

Who Is Who - the Hunt for the Real E. Howard Hunt.

Once Hunt's name came out, there was a natural reportorial curiosity about him. His disappearances, real and imagined, and the false stories planted about them, added to this curiosity. But once the reporters got onto his extensive fiction-writing, most were diverted by the apparent ~~living~~ second life "Hunt had in his own writing. He is <sup>his own</sup> the hero of ~~his own writing~~ and in it he lives out his fantasies. Reporters had fun with this. They dug up some of the out-of-print work, read, reviewed and ridiculed it, and thought it was great sport that a real spook used so many different names in writing novels about himself and intelligence activities.

What does emerge from a reading of Hunt's always political pot-pourris is a simplistic political concept in which it is either white<sup>x</sup> or black and black is always Red. He holds to a fundamentalist view of politics that, sincerely as he believes it to be "conservatism," is hardly distinguishable from fascism.

<sup>Berlin Ending</sup>  
In ~~it~~ a Willy Brandt can be the USSR's top European agent and, as Tad Szulc reports, Hunt could send a picture of that West German leader with Leonid ~~Bresh~~ Brezhnev to his publisher's editor - after The Watergate, mind you - with a note about the villain of the novel being edited, ~~Berling Ending~~, "Here's the dirty dog."

In the trilogy on diabolism, the villains <sup>are</sup> could be a composite of the Kennedys and the villainess that of Kennedy wives - and <sup>Hunt</sup> he can and does really believe it.

Blacknot Uncle Toms are all Red and all <sup>bad and treacherous</sup> villainous, wherever in the world they are, with no difference between Russian Red and Chinese Reds. Uncle Toms are patronized but are never equal to whites, never as capable, always servile and generally are caricatures. *It*

Hunt's domestic political enemies are all those not to the right of the John Birch Society, as in his Bay of Pigs day, in reality all those not Batista followers were. He really believes this nonsense, and unless this is understood, Hunt can't be. He is a sincere, dedicated man. He believes it is his patriotic obligation to oppose all these enemies by whatever means are available, uninhibited by any "liberal" concepts, like laws. Being restrained by not violating the law is unpatriotic to him. There is this

He is reported to have cancelled his subscription to the Brown alumni association's  
magazine after it reported demonstrations by campus blacks. (\_\_\_\_\_)

7

7

great national need above and beyond democratic concepts that he sees and as he sees it only the minority who like him see clearly ~~and~~ what they alone understand can save the nation from a terrible fate. All their enemies are Communists of <sup>iv</sup> <sup>is</sup> Comsymps - Devils and Devil Worshipers - and they must not be allowed to be protected by the weaknesses of representative society as he sees it.

To be a patriot is to have the vision to understand that the law must not stand in the way, that these enemies must be dealt with by the real, the only, patriots despite the law. The law is a weakness of society, not its strength.

This is both inherent and explicit in Hunt's writing.

That it is his true belief he has sworn to. His acts, which he knew to be illegal, he said were proper and thus not illegal and for his illegalities and crimes he should not be punished because <sup>they</sup> there were the national needs, ~~crimes~~ not crimes. Crimes in what he and Nixon call the interest of "national security" are not crimes, not punishable. *They are etc*

He believes his political crimes are heroic.

*May 24, 1973 Watergate Wm mittee testimony (1H35766) and in interviews.*  
Mario Lazo, who was on the Buckley show with him, said it right out: Hunt is a great hero, the greatest. So did Barker in his ~~Watergate committee testimony~~.

And they believe it. Passionately, devoutly, as they believe in God.

Any reading of their words, under oath and in public, and of the statements in and out of court of their followers, leaves no doubt about the sincerity of their beliefs, *in what sense* insane and anti-democratic as they are, and that their beliefs are an American variant of what in Europe is called fascism. *They are* genuine, practising authoritarians in which The Leader is like God, his word is to be taken like God's, and he can do no wrong.

It is not these revanchist Cubans only who adhere to this anti-American line and call it patriotism. ~~John Ehrlichman~~ testified to it before the Watergate committee, *(7H266366)* vigorously supported by his lawyer of the right extreme who was so welcome in Nixon's White House, John Wilson. Ehrlichman and Wilson asserted the right, indeed the sacred obligation, of the president to order murder in the name of what he conceives at any time to be national security. And those who work for the president and read his mind have the same obligation. Their reading of his mind - his whim or theirs - is the holiest of

Kill me, George Gordon Liddy, the Committee to Re-Elect the President's (CREEP)  
spy chief and counsel to its finance committee told his colleagues after ~~the~~  
fumbling The Watergate break-in. He meant it, to their shock, to which they testified.  
He offered to stand on any street corner of their selection to be assassinated.

3\*

hold duties. It is, in their sincere belief, legal, too. Wilson interrupted the Ehrlichman hearing to present an extremist's twisting <sup>of the</sup> <sup>(Constitution, the</sup> law and court decisions to allege exactly this. <sup>it</sup> It is their ~~belief~~ genuine belief, <sup>it</sup> it was Hitler's practise. <sup>if without murders,</sup> They, too, practised it, from coast to coast, and got caught. Nixon from the first and repeatedly in court claimed that these crimes were not crimes because they were in pursuit of what he called "national security." No law, no Constitution, in Nixon's belief and in court argument and in public statements, could stand in the way of what he or his minions at any time chose to conceive to be the "national security."

From common thuggery on the steps of the United States Capitol to the various burglaries in an assortment of Nixonian crimes, to the Ehrlichman/Wilson claim to the right to murder, it is all <sup>legal</sup> ~~right~~ and proper if Nixon wants it. "National security."

This is the content of Hunt's writing and of his mind. He believes it. He <sup>simply</sup> cannot be understood if he is not credited with sincerity.

Nixon's only assistant closer <sup>than also represented by Wilson,</sup> than Ehrlichman, Haldeman, shared these views, and <sup>Haldeman,</sup> Wilson as a lawyer at that time. He, too, testified to this concept of "national security." (7 H2866;8H 3017ff)

In summary, this is what is disclosed by a reading of Hunt's writing, his belief and the genuineness of it. In turn, this reveals the kind of man he is. That he had been a CIA operative was known from the time his name ~~emerged~~ surfaced, to Szulc within a day, to others shortly thereafter.

The most obvious checking - and checking was called for on a crash basis by the magnitude of the story - included newspaper libraries of clippings and other data and Who's Who, which the most primitive libraries <sup>have</sup> include, then other directories as indicated. With writers, Contemporary Authors and LMP, standing for Literary Market Place, are the beginning.

Once the current edition of Who's Who was checked - Szulc's Times magazine article has the Hunt entry from the 1972-3 edition ~~as~~ in facsimile ~~as~~ as its beginning - the reporter's ~~eye~~ <sup>an eye</sup> and mind have to be grabbed by its content, its lies and its omissions. Inevitably, this means questions and questions, at least by normal practise,

means more checking.

If Hunt was a total stranger, as he was not to Szulc, the use of what <sup>need</sup> Hunt himself called "pseudonyms" required interest. Why the ~~was~~ for writing under assumed names? Why no reference to the CIA, from which he had been retired more than a year? For those who were unaware of his Mullen connection, that was a lead. For those who knew, why did he lie and say this <sup>Mullen connection</sup> ended ~~taxation~~ ("v.p., dir. Robert R. Mullen & Co., Washington, 1970-1") ~~when it had not~~ <sup>replaced by</sup> "cons. to the Pres., 1971- "?

Any reporter who knew that Hunt found it necessary to lie about his Mullen connection and disassociate it from his concurrent White House employment had to ask himself what there was about Mullen requiring disassociation from Nixon. Every reporter knew this within days.

Checking backward was indicated. Some reporters to my knowledge did this and ignored what they learned. I informed others, pointed out the meanings, and they suppressed it or their editors did.

*These include Washington Post and Star*  
*Don Bohring (6/25/72)*  
*Miami* reporter, to follow the leads provided by Hunt's earlier biographies in Who's Who and he stopped when the New York telephone company told him there was no listing for <sup>a business</sup> the name and address Hunt gave in these earlier biographies. *Miami Herald*

When a friend consolidated in a single tabulation all of Hunt's self-descriptions in Who's Who going back a decade, I provided this to reporters, too, along with <sup>Hunt's</sup> his fake biographies under his pen names from Contemporary Authors. But suddenly this part of Hunt's life became non-news. In fact, it was the most essential of Watergate news and had it been reported it, too, could and should have been a turning point.

There are so many apparent questions! And so many oddities, like listing himself as a member of three posh Montevideo clubs four years after he said he left Montevideo forever. *Why?*

Why would he say in the 1964-5 edition that he had retired as a consultant of the Department of Defense where he had been 1960-5 in the 1966-7 and 1968-9 editions and not have retired from that job (which he never had) in the 1970-1 edition?



CIA

Despite the pretenses of his novel, that he was the real James Bond, Hunt's specialty was calndestine political activity, not the dashing stuff. He was chief political officer of the Bay of Pigs, and he had a similar role in the Guatemalan overthrow. In Mexico his work was with the right wing of the labor movement. Szulc recounts an incident in which Hunt almost compromised the then President of the Philippines, almost got him arrested!

(Compulsive Spw 66-7) This, not the common concept of intelligence agents as spies, was the reason he was always under cover. Even when he worked at CIA headquarters after his <sup>personal</sup> fiasco in the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs (<sup>national</sup> listed as <sup>he was carried</sup> consultant to the Department of Defense). <sup>a strange, psychologically suggestive</sup>

His accounts of his career vary with the pseudonym. (By an odd quirk, he never gives that under which he wrote the viciously anti-Kennedy David The Coven and the rest of his novels about devil worship where, also oddy, he made the alias of the real names of his two sons, David St. John). In Who's Who he lists his State Department covers as attache in Paris, Vienna, Mexico City and Montevideo. After for the previous decade accounting for "political officer Far East commoand of ~~195-4~~ 1954-6" (when he was not always there), in the 1972-3 edition he added Tokyo as his assignment. When the assignment, as distinguished from the actual duty, is overseas for a long enough period, there is tax exemption on the salary, <sup>no first 25,000 is exempt after three year</sup> ~~as it has other tax speaking~~ advantages other than spooking cover.

In using Littauer and Wilkinson <sup>Hunt</sup> he was

up to full exemption on the first 25,000 after three years. So, there are



And with the refusal of what is probably a record-breaking number of publishers to publish a book that became a best-seller, my first on the John Kennedy assassination, Whitewash  
By the time I reached <sup>me</sup> Littauer & Wilkinson, literary agents, a member of a Congressional Judiciary committee who would not benefit from identification told ~~him~~ me he was satisfied that as soon as I left a publishing house a federal agent entered and conveyed official disapproval.

I <sup>had</sup> began with a contract and a collaborator, a man provided by the publisher and whom I had known slightly when we were investigators for different Senate committees. I later learned he was a friend of Bill Buckley's brother-in-law Brent Bozell and that he shares their political beliefs. He failed on his part of the collaboration, <sup>And he</sup> / tried to turn the work into a political treatise in which with no more than <sup>contrived inferences</sup> / ~~inference~~ he sought to link those ~~he disliked~~ politically, including the respected American Civil Liberties Union, <sup>an imputed?</sup> with a left-wing conspiracy to assassinate JFK.

The publisher was Ivan Obolensky, son of the Russian prince Serge who had been in OSS. I wrote the book in 28 days and delivered the last chapter by the contracted date, <sup>February 15, 1965.</sup>  
While Obolensky was still drooling into the till over the salesman's forecast of advance sales - "A gold-plated best seller," vice president John Ledes told me <sup>made</sup> / Ledes may a to me mysterious ~~trip~~ one-day trip to Washington and the next day they broke the contract. And they never returned the manuscript.

Next the reconstructed manuscript went to one of the larger paperback houses, a subsidiary of a large hardback publisher. There was excited approval up to the top man, who owned the controlling interest in the business. He feared that because the government was already after him, were he to publish Whitewash and expose the official dishonesties of the JFK assassination - prove the official explanation could not be believed - "It would be the red flag <sup>to</sup> ~~under~~ the charging bill." But the executive who had read the book believed it would be a best-seller, so he phoned another major house and asked them to consider it. Their explanation on declining it was, "Our decision was not editorial and not easy to arrive at."

After many rejections none accompanied by editorial criticism, after quite a large number of publishers, including two with reputations for courageous publishing refused to

consider ~~the subject~~ publishing anything on the subject at all, I phoned the editor of The Saturday Evening Post toward the end of May 1965. He was interested and directed me to the proper editor. John Appleton wanted to buy chapter use, which would have returned more than enough for me to print the book myself <sup>if</sup> it enticed no publisher. He wanted to deal with me through an agent. I still have his note introducing me to the Sterling Lord Agency.

¶ "Tell Lord I want him to handle this," Appleton told me.

Lord was busy. After an hour a secretary came out with his question, what was the book about. She returned to me promptly with his fear that he could do neither the book nor me justice. I called Appleton. He sent me to Littauer & Wilkinson. "Ask for Max," he directed. I phoned first. Maxwell Wilkinson had to leave in 15 minutes but if I could get there immediately he could spare a second or two.

<sup>with</sup> I almost ran those 16 blocks. Wilkinson got so interested he took an hour and <sup>we</sup> I then <sup>talked</sup> walked him to his bank before he went to a late luncheon appointment.

He believed the book would be a commercial success, asked me what else I was working on, forecast one of the books would be bought by Hollywood, and took the manuscript to read.

On June 2 he phoned to say he liked the book and would I send him a letter authorizing him to represent it.

<sup>to only two weeks later,</sup> Then <sup>(he wrote)</sup> on June 17, to say, "I am ~~surprised~~ sorry (but not surprised) to be obliged to tell you that the Post (sic) is not going to use your book. No magazine is physically able to publish such a work for the simple reason that its value depends upon copious documentation. ... You know of course that the chances of finding a sponsor for the book are very slim." He <sup>added</sup> then cautioned against "indulging in false hopes."

"It is safe to say that no American publisher will do it," Wilkinson wrote on July 9 in returning the manuscript.

With my previous experiences these discouraging words did not then lack credibility. Nor did I recall them when, after I published it privately and in that and reprint form it became a best-seller or when Saga paid more than it had ever paid ~~for~~ before to use a single chapter. Many of the chapters had been written so they could stand alone. <sup>in magazine use</sup>

Only when I saw Hunt's office was Littauer and Wilkinson did I recall these words, <sup>then</sup> check my files.

And wonder about what the member of the Judiciary committee had told me.

and the secretary / other

Besides the members of the firm, the only person in the office was Carolyn Blakemore, who left the firm <sup>later</sup> in 1965 and in 1973 joined the publishing group that was honest enough to tell me its refusal to publish was based on policy rather than editorial decisions.

What was the CIA's Hunt doing there?

When Whitewash reported at six different places the then available reasons to believe that ~~Oswald~~ the accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, had had intelligence connections (pp. ~~xim~~ 119-22, 125, 136, 146, 148) and had a chapter of more than 10,000 words on "The see possible Oswalds' Government Relations," it was not difficult to ~~expect the CIA might be~~ interested.

Long before this I had proofs of CIA surveillance of me. I asked one of those honored Bob Woodward Washington reporters if he was interested in tracing a lead on Hunt's and CIA's prohibited domestic-intelligence operations. He said he was and then said he could not ~~do anything~~ ~~with them~~ develop any information. What he and that Miami reporter who phoned the information operator could not <sup>do</sup> was easily accomplished by a friend <sup>h</sup> who is a high-school dropout and is a waiter in an Italian restaurant in New York City. He consulted standard sources for me at the New York Public Library.

The New York Times index led to the July 16, 1968, obituary of Kenneth Littauer at age 74. Before ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ establishing the literary agency he had been a newspaper reporter and a magazine editor, last at Collier's. "During World War II Mr. Littauer was a senior intelligence officer with the Eighth Air Force."

This reminded me that a Littauer foundation had been involved in the <sup>well publicized</sup> 1967 exposure of the CIA's misuse of foundations. <sup>in early 1967</sup> Could Kenneth have been of that family?

New York ~~city~~ has millions of people, but from the death of <sup>and former Congressman</sup> glovemaker Lucius Nathan, seven <sup>Littauer's</sup> ~~others~~ died, ~~William~~ ~~xxxx~~ 1957 ~~and~~ ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ Or, a very small family.

The year Kenneth died the foundation's assets were almost \$10,000,000.

While The Foundation Directory (p.306) shows it to have "broad purposes," <sup>It</sup> is supposed to be "for higher education, studies on the Near ~~East~~ and Middle East, Hebrew literature and philosophy" and similar projects, with no reference to any interest in any other

at it

man who wish with in det my

S.A.

al?

is located  
It ~~was~~<sup>u</sup> ~~located~~ at 345 East 46 Street, New York City. The officers and directors are Harry Starr, president and treasurer; Hyman C. Brandman, secretary; and Walter C. Feinberg, Alvin S. Johnson and Harry A. Wolfson.

9  
parts of the world.

Its reports required on Form <sup>990</sup> ~~(4)~~ to which I have been able to gain access show no grants to organizations with special "Near and Middle East" interests. But beginning in 1962 they ~~may~~ establish heavy grants to known CIA fronts, like Radio Free Europe.

This is also the period of Hunt's domestic-intelligence activities. Of the several of in 1962 the largest grant, \$30,000, was to the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Tracing this and these CIA outfits that could be of relevance, <sup>and other</sup> tracing one through my files of what had been published, <sup>stet</sup> ~~The Committee of Correspondence~~, produced some provocative suggestions.

<sup>Q</sup> ~~One~~ <sup>Q</sup> ~~The~~ Congress for Cultural Freedom ~~has~~ received funds from the Texas-based Hobby fund. This is the family of ~~the~~ Culp Oveta ~~Hobby~~ Hobby, who served in the cabinet when Nixon was Vice President.

As of the time of the break-in, the same Cord Meyer, Jr., mentioned before was CIA's Assistant Deputy Director of Plans, the fancy name for clandestine activity and dirty works that are supposed to be limited by law to exclude the United States. He had been in charge of providing the CIA's covert funding of these various foundations and funds used as CIA covers. After the scandals of this covert and illicit activity became public in 1967, President Lyndon Johnson appointed a committee to investigate the activities Meyer administered. He was questioned for weeks. The lengthy document that resulted was and <sup>remains?</sup> remained classified. (Wx Post 3/30/67, ~~4/6/63~~)

Meyer also was the CIA representative who tried to get Harper & Row to provide it with proofs of a book exposing CIA's involvement in narcotics traffic in the Golden <sup>W</sup>triangle of Southeast Asia, the largest single source, and to change the book. (NY Review 8/21/72) was later reported to be involved in such CIA Hunt ~~and such CIA endeavors have other connections~~ endeavors <sup>with books</sup>.

And it is this same Meyer who was a key figure in the CIA's anti-Allende activities in Chile, those <sup>also</sup> reported by Sculz. He is credited with electing Eduardo Frei over Allende April 6, 1973 in 1964, too. (The Washington Post's headline was "'64 Allende Loss Backed By U.S.")

Meyer's covert programs were directed at neutralizing the influence of those the CIA did not like in opinion-molding sectors of society, <sup>such as</sup> like important trade unions, the media, students and farmer and peasant organizations, <sup>believed to be "left" by the CIA.</sup>

These CIA-backed Littauer Foundation grants continued over the years. That to the Congress for Cultural Freedom was \$45,000 the year before the explosion of the scandals.

~~If insert on <sup>U</sup>pinions and Policy Research, make it here.~~

If this summary of what was readily available and is provocative and suggestive (is  
short of absolute proof, it ~~is all public~~ and should have been investigated, at the  
very beginning and later, when the question ~~was raised~~ of Hunt/CIA involvement with  
domestic activities, including books, was raised by leaks from the Watergate committee

*about Hunts  
career and  
connections*

*but it held no hearings  
on this.*

The earth did not swallow Max Wilkinson. ~~XXXXXX~~ (standard ~~situations~~ like LMP  
directories)  
list him as running <sup>his</sup> own literary agency from his home at Shelter Island, N.Y. &

But even when <sup>published</sup> the accounts of the reprinting of Hunt's spy novels included identifying  
Wilkinson as Hunt's agent, there was neither journalistic nor official interest. No paper  
I saw remembered that when Hunt was in domestic activities for the CIA he used the  
Wilkinson address as a cover address.