

Polish-born Tad Szulc was the respected and deservedly honored correspondent for the New York Times who was one of the first assigned to Watergate coverage. There was excellent reason for the choice. <sup>With Karl F. Meyer of The Washington Post</sup> ~~He had~~ written one of the assumedly definitive books on the Bay of Pigs, ~~their~~ The Cuban Invasion, subtitled The Chronicle of a Disaster, was published by Frederick A. Praeger in 1962.

(Szulc left the Times in 1973, reportedly retiring to write a book on Nixon's foreign policy. <sup>This was just before Szulc's 47th birthday.</sup>) ~~(book citation Sunday Times Mag. 6/3/73; no announcement "retirement" to cite.)~~

Szulc is an experienced reporter, fluent in five languages (English, Polish, French, Spanish and Portuguese) and a specialist on Latin America.

As his stories continued to appear, at first daily, beginning with one of ~~the~~ <sup>S</sup>unday, ~~at~~ the day after the break-in and arrests, there were little touches and errors in them that attracted my attention. In time there came to be a consistency in this as there was in what he knew, was newsworthy and was omitted from his writing.

Meanwhile, Hunt's Give Us This Day was in galley proof, Szulc supposedly retired

before his birthday because, after 20 years of service, as the reports in Washington journalistic circles had it, he was eligible for retirement. However, he had not joined the Times until 1955 (Who's Who), so his departure requires another explanation.

(An unconfirmed right-wing writer source with the best anti-Castro Cuban connections tells me ~~says~~ he was fired over some aspects of his Watergate reporting.) (Note-Andy St. George)

When his article titled, "Beyond the Howard Hunt of June 17, The Spy Compulsion," appeared in The New York Times Magazine of June 3, 1973 and its content and obvious sources also confirmed these earlier suspicions, I decided to try to take a closer look at him.

(The identification of him with this story reads, "Tad Szulc, formerly a member of The Times' Washington bureau, is a freelance working on a book about President Nixon's foreign policy." There was no reference to the fact that he was working on a book that appeared later with ~~the~~ <sup>its</sup> <sup>from</sup> title of the bold-face part of this title, The Compulsive Spy.

If it had been designed as part of a psychological warfare against Hunt it could no better have served that purpose. There are touches throughout that are an assault on ~~the~~ Hunt's self-respect and self-concept. Coming after Hunt's long stretch in jail, including a minor stroke and an assault upon him under mysterious ~~prison~~ circumstances by another prisoner, there was a purpose to be served in working on Hunt, particularly in so influential and widely-read a publication.

This coincided with what by then had surfaced a White House-CIA conflict over a plot to get the CIA to take the blame for The Watergate. Perhaps it might be more precise to limit this to a wing of the CIA, for it is not a monolith and has what are generally described as liberal and conservative elements. Hunt was a fanatical rightist. Szulc is a liberal.

There can be no doubt that Szulc had galley proofs of Hunt's book. I believe I have <sup>some</sup> a copy of his set because ~~the~~ markings on it coincide with Szulc's writing.

*MSW*  
Szulc <sup>also</sup> credits unnamed CIA and "intelligence community" sources.

One of the more mind-grabbing omissions is marked on the galleys, as is what is relevant to it. Szulc quotes the bottom half of this identical galley virtually in full,

Under some circumstances publishers do make galley proofs available in advance of publication, as part of their promotion of a book. However, they generally try to sell the subsidiary rights to magazines and newspapers. Authors write special articles timed to promote the book. Hunt's publisher, Arlington House, is strongly conservative. Szulc is liberal. And the use he made of the proofs is ~~anti~~ against Hunt and his book, as a conservative publisher would anticipate of a liberal writer, and in what can be taken as ~~as a~~ a pro-CIA context.

Intelligence agencies obtaining manuscripts and proofs illicitly is not uncommon. CIA documents in my possession from ~~the Warren Commission files~~ prove that the CIA does it.

I had a personal experience of this nature with my second book, Whitewash II: The FBI-Secret Service Coverup. There were four copies only out of my possession. The printer didn't even have it when J. Edgar Hoover attacked charges in it that I had not made publicly. Although The New York Times printed the full text of Hoover's and it was given heavy news play throughout the world, the late sainted Director of the FBI refused to send me a copy of his release.

I did not give the manuscript to the FBI. How it got it I do not know, but it had to be from one of four sources all of whom I trusted - and one of ~~whom~~ <sup>whom</sup> then a York Times <sup>Harrison Salisbury</sup> managing editor, (who undoubtedly showed or loaned it to those working under him.)

So, Szulc's possession of the proofs and being in a position to ax Hunt and his book a half year before publication is not an ordinary circumstance, whether or not it is innocent.

3  
in extent a full page of Give Us This Day, beginning on page# 39.

What he omits was by any standard more newsworthy than anything else in Hunt's book. It is the first of Hunt's four recommendations, the one Buckley censored, "1. Assassinate Castro..." (p. 39) The markings are immaterial because Szulc really is a top-notch reporter, but ~~where~~ this omitted quote is marked with a bracket, ~~xxxxxxx~~

Also omitted is the part where Hunt says "action on my principle recommendation... was 'in the hands of a special group.'" And not only is this newsworthy, in part because Hunt does not say that his assassination recommendation was ever formally rejected, but every word in the full quotation (Galley proof 10, pp.38-9) is underlined and marked with a parenthesis in the left margin. sp

Official consideration of the assassination of a head of state by the United States Government is not news? Nor the "special group"/Not even when this is followed by that which Szulc quotes almost in full, the part about Nixon's personal responsibility as "action officer" and all of <sup>Nixon's orders</sup> ~~the instructions~~ to Cushman to stay on top of everything - and Cushman's giving Hunt, ~~him~~ this would-be assassin, "his private telephone numbers and asked that I call him night or day whenever his services might be needed?"

What makes this all the more provocative is what followed.

After Szulc wrote ~~and~~ this article ~~and after advance printing~~ but before it appeared, precisely this newsworthy part about Hunt the would-be assassin originated in United Press International's Washington bureau. The story, written by Donald Lambro, made afternoon papers of May 29 and morning papers of May 30. It received a heavy, international play. Lambro <sup>gives</sup> credits the galley proofs as his source. In content it is pro-CIA while blaming everyone else for the failure of the Bay of Pigs because those quotes from Hunt are selected. The first of many examples is, "...Kennedy tried to 'whitewash the New Frontier' after the fiasco by 'heaping guilt on the CIA.'" Another blames the Pentagon for the military aspects, "Assault planning was almost directly in the hands of the Pentagon." And it concludes with a prejudiced account of why there was no second advance air strike, blaming it on the Kennedy administration and four in particular are liberals to Hunt. Neither the story nor Hunt nor Szulc describe the miserable botch the CIA made of the first air strike and how it blew all cover" on it, well reported contemporaneously.

4 TT  
Timed to promote Szulc's book, he had "Cuba On Our Mind" in Esquire of February, 1974.  
of January 10  
The New York Times story/on it is headed, "'61 Pressure To Kill Castro Reported." Not this  
1960 Hunt scheme. Kennedy had told Szulc after the Bay of Pigs that "he was ~~yhde~~ under  
great pressure in the Intelligence <sup>community</sup> (sic, Lil) (whom he did not name) to have Castro  
killed," but that "for moral reasons" JFK "violently opposed" any United States involve-  
ment in political assassinations.

While continuing to emphasize that this was a 1961 scheme and thus not the Hunt one,  
which he handles in an entirely different way, Szulc reports being "vaguely aware" of a  
an alleged much later plot, of 1964 and 1965, in Compulsive Spy <sup>(pp. 96ff)</sup> attributed <sup>to</sup> the Johnson  
administration with an ~~inferred~~ alleged Hunt leadership role from Madrid. If this later  
plot, code-named "Second Naval Guerrilla", ever existed, it came to nothing and was in  
open violation of United States pledges and agreements with the USSR at the end of the  
Cuba Missile Crisis. It would have been enough to launch World War III, with the only  
alternative the end of the USSR as a major power whose pledge meant anything.

Here is the only Esquire reference to the Hunt plot, which, of course, meant the  
Hunt plot when Nixon was in charge for the White House:

"In fact, the Eisenhower Administration turned down in 1960 the recommendation of a  
CIA operative to kill Castro."

No mention of Hunt by name. Still no quotation from Hunt. And the evidence that  
the Eisenhower-Nixon administration rejected the Hunt plan is missing. Szulc cites no  
authority for the statement.

This is directly followed by the account of "Second Naval Guerrilla," as both a plot  
to kill Castro and a planned invasion of Cuba "presumably acting with President Lyndon  
Johnson's authority."

Shortly afterward, preceded by generally unflattering reviews, Compulsive Spy  
appeared.

Not until the last chapter in the book allegedly on Hunt but still again a defense  
of the CIA and an element in it - both - does Szulc, who covered the Bay of Pigs from  
Miami, mention in an offhand way ~~that he knew Hunt as E "Eduardo" beginning "during the~~  
~~preparations for the Bay of Pigs."~~ Szulc calls this

5

[ Hunt's ~~SECRET~~ code name ]

that "Eduardo/was the man I had known casually in Miami, in 1961, during the preparations for the Bay of Pigs." (p.156) His memory was ~~re~~ "refreshed" by a call from an unidentified "friend from my Cuban days" who also "told me" that "It is Eduardo who is behind this whole business."

Here Szulc goes into a fascinating razzle-dazzle that apparently succeeded in distracting everyone from not only his failure ever to report this in his New York Times writing - where he said what he here proves he knew was false -but what is even more significant, when he learned it. (How-from whomever might have had the <sup>?</sup> motive Szulc serves, is a remaining mystery.)

It was "Early on Sunday afternoon," or the day of his first story, the day after the breakin and the arrests.

All the other elements the skilled Szulc here throws in also make the reader forget to ask himself why this "friend from my Cuban days" has to be anonymous. All of Szulc's writing is studded with name dropping. All reporters tend to be ~~more~~ specific and to give names not only as a matter of journalistic practice and responsibility but for credibility. The five traditional "W W'S W's of the "lead" of a story begin with "Who?"

Whatever the reason may be, it is atypical and unprofessional and strongly suggests CIA. And in CIA most likely the faction not Hunt's, the liberals.

How "casually" Szulc knew Hunt follows (pp. 156-7). Szulc assumed Hunt would recognize him ~~and surprise~~ after more than a decade and says so:

"Then, because I did not want my own name to surface pre-maturely in the handling of the story, I asked one of my colleagues at the office to dial Hunt and to say that "Macho Barker says he knows you." Bernard L. Barker was Hunt's Bay of Pigs assistant and the man in charge of Hunt's Plumbers' Unit Cubans in their White House jobs. Predictably Hunt hung up promptly.

Predictably eager to take credit, Szulc claims "I may have been the first person to alert Hunt to the knowledge that he had some involvement with the Watergate burglary" and that "The FBI, which entered the case on Monday, only established the connection with Hunt a few days later." Consistent in inaccuracy, he also claims it was from the

Barker ~~was~~ pocket phonebook rather than addressbook, which required checking, rather than the check signed by Hunt, as <sup>at</sup> Gray testified, that the FBI learned about Hunt. As we have seen, the FBI, inevitably, learned immediately and had already interviewed Hunt at least once long before the indirect Szulc call. He even goes so far as to say that it was later that the FBI was "able to link Howard Hunt with the Barker team and the White House." (p.157)

(This assumes that his "friend <sup>my</sup> from Cuban days" was either unpatriotic and withholding evidence of a crime from proper authorities or that he had reason for not telling the local police and the FBI. This, too, very strongly suggests CIA, which would be anxious to stay out as long as possible and which has a traditional rivalry with the FBI.)

Before going into the quintessential importance of Szulc's - meaning the important New York Times - early Watergate reporting, in what he may regard not as fairness to him in this book (p.81) he makes passing reference only to "Hunt's" proposal to assassinate Castro" from this, the only "casual" mention and the first in all Szulc's writing that I have seen, proceeding to one of his more overt taking up of the cudgels for the CIA. "Quite clearly," he writes on the next page, "there was no intention of assassinating Castro."

This from the man who wrote of ix in Esquire, after he had completed this book and who knew that Hunt's proposal had been long ~~and~~ seriously considered and who has to know that assassinations and all of intelligence agencies are like hand and glove!

The record of Nixon's sense of outrage <sup>at?</sup> that any official proposal to assassinate any head of state does not exist, and he was on the national security Council and the White House "action officer" on the project of which this was part. There is none of/attempts <sup>VIA</sup> to assassinate Castro under Eisenhower being rejected and the efforts were numerous. So, Szulc writes of what he represents as serious assassination plots against Castro under two Democratic Presidents, one he has alleged to be definitely CIA and the other attributed to the intelligence community in general although it could mean no other agency. Of these he does not so "there was no intention." The only one of which he says this, with his total substantiation being his own opinion, "quite clearly," is Hunt's, ~~the only~~ one that had <sup>JFK vetoed.</sup> any real corroboration, from Hunt himself and appears to be the same one of which

7  
14

If the ~~errors~~ major and minor errors that permeate this book did not attract New York Times attention - and they did not get reported there or elsewhere - they are glaring to one who knows the subjects of which Szulc writes and they have to have been ~~ix~~ closely read by foreign intelligence services. The conclusion is inevitable that if Szulc was not in CIA pay the distinction is immaterial. This book serves, among others, CIA purposes. Ostensibly it is a book on Hunt. Actually, he is relatively minor in it.

There is, of course, criticism of the CIA. Here it is understated and comes from only part of what was well publicized, well known. A conspicuous example is what amounts to a justification of what he says is illegal domestic activity (p.40), the CIA's use of foundations, but in reporting this omits the greatest of them all, that which lead to the exposure, the CIA's taking over of and financing of the National Students' Association.

Szulc is almost a one-man protection team. On Hunt he says little of Hunt's career and nothing about his domestic activity whereas he has to have been onto it from what he does report. Of Hunt's work for and relations with the Robert R. Mullen public-relations agency he writes inadequately and inaccurately, as we shall see, raising serious questions about further covering of the CIA. Mullen's personal connections with spying may go back to the end of the 1940s. It certainly existed at the time of the Bay of Pigs, where it admittedly worked for CIA. It was doing CIA work at the time Szulc wrote this book. He edited the Cushman tape to eliminate Hunt's own references to his domestic operations and takes at face value - in fact reports extensively about - other of Hunt's <sup>?</sup>overs that are of a time Hunt told the Ervin committee in private that he was engaged in domestic operations (pp.96ff). So carefully does Szulc edit this part of Hunt's career that he even eliminates a <sup>H</sup>Hunt Washington address that <sup>H</sup>unt listed in Who's Who for consistency. (pp.99-100)

Knowing it to be factually incorrect, he has Hunt working for the re-election committee rather than the White House at the time of the ~~error~~ caught crime (p.140,142) He revised his book to include the sworn testimony - by Hunt - on September 24 and 25, 1973 but omitted this, which is in that testimony and was known prior to it. While he hedges, he says there were only three known Hunt White House jobs (pp.134-5) but all Hunt's work was for the White House. He was never employed by the re-election committee.



8 2  
On his handling of the whole spying and dirty-works campaign (pp. 136-50) Szulc's protection of Nixon and those closest to him extends to ~~expunging the name of~~ eliminating the name of the man in overall charge, John Mitchell, Nixon's Attorney General and then campaign director.

Not even Douglas Caddy is unworthy of Szulc's covering up, which promotes wonder about Caddy and what is not known about him. That he shared <sup>Mullen</sup> an office with Hunt, that they had other joint projects, that he had serious trouble with the grand jury for refusing to testify and a battery of lawyers in attendance including <sup>the Hogan & Hartson</sup> a firm that had a CIA history and for a time defended Hunt is not mentioned. Nor are many other things, like Caddy's politics (first director of the Young Americans for Freedom, ~~Buckley's~~ sponsored by Buckley). (pp. 154-5)

And, as we have seen, he has Hunt the man in charge when he was not (pp 156ff)

The prosecutors who covered up are shielded (p. 161) when they went into nothing except the burglary of all the White House crimes.

Even Hunt's then lawyer, William O. Bittman, <sup>H</sup>ogan & Hartson partner, who had been part of Hunt's blackmailing of Nixon and had a part in ~~launders~~ an until-now unreported laundering of some of Nixon's \$100 bills, merely "withdrew as <sup>H</sup>unt's attorney" when it was public knowledge, thanks to the New York <sup>T</sup>imes, that the Special Prosecutor had asked him to resign over an allegation of conflict of interest.

Not even Buckley escapes the Szulz wing. (pp. 163-4). His set-up for Hunt's public relations becomes "tough questioning" and his editing of the transcript, which Szulc does say he read, is expunged.

It sure sounds like the CIA's old-boy network at its professional best!

In all this kindness to others, Szulz does not forget himself. He goes far out of his way to be kind to the CIA and to justify much of its activity that is not properly <sup>justifiable</sup> justified as the proper functioning of an essential intelligence activity. After ticking off a "list of the brilliant men who served" - and there is nothing wrong with serving a nation's proper intelligence activities -(pp 30ff.) he gets into and justifies with mild criticism some of CIA's domestic activities. There is this passage on page 40:

"At home the CIA slightly [sic] overstepping its statutory ~~authority~~ role, managed to subsidize a highly active publishing house in new York..." The CIA is known - publicly exposed as having - also subsidized other publishers, including leftish journals. There is a good reason for this limitation, hiding the other activities and even the name of this "active" publisher: he was Szulc's. The house is Frederick A. Praeger, the book Szulc's apologia for the CIA's Bay of Pigs fiasco, The Cuban Invasion.

So extensive was this covering of the CIA in this particular book that, although Szulc now admits he knew Hunt then when Hunt was political chief, there is no mention of him by his right name, as Eduardo or even the role! A book on the Bay of Pigs invasion that has no reference to the man or the politics of the man or even the function of setting up an exile government and directing it and then writing its constitution! How much more could he have underplayed the ambition and intent of the CIA?

A careful reading of Szulc's Dominican Diary shows him to be consistent in white-washing the CIA. He covered the United States invasion of the Dominican Republic when the United States subsidized and educated Dominican military overthrew the first democratically-elected government for The New York Times. The book is well done. So is the hiding of the CIA's hidden role that was reported contemporaneously in the newspapers, including The New York Times.

It would seem that when CIA's duty is to be done, the left and right are really one.

A Buckley and a Szulc combining at suppressions of which a Nixon is beneficiary?

Who would have thought it possible!

Extra space

The initial Nixonian need was the classic of intelligence activities - detachment from The Watergate. It successfully pulled off probably the greatest covering-up in political history for the crucial period. Gradually there were disclosures, but after two years, even with impeachment commenced, after not less than seven Congressional investigation(s) partly or entirely devoted to it were completed and another in progress, the full story was far from told. There is no better measure of the success of the Nixon deception, misrepresentation, diversion and outright falsification of which Nixon, personally,

10  
was in overall command, as his own transcripts leave without question.

Had it not been for The Washington Post, two young reporters, Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, and the Metro editor, Barry Sussman, under whom they worked when the story first broke, all may well have been different and as much as did become known of Nixon/White House crime may not have *been exposed*

It can, I believe, be fairly alleged that Szulc's reporting for The New York Times, the most influential paper, is of opposite character, and that until long after the Post had done the work that earned it the prestigious top journalistic honor, the Pulitzer prize - until the Times, much later, put an excellent investigative reporter, Seymour Hersh, on the staff ~~it~~ had on this story - the Times' reporting was so inferior and inadequate that it actually served the Nixon whitewashing of Nixon.

Here the importance of Szulc and his work can't be over-estimated. He was an authentic expert on Cubans and as close to an expert on Hunt as there was in the press.

And here it also should be noted that the Post never used its own expert, Haynes Johnson, who as a reporter for the Washington evening paper, then the Star, now the Star-News, had also written <sup>the supposedly</sup> ~~a definitive~~ Bay of Pigs. The original printing was by W.W.Norton & Co., Inc., the reprint was Dell's. In Johnson's book there also is ~~is~~ <sup>no</sup> Hunt, no one in his role, no Eduardo, and provocatively there is a Bernie, Barker's Bay of Pigs name, <sup>Dell,</sup> (pp. 60-1) Bernie, whose description is that of Barker whether or not he was, was one of the sub-commanders of the Guatemalan training camp. When some of the Cubans expressed political opposition to ~~the~~ <sup>this is what Johnson reports;</sup> ~~authoritarians~~, ~~next~~ ~~they~~ "They were soldiers, he ~~stomped~~, and had to obey orders whether they liked them or not." Thereafter, without <sup>trial,</sup> these men were confined in a virtual concentration camp "in the ~~midst~~ of the ~~un-~~ jungle, accessible only by helicopter." (p.61)

*written Sunday June 18 for the next morning's edition, as*  
Bernard L. Barker is the lead of Szulc's first story, "The apparent leader of five men arrested yesterday for breaking into Democrats' headquarters. Knowing better, Szulc given him Hunt's description in the second paragraph of the lead: "He is also said to have been one of the top planners of the Central Intelligence Agency's abortive invasion of Cuba in 1961."

This is what Szulc wrote after he had been told that Hunt was in charge, after he was "reminded" that he knew Hunt as Eduardo, after he had <sup>a college ice phone</sup> ~~Hunt phoned~~ <sup>he</sup> so Hunt would not recognize him.

This is also deliberate lying. Why he did it only Szulc can answer. But his own book ~~has~~ we have already quoted, proves ~~that~~ it is a lie and it was deliberate.

The beneficiary was Nixon, to a lesser degree <sup>and the CIA,</sup> Hunt, and the victims were the editors of The "New York Times, the people and truth.

Without this deliberate Szulc lie, Nixon could never have gotten away with his *immediate* self-whitewashing. *detaching himself from The Watergate*

The initial ploy was to say that Hunt was ~~off the White~~ not working for the White House. As late as Compulsive Spy, when he knew better, Szulc was repeating this lie, too.

Unless Nixon got past those first few days, he was done.

Few helped him more in ~~separating~~ separating the waters than Tad Szulc.

This first story seems to confirm Johnson in describing Barker as a Cuban-American Nazi by making him Johnson's "Bernie". "Mr. Barker was one of the principal links between the C.I.A. headquarters and the Cuban exile army during the pre-invasion period," according to Szulc. "Mr. Barker was said to have a role in establishing the secret invasion bases in Guatemala and to have served as one of the conduits for C.I.A. money to the exile army."

In Szulc's second story, written June 19 and published the next morning, he paraphrased and eliminated what could trace back to the Nazi behavior, describing Barker as "a wealthy Cuban-born Miami realtor who played a major role in the C.I.A.-led Bay of Pigs..."

Citing no sources, Szulc this comes of his own knowledge. Here, attributed to "informed sources," he repeats "that the group's apparent leader and recruiters [sic] of the team was Barnard L. Barker." In the context of this gross and intended inaccuracy, this makes Barker the role of the properly identified James W. McCord, described accurately as the "Republican's security chief and a retired CIA operative."

Or. Szulc is still building Barker up as the big man on the deal.

By the time Szulc wrote his story on the 20th, Hunt's name was out. So, he begins with Hunt's name and a pivotal inaccuracy and then there is no further mention on the front page:

"E. Howard Hunt, Jr., former part-time White House consultant, has refused to answer questions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation..."(emphasis added).

Nixon was back in Washington from weekending at Key Biscayne, Press Secretary Ronald ~~Zig~~ Ziegler with him. Ziegler "told newsmen that Charles W. Colson, special counsel to the President on whose recommendation Hunt was hired as a consultant, has "assured me that he is in no way involved in this matter."

Szulc then repeats still another and a very obvious lie, more than \$5,000 been found on and in the posh, expensive Watergate quarters of the burglars,"...the break-in was not a well-financed operation planned <sup>from</sup> 'high up'..." It could hardly have been better financed or directed and conceived from higher up.

Next, continuing to have Barker in charge, Szulc, after White House disassociation, reports that "Mr. Barker was an aide to Mr. Hunt during the abortive Bay of Pigs..." But still no real acknowledgement of knowing Hunt or his Bay of Pigs-CIA role.

Instead, further repetition of the official lie, what Ziegler "stressed," that "we don't know where Hunt ~~is~~ <sup>Mr.</sup> has been because he has not been involved in a consulting capacity with the White House since March."

With the well-known White House semantics, with its well-known lying by careful selection of words, and with Szulc's certain information that Hunt was the man in charge, it does seem odd that neither he nor anyone else asked if Hunt had been employed in anything other than whatever Ziegler meant by "in a consulting capacity." This is especially true because some reporters reported and two personally told me of having the White House take calls for Hunt, who still had a phone, then referring the calling reporters to Colson's office, and then being told to try his Mullen office. Ziegler and everyone else involved knew Hunt still had a White House office, so did the press, but the lie was reported and Nixon crossed his first hurdle.

Szulc here helps the White House lie by writing that "Robert F. Bennett, president of the Robert R. Mullen Company, a Washington public relations concern employing Mr. Hunt as a full-time (emphasis added) writer, said in an interview this afternoon that <sup>Mr.</sup> Hunt could not be found."(When this was soon proved to be untruthful, the press, including

Szulc, was without curiosity about why Mullen would deceive them. ~~XXXX~~ When Bennett said under oath what makes this a lie, for he was in contact with Hunt regularly, nobody investigated to see why Bennett would lie and a number of reporters refused to. Under normal conditions, editors would have sent reporters to interrogate and investigate Bennett and Mullen. But it never happened.)

By reporting the lie, that Hunt worked "full-time" for Mullen, Szulc and those who did the same thing helped build Nixon's cover. If Hunt worked "full time" for Mullen, how could he have worked for the White House at all? This validated Ziegler's lie on which all of subsequent history turned and without which Nixon could not have survived.

Because this is true, it is even more of a departure from tradition and practise that when the truth finally did come out, ~~as~~ <sup>or</sup> as much of it as did, which was more than enough for their purposes, no editors even then sent reporters to dig the reason for his lie from Bennett or to learn it on their own. Establishing the truth was child's play, requiring much less than what it takes to be a Washington correspondent or a staffer of any of the Washington papers or TV and radio news staffs.

In the last paragraph of this story Szulc introduces Miguel R. Suarez, Barker's Miami partner. In the story he wrote on the 22nd, published the 23rd. Szulc ( and others) seized upon this for still another large-scale, successful and obvious new Nixon diversion, attributed to "Cuban sources." This Nixon operation suddenly became, in Szulc's words, those who did the job and "had a role in four incidents here...beginning in early May."

It is Ex-Combatientes Cubanos de Fort Jackson and is composed of about 800 Cubans who accepted United States <sup>officers or officers?</sup> ~~offier~~ officers of military training after the Bay of Pigs.

(The "four incidents, in another remarkable lack of reportorial curiosity, are unreported and undescribed. Only two ~~xxx~~ others were later reported, by the press or officially.)

And from this scanty, uncorroborated and it turned out unfactual diversion that again served Nixon's and Hunt's and CIA's needs, there blew up another and very large diversion that flooded the press. From the name of the Suarez-Martí Barker corporation, "Ameritas," there was extrapolated a "cover for the whole operation. There was this secret Cuban outfit code-named "Ameritas" and they did it.

By "flooded" I mean by separate reporting, by picking the story up and re-writing it and by what makes all of Szulc's work much more significant, by extensive syndication to other papers by The New York Times Service. Radio and TV also played it heavily.

So <sup>whether</sup> ~~what~~ or not motivated, Nixon immediately had more than the needed supply of covers and diversions and <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ disassociation from ~~his own criminality~~ <sup>and White House</sup> White House criminality was more complete than anyone in it could have dreamed at the horrifying outset, from the moment they learned of The Watergate arrests.

Szulc buried in this story what he knew to be true and then, departing from what the press calls "objectivity", argued against it. He quotes "some Democratic leaders" as charging that "'all ~~times~~ the lines'...~~pointed~~ <sup>pointed</sup> to the White House because of Hunt. To this he adds his words, not those of "some Democratic leaders," and all in a single sentence, that Hunt had served only "until last March as a part-time White House consultant." And he followed this immediately with Nixon's seeming denunciation and Nixon's statement that "the matter is under investigation by the police and the F.B.I."

There were, of course, no skirts too mini for Nixon to hide behind. Here it was the reputation of the FBI, assumed to be derring-do and impartial.

Just before ~~the~~ the end of the long, syndicated and oft-repeated article, without reference to or correction of his own falsifications, Szulc has a short paragraph that still did not correctly inform those who recalled or later consulted his initial stories:

"Mr. Hunt was the principal C.I.A. official in charge of the 'Day of Pigs' invasion, using the code name ~~'Eduardo'~~ 'Eduardo.' Mr. Barker, then known as 'Macho,' was closely associated with Jim in the invasion preparations as was Mr. McCord."

This still leaves Barker, in Szulc's reporting, the man in charge and Hunt away from - disassociated from- the White House for almost three months.

Szulc is clever, subtle and effective. How honest and uncomplicated by other associations <sup>after</sup> or obligations can be evaluated from what he learned the ~~very~~ day ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> The Watergate, as he reported it in his chapter "The Deed" in Compulsive Spy:

"'It is Eduardo who is behind this whole ~~thing~~ business,' my friend told me. ...and he worked at the White House." (p.156)

There is no honest, respectable way of reconciling Szulc with Szulc.

Nixon owes him much.

(How interesting it would be if Szulc's unidentified friend were connected with the liberal faction in the CIA, which hated Hunt. Especially because of the immediate White House effort to get the CIA to take responsibility and more because of what was suppressed about this and the relationship between Hunt and the CIA after Hunt went to work for Nixon.)

After it was no longer news and again buried, in a story Szulc wrote July 6, there is this:

"Mr. Hunt's friends and associates have said that his part-time consultant status [sic] at the White House did not cease March 29, was was asserted by a White House spokesman last week, but continued until the time of the Watergate raid."

At best this inconspicuous and far from adequate "correction" when it was too late is a belated Szulc effort to cover Szulc's "deed."

By this point he had done his "deed" and its beneficiaries had profited, its victims had been victimized. There was no undoing it and Szulc did not make the effort. He did only the very least of what he could to cover his own tracks, save his own face.

If he and other competent reporters had done what is obvious and what newspapers buy copies of Who's Who for and then had followed the obvious leads there beginning the proper moment, when he had a clean scoop on Hunt and instead suppressed and lied, there was still another possibility all might have been different and by long ago the national agony and the consequent national suffering <sup>?</sup> into long into the future might have ended abruptly, properly and without all this immeasurable cost.

Instead he served the interests of the guilty and alone made possible all that did happen and all that did not.

Extra space

When Szulc left The New York Times so young, there were questions. His wife told the wife of a ~~reper~~ correspondent friend of mine that having put in his minimum of 20 years at the Times Szulc took his retirement and would be devoting himself to other writing. His own biography shows he had not spent 20 years at the Times. It also leaves unaccounted gaps in his earlier career, gaps that with others like Buckley coincide with CIA service.

Extra Space



The record is clear. It is immaterial whether Szulc worked officially for the CIA or was in its pay. His own writing, particularly in the three books cited, serves CIA's interests. So does his Times reporting. So do his Hunt writings after he left the Times. And there are others. After the military overthrow of the democratically-elected Allende <sup>Salvador Gossens</sup> regime in Chile, he wrote "The View From Langley" for The Washington Post of Sunday, October 21, 1973. It is not my interpretation alone that this lengthy article in time of CIA crisis -it had been charged with involvement if not engineering the ~~mitt~~ bloody, really murderous military coup of which Americans were also the murder victims - is a product of CIA factionalism and certainly not ~~CIA~~ anti-CIA.

In it Szulc quoted extensively from the secret Congressional testimony of William E. Colby, then Director, Central Intelligence, and of others in the Agency. Szulc had to explain how he got this secret transcript. His explanation in itself answers whose interests he served: "The transcript of the testimony was made available to this writer by sources in the intelligence community."

The CIA had always opposed Allende, whose socialist program including nationalizing United States owned corporations that dominated Chilean life. ITT, involved in The Watergate scandals, is a major one of these. Luarenc Stern, writing in The Washington Post of April 6, 1963, reports "major intervention by the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department helped defeat Socialist Salvador Allende in the 1964 election." To this he adds that "the previously undisclosed scale of American support for Allende's unsuccessful ~~1970~~ opponent was "Up to \$20, million in U.S funds" and "as many as 100 U.S. personnel." In this violation of all international obligations and moralities and ethics, "One of the key figures" was "Cord Meyer, Jr., the redoubtable Cold War liberal."

After Allende won the Chilean presidency it was admitted by CIA in Congressional testimonh that when ITT offered it \$1,000,000 to help throw him out by a military coup, instead of tossing ITT out or initiating criminal charges against it the CIA actually sent its clandestine-operations chief to a meeting with it!

(Before this promotion, when assigned to Vietnam, Colby instituted the Operation Phoenix program under which countless political opponents of the United State supported regime were assassinated.)



There is a difference. Szulc knew Hunt and much of his past and he soon found out more from his own "intelligence community" sources, including CIA, as he acknowledged.

Had he and others followed these overt leads because of Hunt's incredible ego a breach of his training and experience, again all could have been different.

For Nixon. In the election.

And a story of illegal CIA domestic activity, about which the "oversight" committees of the Congress never do anything but suppress, would have emerged.

That story exactly coincides with The Watergate story.