

7/18/71

Dear Ed,

I've finished Domhoff's excellent chapter on the CIA. Too bad the current taste is for short books, for this chapter alone could have been expanded into a book. I'd like to see it happen. Thus, there are things I know he had to know from his citations that he had to omit.

The chief value this had for me is to remind me of what I'd forgotten (and someday I have to locate my misfiled or misplaced file on this subject, lost since we moved here).

One of the sources cited is a contraction for a doctoral thesis with which I had some influence. Berger planned a different subject. I persuaded him to shift it to this and then opened sources, mouths and files for him where I could.

The internal evidence suggests that Domhoff may have had some trouble getting this book published, for there are things he should have known, such as deaths (Romoldi), new and relevant positions (Mappelman on the WETA board, Braden as commentator-columnist, etc). These required so few words I can't explain it as space-saving.

Brown, for example, had the use of the diplomatic pouch, to my knowledge (I was offered it for an arcane project of non-intelligence nature).

Matter of fact, this chapter's parts could each, easily, be expanded into a separate and worthwhile book. That on L.A. would be among the more fascinating.

I hope to find time to read all of this fine writing, and I'm certainly glad to have it.

The stuff from N.O. strongly suggests there is no case against JG. I've no time to explain the evidence and reasoning behind this. I believe other objectives are more important than convicting the petty racketeers, hence the clear case against them is jeopardized for the larger objective and some of the guilty besides Gervais will surface as immunized added informants. Callery now seems to be a likely one. And there will be more than one. I can't believe it is merely to get Jim, for that they will not do on the basis of what has come out and probably can't do before a New Orleans jury regardless of what they have. The p.r. objectives are clear, as is the subtler ruboff on all WR critics. Still not enough, tho. I can visualize a combination of minor ones like these, but still wonder if combined they provide the answer. I did get a clipping from the States-Item from a N.O. source more recently than any you could have sent me could have reached me. It came by air from there getting here yesterday. Apparently F. Lee Bailey is down there considering whether he'll join or lead the defense. I hope it is true for he will not let Jim dominate it and will undoubtedly stipulate that as a condition. They have met through Belli, I believe, in the past. Bailey is, I think, the better trial lawyer. I think this could help assure a chance of the truth and the underlying cause emerging.

Best,