

turning down a drink

This is as normal as an alcoholic turning down a drink.

My point in our conversation was that if someone up there didn't know of this book and me from Obolensky or Wilkinson, it was much more likely that there was earlier knowledge from Praeger or McKay, and these are the only two CIA publishers named in the stories that followed. Warlier than Wilkinson, who was May, 1965.

I would rule Pocket Books out. They were honest in their reason for declining, and I can explain it. They actually figured that Whitewash would be the best-selling book of 1964, a repeat over Green Felt Jungle and 1964 for them. That rejection was by Shinkin personally. He was legally vulnerable.

While not unique, it is worth noting that both Praeger's and McKay's professionals believed before the policy decision was made that the rejected book would be a best-seller. This has an added significance in evaluation damages.

I also have analyses and I am pretty sure a letter to Barty Susman debunking the story of Hunt as heading a publishing unit (or being part of a ten-man one) that had as its job getting pro-policy books on Vietnam published. That second or retreat-to cover story was transparently false. It did not take more than a single person to fill that job adequately.

I then believed and am now more confident that if not the major purpose one of those of this Hunt unit had to be preventing publication of unwanted writing, jot just books.

And I note here the apparent certainty of what my analysis several years ago said had to be what we would be able to establish on discovery in a damage suit, absent perjury. (And still another example of Bud's judgement in not doing what he said he would, at least speak to Houston. It is later that Bill said they could not afford another pro bono suit in which he was not influenced by the proofs I told him I already had.)

With this there will be my unanswered letters to Helms, under FOI, and one I'd forgotten, to Ron Ziegler on it. There is also the returned envelope showing Helms and CIA unknown at Langley and the farout final response, in an envelope without a return address and without frank a printed copy of Helms' speech. Note also if my recollection is correct that he did not then say what the Pest editorial of a week ago quotes him as having said, that they do not target on Americans. He qualified this with "inside the United States." He can undoubtedly claim this was not a lie by interpretation of "target."

Today's news (radio) accounts of today's printed stories includes the probably correct Hunt claim to having been in close association with Helms. My writing shows that I described Helms' testimony about Hunt as false and deliberately deceptive, including on how Hunt got to Hullen only after retirement from CIA.

I would be inclined to attribute significance to the total non-response to my FOI inquiries. I believe it represents a lesser-evil decision. However, it seems to me to mean that we can with some safety file a complaint as soon as it can be written. I am not inclined to believe that it was simply an oversight. I rather suspect that Warner has had occasion recently to familiarize himself with what the immediate future might hold. You had too little difficulty getting a very fast appointment.

Back to Hunt: one of the documents in the ripped-off envelope of them gave an account of Hunt's communications between New York and Washington. He had a cover phone in New York City that rang in his Washington office. As a "plumber" what he asked of CIA was only a duplication of that. It is not impossible that I have the addresses because I have several that could have been used and did have the same answering services.

Currently I am reading KGB. My interest was attracted by a phone call from a man with a heavy Russian accent directing me to the Rosenko content I showed you. However, as I began to read it it became apparent that this has to be a CIA book. It would represent the kind of project on which this publishing/Domestic Operations branch would be inclined to dedicate itself. It also is official propaganda, internally. I believe the Angleton staff had to have been involved. The Hunt project has to have been under Angleton. This book started in 1969, it says.

HL