

Neither used
in hrgs. Both hid
Neither even asked
question about 3/4/74

Harold Weisberg
Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/15/73

Sen. Robert C. Byrd
Sen. John V. Tunney

Dear Senators,

John W. Dean III's disclosures in the attached letter may interest you in your consideration of the nomination of L. Patrick Gray because of what it says of Mr. Gray and his conduct and because of Mr. Dean's refusal to appear before the Senate.

I think this tells you some of what both Mr. Dean and Mr. Gray have been hiding from you and want to continue hiding from you and from the country.

E. Howard Hunt was working for the White House during his criminal activity and at the time of the Watergate arrests. When Ken Clawson put out the word that Hunt's employment had ended months earlier he dissembled. So successful was this disinformation that the current issue of Time says Hunt was working for the Creeps.

It seems to me that with a White House employee, and especially one on Hunt's level, engaged in criminal activity, the obligations of the FBI far transcended anything Mr. Gray disclosed to you and made more culpable his providing Mr. Dean with copies of the FBI's reports.

In his letter of October 19, 1972 to me, Mr. Dean eliminates any possibility of innocence on Mr. Gray's part. I asked for the records of the final days of Hunt's White House employment under 5 U.S.C. 552. Mr. Dean told me that "The information which you seek has been turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and is a part of its investigatory files." So, Mr. Dean and Mr. Gray both knew that as of the time of the arrests and for the period preceding it Mr. Hunt was working for the White House. This is not quite the same as that "self-starter" White House misrepresentation. In itself, in my view, this was enough to require criminal investigations within the White House, not keeping the White House informed of everything the FBI was learning. If Mr. Gray did not make such an investigation, I think questions of suitability for the job and conflict of interest and his ability to cope with such conflicts of interest can't be avoided. Meanwhile, there is the record of this administration, which controls the Department of Justice, in suppressing as well as misrepresenting in pretending that Hunt was not in White House employ at the trial.

Mr. Dean has not replied to my letter of October 20, 1972, despite the clear requirements of 5 U.S.C. 552 that reply be "prompt". Moreover, the White House had waived the exemptions of the law in making the statements it had, so the public information I sought could not properly be withheld. I think it is obvious that it was not Mr. Hunt's interest Mr. Dean was serving but that of the White House.

Hunt's relations with the Mullen public relations firm have never been honestly and completely reported, including by Mr. Bennett in his public statements. You will note that my letter to Mr. Dean repeats an earlier request for the Mullen agency's government contracts. My request was not prompted by idle curiosity. A small part of this story is available if you have missed it. It came out after this request. I knew enough to make the request before the Bennett/Hunt operation for the hiding of Republican campaign funds attributed to some 40 dummy committees became known.

Perhaps I should explain that I am a writer, what is known as an investigative reporter, with previous experience as an investigator and in Intelligence.

From his own biographical material, which has been universally ignored, it would seem that Hunt was engaged in domestic intelligence when he was with the CIA. He also had a connection I have already proven, by confidential means, with the Mullen agency while he was with CIA. The Mullen agency itself did CIA work, including in an earlier

area of Hunt's specialization, Cuba. I cannot understand why nobody questioned the Bennett explanation of Hunt's work from the time it was first reported. Do you really believe it was necessary to hire a public-relations agency to get the President's daughter on TV in public-service announcements? Or that Hunt's role in this was indispensable? These are only two of my reasons for wanting to know of the public money that went to the Mullen agency and how Hunt was really spending it.

Moreover, Hunt was not a mere hired pen at Mullen, as he and they alleged. According to Hunt himself he was a member of the board and a vice president. My private information, from an unimpeachable but confidential source, is that Hunt's connections with Mullen did not terminate with announcement of the termination. Months later it existed.

I am not writing you in terms of a Watergate investigation. I report this as I can report more because your proper public function is an examination of Mr. Gray's record, his suitability, and how he meets conflicts of interest. If I could establish these things without leaving home and with no resources, do I have to suggest that the FBI had greater capability and had to have developed more information - or was kept from doing it. In the last analysis, all of this is Mr. Gray.

It is not secret that Hunt was working for the White House directly and for the government if not the White House under a government contract with the Mullen agency - both at the same time and at the time he was engaged in his criminal activity. Can you conceive of the FBI doing its duty and not conducting an investigation to see if the criminal Hunt in his criminal activity might have spent any taxpayers' money in his criminal activity? (which was for the White House). If Mr. Gray did not cause such an investigation to be made can he possibly be trusted with the high office of Director of the FBI? In considering this question, I urge you to bear in mind that both employments are a matter of public record, so it is not possible that the FBI and Mr. Gray did not know. I am not suggesting a lack of FBI professionalism. I am suggesting political control.

There are so many, many more questions Mr. Gray did not address with you if I can judge accurately from the public reporting. He told you no more than he could expect to be leaked if he did not tell you. He was not a noble spirit unloading itself. He was following the traditional practise of all spooks during history, telling you what he had to expect you would know to make it seem that he was really levelling with you.

If I could continue this at great length and will devote more time to it should you so desire, I close with another subject of unavoidable FBI investigation unless political control prevented it. Again what I will say is not secret and is from the press. There was a tragic accident in which Mr. Hunt's wife lost her life. She was found to be carrying \$10,000 in \$100-dollar bills, the largest denomination of which banks do not keep records on handing them out. Under any circumstances, this is not normal, especially not for a woman who is allegedly carrying this money for a normal business investment and when she has a checkbook with her showing some \$3,000 in her account. The authorities did not turn this money over to Mr. Hunt immediately, if they have yet. Despite the statement he and others made that he was the owner of the money, it seems to have gone to her estate, not to him. This may be immaterial. According to a Chicago reporter, some of the bills were from the New York Federal Reserve Bank, not from the already-laundered Florida source. Do you really think that a diligent L. Patrick Gray or any other Director of the FBI could have avoided investigating to see if this treasure could have been provided by Mr. Vesco? I am not saying it was. I am asking if investigation to learn if it was made under Mr. Gray's direction and if it was not, is he serving a political or a public interest?

Inherent in Mr. Dean's letter to me is the statement that White House employment by Hunt was criminal, although I don't think he meant to say it. If my letter to him or anything else required further explanation, please ask. I will be away during the working day tomorrow and I will be in Washington Saturday. Except for this, I do not expect to be away from home for more than a few moments at a time for the coming week. It does not concern me that I suspect some of Mr. Gray's people may be interested in my phone.