

The last story Szulc seems to have written for the Times on The Watergate appeared July 10. It is a fairly straight story the contents of which are reflected by the headline, "expensive Line-Up of Legal Talent Enters Case of Raid on Democratic Office."

One he did for the Sunday ~~Times~~ Times of June 25 can be interpreted as a deprecation of what at that early date was recognizable as the greatest political scandal in our history. He began it by saying, truthfully, that the affair was known as a "caper," to which he added the interpretation, "But no one is quite sure what it means." He manages to limit the Cubans he says "various Sources~~x~~ said ~~Hunt~~ "had recruited" to "three of the operatives arrested at the Watergate," which, with the three not identified, sponsors wonder if the fourth, the one he omitted, could have been "Martinez, who was still on the CIA payroll when arrested. And of all the quotes readily available from countless Democrats, he winds up with one he fails to identify saying, "I wish it had happened in October instead of June but I don't want to sound ~~ungrate~~ ungrateful," one Democrat said. The party moved to exploit the case by filing a million-dollar suit. ...~~That~~ " And to this prejudicial selection of anonymity for quotation Szulc had another interpretative opinion for his readers, "That [meaning the suit] could keep the topic alive through the summer."

the victims were the bad guys and filed a frivolous suit. Actually, it This ~~is~~ is to say that ~~only a frivolous suit which~~ was settled out of court for an exceptionally high percentage of that for which claim was made, \$775,000 with one of the litigants still not settled with (Post 2/22/74) The selection of the unattributed quote is designed to carry out the idea that this deep subversion was only a playful "caper" without significance ("But no one is quite sure what it means) and the "Democrats ~~and~~ the victims are "exploiting" it and are "grateful."

This is a clever piece of dirty writing intended to exculpate the villains in the public mind and to make villainous those who were the victims of the ~~certa~~ concatenation of crimes of which this break-in was but a minor part.

Szyuk has Hunt returning to Wash when he bought his  
Potomac home and not until then. But Hunt's  
Who's Who biographies from 1962 through 1967  
show him having two other Washington residences,  
2314 Tracy Place and 5029 Millwood Lane, both  
in Northwest. Gov W This Day confirms that  
Hunt's residence was Washington when he left Monte  
video <sup>in 1960</sup>. What Szyuk here does is direct attention away  
from Hunt and Washington for the period in which  
Hunt was, to Szyuk's knowledge, in Washington.  
Hunt was then engaged in domestic intelligence  
for CIA. It is supposedly illegal

1

Jim, After checking all the files I believed could be ~~xx~~ likely to hold them I have found  
re Szulc WG by-lined stories. You got all the Times issues except Sunday's. It may be  
tant to know what other stories he wrote and when he was yanked. I have only the enclosed  
unless he handled the Rothblatt story & probably have in a file I didn't check and will now.  
ugaber. I have it. He also was on it early. Well, with what I've put together on Szulc, which  
ies he was not retired after 20 years with Times, his wife's story to Ian's wife, confirmed  
night, I have no doubt he was CIA, whether or not paid. He was the original Dept. Disinforma-  
I have found a Times Service unsigned of 7/3/72 saying Hunt was in Europe when he wasn't &  
two of Szulc's stock lines that are not exclusive but are provocative, "report from persons  
to Hunt" and Hunt "spoke to the FBI three days after" the arrests, TS' original lie.  
no reason to believe Hunt was in Europe, if he wrote this could be important to add to that  
er, which I'm now more than half through. (Juxtaposing with Buckley, done and I think both  
tant in original covering up). Thanks. HW 5/31/74