senate Intelligence

---

<sup>9</sup> See Martin Edwin Andersen, "How Late DCI William Colby Saved the CIA, and What That Can Teach Us Today," *Just Security*, January 16, 2020.

<https://www.justsecurity.org/68065/how-late-dci-william-colby-saved-the-cia-and-what-that-can-teach-us-today/>

Committees on DIA working conditions. These included colleagues spying on each other, undermining each other by exposing potentially derogatory information, and the harassment of female colleagues. The story was published as President Biden announced that the U.S. had reason to believe that Russia had decided to invade Ukraine. In the Petitioner's MSPB filing, he wrote, "Please note that the story was juicy enough to be picked up yesterday by *Sputnik News*, a Russian disinformation and propaganda portal, in an article entitled, 'Lie, Cheat, Steal, Cry? U.S. Military Intelligence is Overwhelmed.'"

Whether Mr. Kissinger's view is upheld or that of our all-too-toxic secret warriors, controlled stupidity, the refusal to see the consequences of what one does and what one stands for, reigns supreme. As the Petitioner noted in his initial 01/22/2023 Petition before the Court, the losers include those in uniform, the taxpayers who pay the bill, and those who attempt to warn, like Paul Revere of old, of the dangers to our people and our Constitution posed by military impunity.

Very Respectfully.

Martin Edwin Andersen



# Kissinger's Culpability

*At 100, more than a half-century of blood  
is on the elder statesman's hands.*

BY SARAH CORDS

**H**enry Kissinger is still alive and still in possession of the Nobel Peace Prize he was awarded in 1973. Time will eventually address the former issue; as to the latter, the Nobel Foundation has declared that “none of the prize awarding committees in Stockholm and Oslo has ever considered [revoking] a prize once awarded.”

This year marks both the fiftieth anniversary of Kissinger's peace prize and his 100th birthday. At this point, questioning the former Secretary of State's right to retain the award might seem both futile and vindictive. It is neither.

Kissinger remains a lauded and deeply entrenched member of the Washington establishment. Although Joe Biden is the first President since Richard Nixon not to invite “Dr. K” to the White House, this has not kept Kissinger from making headlines. In 2022, *Politico* revealed that the Biden Administration has consulted Kissinger regularly; he published a new nonfiction bestseller, *Leadership: Six Studies in World Strategy*; he spoke at a Council on Foreign Relations lecture and warned that if a country's educational

---

*Sarah Cords is a children's nonfiction book author and lives in Wisconsin.*



system—ostensibly America’s—“becomes increasingly focused on the shortcomings of its history,” then that country’s “capacity to act internationally will be diverted into its internal struggles.”

Kissinger has always been adept at controlling the narrative of history, not least because he simply had the time to do so. Most of his similarly notorious political colleagues are gone: Richard Nixon died in 1994; Kissinger’s successor as National Security Adviser, Brent Scowcroft, died in 2020; Vietnamese general and politician Lê Đức Thọ, the co-recipient of the 1973 peace prize who declined the award, died in 1990; and Robert C. Hill, a State Department employee, ambassador, and eventual whistleblower who incurred Kissinger’s wrath more than once, died in 1978 at the age of sixty-one.

Hill’s is not a name you see in “this day in history” listicles. In fact, it is not a name you’ll often find in history books about the 1960s, Nixon, or Kissinger. In part, this is due to his death more than forty years ago, but it is also due to the trajectory of his career, which began with powerful roles within the Republican Party machinery and in Nixon’s inner circle, but ended with Hill sounding alarms about human rights abuses and murders from his post as ambassador to Argentina during the 1976 military coup. As is the case with most whistleblowers, Hill’s attempts to draw attention to wrongdoing in Argentina—and his habit of questioning the State Department bureaucracy—led to career marginalization and his erasure from history.

**S**elf-described “history detective” and author of a book on the Argentine military dictatorship, *Dossier Secreto*, Martin Edwin Andersen is working to highlight Hill’s career arc from political party insider to questioner of the party line. Andersen himself is a former Justice Department employee whose career has been derailed due to his whistleblowing. In two recent articles for the research journal *A Contracorriente*, Andersen contrasts Hill’s journey from collaborator to dissident with Kissinger’s legacy of what Washington insiders have studiously avoided calling war crimes.

Born in 1917, Hill’s first ambassadorship was to Costa Rica. Prior to that, he had worked as a banker and diplomat and gained experience in Latin American culture and politics through his work with W.R. Grace & Company, a global entity involved in the

fabric, fertilizer, and machinery trades. In subsequent years, he would serve as ambassador to El Salvador (1954-1955), Mexico (1957-1960), Spain (1969-1972), and Argentina (1973-1977). He was influential in Republican Party politics, serving as an aide-de-camp to Nixon as the two campaigned on behalf of the party ticket in 1964 and 1966, and in his role as chair of the Republican National Committee Foreign Policy Task Force from 1965 to 1968.

As Andersen reveals in his article “The Ultimate Unmasking of Henry Kissinger,” in 1968, Hill was not only an insider, but also a collaborator in the possibly treasonous sabotage of the Vietnam War peace process. In 1968, as Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey faced off in a close and contentious presidential contest, Lyndon B. Johnson’s administration was engaging in the 1968 Paris Peace Talks meant to end the Vietnam War. What happened next was something that Christopher Hitchens, in his 2001 book *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*, claims was an “open secret” in Washington: “In the fall of 1968, Richard Nixon and some of his emissaries and underlings set out to sabotage the Paris peace negotiations on Vietnam. The means they chose were simple: They privately assured the South Vietnamese military rulers that an incoming Republican regime would offer them a better deal than would a Democratic one.”

This secret has long been whispered, but it has taken decades and numerous investigative journalists and historians to more substantively piece together the mechanisms by which the peace talks were derailed. In 2000, Andersen notes, Anthony Summers and Robbyn Swan’s book *The Arrogance of Power* finally revealed Hill’s role in the failure of the 1968 peace talks. For Nixon and his campaign to be able to communicate their willingness to offer a better deal to the South Vietnamese should the Republicans win the presidency, Nixon needed a way to communicate with the government in Saigon. He found his conduit in former journalist and Republican Party fundraiser extraordinaire Anna Chennault, who agreed to use her contacts in South Vietnam to get Nixon’s overtures delivered to South Vietnamese President Nguyễn Văn Thiệu.

The link between Nixon’s people and Chennault was none other than party stalwart Robert C. Hill, who knew Chennault and, in 1967, personally escorted her to a meeting at Nixon’s New York City apartment. At that meeting, Chennault agreed to act

as Nixon's liaison to South Vietnam and later indicated she would always be reachable through Hill.

On the other side of the equation, a consultant to the Johnson Administration on the peace process stood ready to pass information from the 1968 peace talks to Nixon, who then did his utmost to sabotage them, even though, according to the Logan Act, it is illegal for U.S. citizens "to engage in unauthorized diplomacy with foreign countries with intent to 'influence the measures or conduct' of a foreign government." The informant from within the talks? None other than Henry Kissinger, who used his role as Johnson's adviser at the peace talks to help secure Nixon's 1968 victory.

The war in Vietnam would continue until, as Hitchens notes, "four years later the Nixon Administration concluded the war on the same terms that had been on offer in Paris [in 1968]." The difference was, of course, that in the intervening four years, thousands more U.S. military personnel would die, as well as an unknown but believed to be immense number of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian military members and civilians. On January 23, 1973, the peace talks' two main negotiators, Kissinger and North Vietnamese military leader and Politburo member Lê Đức Thọ, initialed what became known as the Paris Peace Accords, the agreement meant to end the Vietnam War. The accords were signed by the participating governments on January 27.

**I**n 1968, Kissinger and Hill had worked together for the greater political gain of their candidate. Kissinger's rewards became clear during Nixon's first term: In 1968, Nixon named him his National Security Adviser; in 1973, Nixon also made him his Secretary of State. He continued in both roles—the first and only person to hold them both simultaneously—until late 1975.

Hill failed to achieve similar heights in his political career. Although he was instrumental in the 1968 machinations that gave Nixon the presidency, Hill's habit of paying more attention to the situations on the ground in the countries where he served than to consolidating his own power and influence had long made him feel like an outsider in the State Department establishment. As early as the late 1950s, while serving as ambassador to Mexico, Hill tried to warn then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles about Fidel Castro's communist connections, and that a regime change from Fulgencio Batista to Castro might be disastrous for U.S. interests. This was not what Dulles or his colleagues back in Washington wanted to hear. After meeting with his staff and asking them, "Is it worth it for me to get canned, to

go to the White House to fight this one out?" Hill decided it was not.

But the clearest divergence between Kissinger and Hill came in 1973 and beyond, with Kissinger entrenched in his double roles as National Security Adviser and Secretary of State, and Hill serving as ambassador to Argentina.

On March 24, 1976, Argentine Army Commander General Jorge Rafael Videla, along with two others in a three-man military junta, overthrew President Isabel Perón and took the oath of office. Over the course of the next several years, Videla's military dictatorship would engage in what became known as Argentina's "Dirty War," during which "more than 20,000 people, including leftist guerrillas, nonviolent dissidents, and even many uninvolved citizens" were kidnapped, tortured, and murdered, as Andersen wrote in an open letter to President Barack Obama in 2016.

In a 1987 article for *The Nation* titled "Kissinger and the 'Dirty War,'" Andersen noted that Hill, still the ambassador in Buenos Aires after the 1976 coup, reported on the increasingly troubling human rights violations occurring in the country. In September of that year, Hill wrote a confidential memo to Kissinger, urging the United States to vote against giving Argentina an international bank loan, in the hopes that denying the loan would give him leverage to encourage the Argentine leaders to ease up on their violent crackdowns on dissidents. That memo was given to Assistant Secretary of State Harry Shlaudeman, who advised Hill that Kissinger wanted to approve the loan. If Hill persisted, Shlaudeman suggested, Kissinger might fire him. Hill told Shlaudeman to send the memo anyway.

By 1977, Hill was so disillusioned by what he had seen of Kissinger's fanning the flames in the aftermath of the coup that he met with President Jimmy Carter's Coordinator for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, Patricia Derian, to reveal his smoking gun about a meeting between Argentina's foreign minister, Admiral César Guzzetti, and Kissinger, that had taken place in June 1976. The Argentines had gone into that meeting, Hill reported, worried that Kissinger would "lecture to them on human rights," only for Kissinger to conclude by merely suggesting to Guzzetti that whatever the military dictators felt they needed to do to "clean up the problem," they should do it before the end of the year. Hill described

Kissinger's greatest skill has been manipulating the political narrative to his advantage, despite decades of evidence to the contrary.

this as Kissinger giving the Argentines the “green light” for their murderous activities.

In 2004, Kissinger’s statement in the meeting with Guzzetti was confirmed in a declassified document released by the National Security Archive. In that document, Kissinger was quoted as saying, “We are aware you are in a difficult period. It is a curious time, when political, criminal, and terrorist activities tend to merge without any clear separation. We understand you must establish authority.”

In assuring Guzzetti that the administration would look the other way while the leaders of Argentina’s junta did their bloody work, Kissinger was following a playbook that had already worked for him barely a year earlier. In late 1975, the former Portuguese colony of East Timor (now Timor-Leste) was invaded by Indonesia, the opening act in Indonesia’s occupation of that country until 1999 that resulted in, by some estimates, nearly 200,000 casualties. In 2001, declassified documents would prove that President Gerald Ford and Kissinger told Indonesian President Suharto during a December 1975 meeting in Jakarta that they would not oppose the invasion. Ford told Suharto, “We understand the problem and the intentions you have.” Kissinger, meanwhile, worried about how to make the Indonesian invasion, undertaken with American weapons in violation of Congressional restrictions, look like a self-defensive maneuver. As he would in Argentina, Kissinger told Suharto, “It is important that whatever you do succeeds quickly.”

Although there have been requests to get Kissinger to testify in court regarding his past, as well as attempts by activists to arrest him for war crimes, his reputation has largely remained untarnished. In contrast, Kissinger took at least one opportunity to try and posthumously disparage Hill. In 1987, after Andersen’s piece ran in *The Nation*, publisher Victor Navasky received a letter from Kissinger in which the former Secretary of State claimed—snarkily, and with little fear of rebuttal, as Hill had been dead for nearly a decade—that nobody ever remembered Hill as a “passionate human rights advocate.”

There have, however, been calls for questionably awarded Nobel Peace Prizes to be revoked, and Kissinger’s prize is often at the top of those lists.

In addition to never considering the revocation of a peace prize once given, the Nobel Committee has also stated that it will “never comment upon what the Peace Prize Laureates may say and do after they have been awarded the prize.” Unni Turrettini, the author of *Betraying the Nobel: The Secrets and*

*Corruption Behind the Nobel Peace Prize*, tells *The Progressive* that she believes this policy does a disservice to the award: “The Nobel Committee, when refusing to revoke prizes in light of new and damaging information, not only erodes trust and credibility in the peace prize as an institution, but it also harms the efforts of people they are championing. If new evidence against Kissinger proves he never was worthy of Nobel’s prize, allowing him to keep it is an insult to Alfred Nobel, the other laureates, and to the world.”

Like the machinations of Kissinger’s global negotiations, many of which were not revealed until decades later, the Nobel Committee also shrouds its work in secrecy; deliberations about the peace prize are kept confidential for fifty years after they are awarded. In January 2023, it was finally revealed that the committee awarded the prize to Kissinger and Lê Đức Thọ even though it recognized there was a good chance the 1973 Peace Accords would not actually lead to peace.

Andersen concludes in his 2022 exposé that “Hill underwent a palpable process of cognitive dissonance and political redemption; Kissinger chose all manners of complicity in crimes heinous and cruel.”

Kissinger’s greatest skill has been manipulating the political narrative to his advantage, despite decades of evidence to the contrary. It will take actual leaders, truly devoted to raising society to visions of peace, to bring about the revocation of Kissinger’s peace prize, and to begin to undo his blood-soaked legacy. ♦

