

Dear Mae,

8/13/73

Thanks for your letter of the 9th and the enclosure.

You apparently misunderstood my inquiry about YAFers. I meant not Warren Commission but White House. However, I know what it is to be busy. I am usually working before 5 a.m. and usually take in the 11 p.m. news before retiring. And I think I'm old enough to be your dad. In any event, this is not essential to what I am doing and as the bulk grows it is likely to be one of the aspects I may have to eliminate except for comment.

Hunt and Bennet are central to it, however, and if I do not have some of what has been published, I do have what has not been and I am in a position to carry it further. Two of the several are these, and please keep this entirely to yourself. There is a prima facie case that "Hunt's path and mine crossed years ago, with hurt to me. It is possible I may be able to take this to court, which would be a better than average forum. The first lawyer I spoke to says there is enough for a case but he hadn't time. I'm waiting to hear from another. Also, the Cubans are now, temporarily, only an hour from here and are growing disenchanted. I may try to interview them. Thus I may be able to do what neither your writing nor mine can. A book can reach only so many people. Ditto for an article in the Realist. I think I have carried my Hunt work far past anything that has a prospect of having been published and certainly past anything I have seen. Therefore, anything that has the prospect of advancing it can be fruitful for all of us.

No, not only Cushman, none of the CIA witnesses described "Hunt as one of theirs. I have seen no such suggestion. It would interest me much because my interest in him and his plan is considerable.

Because I'll be working it over as I write, I have segregated all the Hunt clippings once filed otherwise so I do not have ready access to them at this moment. From recollection the two medical names in Mrs. "Hunt's bad were not both neurosurgeons. If you do not have what follows, please drop me a note on a separate piece of paper and I'll put it in that box and copy for you when I work the box over. One was a psychologist or a shrink, with two offices, one in or near Rockville. The neurosurgeon claimed to know nothing of her. When I got this information, initially from Chicago, I checked the phone books and the listings and the phone company. The Rockville guy had just disappeared from the knowledge of the phone company, rather unusual, I'd think, if many things, including death and moving (I've not checked) could account for it. Rockville is a Washington suburb. Where Hunt lived, "Totomac (which is where my wife was born) is virtually a suburb of Rockville, closer to it than to Washington. About six miles to the center. It is really an area more than a town. "Hunt-club like, horsey set.

I did not know that the CIA psychological profile on Hunt had been published. I knew they were leaking what they figured would upset him. Is that and the one on his wife so difficult to copy? I've made my own, by the way, and from it I figure they are working on him. That they've lied about him is without question. The Tad Szulc piece that I presume you've seen or have has to have major CIA origins. Meaning major parts.

Bennett also was CIA. Is it possible for you to let me have just the CIA-connecting stuff you have on him? And on Hunt, besides ~~the~~ what is indicated above, only what tells of what he did for the CIA, not counting what is in the accounts of his Give Us This Day (I have adequate information on that) and the White House? I have what the New York Times and Washington Post printed. I hope this makes it a relatively simple request.

My financial situation is such that I can't even buy magazines. So, unless someone lends it to me, I'll not see what you write in The Realist. It is likely that someone will. However, in a book, I would not quote The Realist because of his black humor of "L's fornicating with the hole in Kennedy's neck. Should I be able to get a book published, with the enemies already have among reviewers, they could kill the book with this alone.

I have several concerns about the allegations of "McCord's presence in Dallas and the Glass House tapes. Neither your letter nor the page you kindly sent set them rest. If I correctly understand your letter, "McCord was staying at your house (the first and original copy came for his approval") when he received proofs of the - or revised copy for it. I remember well how impressed I was with "McCord's first

writing on the Tackwood business. I am also fairly certain that none of this was in that original. I have addition believing that one as sharp as Freed seems to be would not be aware of the significance of anything involving Dallas, particularly because he has his own kind of interest in it. There is nothing in your letter or in the enclosed page that says, explicitly, that this stuff was in the original tapes. If this kicks back- and how easily it can!- do you realize what it will do to everyone's credibility? It is the kind of thing the guilty can use and use and use, the kind of thing Nixon has made a career of misusing.

If I know enough to cast considerable doubt on the representations of Hunt and McCord for that period, I hope you can see the basis for my concern. This is aside from what the spookery can always fabricate. (Aside from which, is there as common a name in the JFK deal as Martin? Especial J. "artins?) What^{ever} he means by "nobody's over him by the top dogs " is a highly-exaggerate representation of Hunt's position-ever- and most of all at that time, when he was on the skids. He made a Godawful mess of his role in the "ay of "igs and he committed what, for a spook, are unpardonable sins. Aside from all of this, he actively fought Agency and national policy. Had it not been desired to keep all of it inside the family, he'd have been bounced then. As I understand it, McCord's was, essentially, an inside job.

So, it is not that I don't believe this (I do have troubling doubts). It is that I see no proof, no substantiation, and easy disproof, real or contrived. And I have had much too much experience with finks not to know how, almost without exception, they do work, after "reform", too. This goes back to the 30s. One thing you can count on is a fervent desire to satisfy those to whom they turn. So, I don't have to ask if it is possible that Tackwood is doing some kind of dirty thing for somebody else to be troubled about this. I know it is the nature of the type in general. I have received much from such informants I'd not dare use, even when it was reasonable and passed rather severe testing. I'm not talking about the libellous, either. My worry is how we can get people to believe us if we have so much stuff kicking back in our faces, if we have no credibility.

There is nothing you or I can now do about this. I merely explain the reason for my raising the question. The most persuasive person I know is a former fink who led me to some excellent and unknown stuff, criminality by the WC, but whose word I'd not take without checking because I know this persuasive person can distinguish fiction and reality. And I would not take the untested and unchecked word even after everything I took the time to check out did check out.

So, pull the corset-strings tight, into a brace, and I stand with you hoping it does not mean trouble. And if this seems a bit paranoid to you, I remind you that before most critics were born I was dealing with such things and people and that I was once in the spookery, when it was a different world and when being there was to fight fascism.

Meanwhile, if you can supply copies of any of the originals on Hunt and Bennett, I'd appreciate it. That is, along the lines to which I've limited it. If you did not know it, Hunt was with Hullen before Bennett was. And Hunt was not as represented, a mere hired pen. He was vice president when Bennett was hired as president. That he was one of those who interviewed Bennett is, to the best of my knowledge, unpublished. He was. And, on the first of his disappearances (there were more than one), Hunt used a Hullen work as an excuse that stood up. He really did leave town to work on it, in NYC. Rather than the FBI not finding hi, they interviewed him at his home that Saturday evening, typically, not asking him the right questions, not knowing then, and giving him, without intending it at that early hour, all the reason he needed for skipping town. He id, pronto. Lack of the assurances he wanted, not payoff or hushmoney, ~~xxx~~ is that delayed his ultimate return from the big trip. It is obvious to me that when he wanted to return, his return was not wanted...So, busy as you are, I hope you can find time to help me advance this part of my work.

Best regards,