

Dear Jim,

6/25/84

I've read through p. 644 of the David Phillips deposition in his suit against Donald Freed et al and after making some copies will be returning it. It is quite interesting, in part because of what Phillips testified to and in larger part because of Mel Wulf's Perry Masonry. Opinions on everything, no crap from Phillips or the assistant UBA who was there, and spectacular subject-matter knowledge. He sure knows how to handle a deposition and adversaries in it!

While I was quite interested in the Chile part, I was more interested in the ~~XXXX~~ shorter Mexico portions. I think there is a bit new in them. Or my recollection of what was disclosed <sup>earlier</sup> in wrong.

He appears to say that there was electronic surveillance on both the Russian and Cuban consulates and that he had read transcripts of both related to interceptions of Oswald. He was in charge of those surveillances, and their first LHO knowledge came from a source inside the Cuban embassy. After he admitted this there was a hassle started by his lawyer or the other government lawyers there, a claimed desire to clarify, which Wulf did not permit. Of course an inside source could be electronic, but it also could be a person, and I am inclined, as I have been in the past, to believe it was a person and for some years I've had a candidate. Also, I am not inclined to believe that he'd have referred to the electronic surveillances, to which he'd testified earlier, as an inside source. No reason not to say electronic, particularly because at least one was already for years public domain.

I'm surprised that Wulf agreed to suspend questioning after some of the objections because the subject matter of the objected-to questions had already been cleared for disclosure by the CIA, before the HSCA. Perhaps he did not know, perhaps he had other reasons.

If you speak to him, where in the questioning he asked about FBI surveillances on the Chilean embassy in D.C. and says he will issue a subpoena, he may not know about the generally unknown WF part of WFO and should have included it in the subpoena, in addition to FBIHQ, and he may not know about the probability that the so-called Plumbers, particularly Phillips' former associate Hunt, were involved in such surveillances. As I recall at about the time of the Ellsberg breakin.

Phillips placed <sup>Jeremiah</sup> O'Leary at the 1982 AFIO convention. Perhaps it was open and O'Leary covered it. But is there also the possibility that O'Leary was a member? That would be interesting.

I am truly surprised at how little interest there was in Phillips as an author and as a public speaker before the alleged libels. I refused fees he accepted and I

was not notorious, witness the fees Liddy and Hunt got, nor did I have a publisher like Athenium or McMillan. The notoriety of Phillips' exposed career should have led to <sup>i</sup> demand and fat fees, not skimpy ones, if only from the right, yet ~~it~~ it did not. Years before he was accepting \$500, and I did not have his notoriety or publisher support, I was being offered a third more, plus all expenses and deductions. So, I was netting a third more than his <sup>best</sup> gross. Without doubt those with major publishers behind them got enormously more. His lecture bureaus appear to be among the lesser-known and if there had been a real demand for him, better-known bureaus would have been getting him fat fees, all clear.

None of his books, including Night Watch, did at all well. Some of his topics were not likely to attract significant sale, like the Texas crime bit or a primer ~~and~~ for collegiates on how to become a spook. Not that much demand. His book proposals were guaranteed to have limited appeal and thus insignificant sales. Collegiates generally go for confessions of the kind he has in Night Watch, so the absence of any real lecture interest in it is rather surprising, particularly because of the large number of conservative college groups that book such appearances. With Guatemala, Chile and Cuba he would ordinarily be able to expect many well-paying appearances, yet he got few and was not well paid for any of them.

After the Kessler piece and its exceptionally wide attention, after Hart's and Helm's HSCA testimony, there was not much he'd have had to say that the CIA could have objected to and there was considerable interest, but he got almost no appearances and the few were poorly paid.

I would have expected a fairly good demand for what was cleared and he has in Night Watch and thus cannot understand the poor fees and the few demands for him on it alone. Also his Cuban derring-do should have had a market.

In short, he also was not able to demonstrate any real damage and thus almost no compensatory damages, for which he demands \$40,000,000.

Full of respect as I am for Wulf's performance, I not only do not want to intrude, want less to be coaling New Castle, but might be able to help. I'll have nothing to do with Freed but if any of this can be of help, I've no objections to talking to Lansau and letting him know what I have, in the event it can interest him. I suppose Wulf knows about lecture bureaus and can find out from them what they then were booking prominent people for. (My minimum net from years earlier was \$750.)

I don't doubt that Freed was grossly inaccurate but I do doubt that Phillips can show that he knew better and other than he wrote. I'm sure Freed believed what he wrote that I, for example, would not believe.

I also do not see how Bierbower could have expected to collect enough to

think he had the remotest chance of recovering his actual expenses, leave alone make a profit from representing Phillips.

I suppose the depositions are over, but I was surprised to find what I regard as a possibly significant area not touched on: the CIA's involvement with so many of those involved in bombings like the Metelier job. The first real domestic bombings we had in this country was largely by those who'd been taught how by the CIA, quite probably in some instances with explosives provided to them by the CIA. I once had some files on this.

As you know, I never have believed the Maurice Bishop story or credited any part of it as provided by Veciana.