

## But fellows make strange Politics

If not through connections with "The Mexican Connection," the CIA was to Nixon's and his henchmen's knowledge vulnerable to other pressures because it had broken the law for him with and through Hunt prior to the break-in, the first arrests and the ensuing consternation throughout the government.

Ehrlichman's cited testimony is far from all the so-called investigations all of which were white ashes, which is expectable given the sacred cow status of the CIA in the Congress.

How little interested the congress is in watching the CIA, even when it crosses over into publicized criminal activity and the supposedly precluded domestic-intelligence Democratic are, is shown by the statement of a spokesman for Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, who is hardly anti-Establishmentarian and is not of his party's liberal wing. The Senator was going to "is going to take the matter up with the CIA," this spokesman said of reports of this domestic intelligence activity.

What would one expect it to say or do?

In The Washington Post of May 3, 1973, this quotation is followed by the ~~statement~~ observation, "The oversight committee has not met since Senator Russell's death."

Richard B. Russell gave up his oversight responsibilities long before his death, but as of the time of the story he had been dead almost two and a half years.

The only public testimony was taken by the Senate Watergate committee. The other committees of both House that had any kind of jurisdiction held their hearings in secret. Had they not ~~held their hearings~~ and had they not held off - after all, inferences of CIA involvement were in the very earliest stories - the history of The Watergate if not of the country might have been different.

Even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee got into the act. In secret, of course, when it considered the nominations of Helms to be ambassador to Iran.

The first of his three appearances before this committee, on February 5, 1973, was his public appearance before any Congressional committee. He had then been in CIA for 26, all until the last six and a half, when he was Director, in dirty-works, which he bossed prior



to becoming boss of the whole thing. (Phila Inq 2/6/73)

How much more secret, non-public, can the head of any federal agency be? How much farther removed from any supervision?

The truth is Nixon fired him, under the most exceptional of circumstance - and months only before his mandatory retirement, which is vindictive, even for Nixon. The ashes of history's most corrupted election had not yet cooled before he did it, beginning with what he so protests when he doesn't like them leaks. They were hardly separated from Nixon when, like the UPI story from Key Biscayne on December 3, 1972, beginning "Richard Helms will soon leave his post", attributed to "Administration sources." (NYTimes 12/4/72)

Other people, like Robert Mullen, have Key Biscayne homes, but can "Administration sources" from Key Biscayne be any other than Nixon's personal staff?

Then there were leaks that Atomic Energy Commission Chairman James R. Schlesinger would replace Helms. December 17 he said the job had not been offered to him. (Post 12/18/72) Four days later his appointment was announced, by Mullen's neighbor in Key Biscayne. (Post 12/23.72)

There is an irony in sending him off to Iran. In 1953 the CIA had overthrown the emotional and independent Mossadegh government, considered one of the real coups, equal or great that Guatemala, inside the dirty trickery. (One of the better accounts of this in operation is in Wise and Ross' The Invisible Government.)

Countless commentaries are available to argue that Nixon had other than indulging vindictiveness in mind by ousting Helms under such extraordinary circumstances, as soon as the election was over and so close to mandatory retirement. But the give-aways are the brevity of Schlesinger's stay as Director, Central Intelligence (he was soon made Secretary of Defense) and the closeness to retirement and the fact that the United States Ambassador in Iran was acceptable to Nixon and had hardly adjusted to the desert sands and the stench of oil before he was replaced.

The factor other than Watergate was "reorganization" of the CIA. In fact it was evisceration, ending the only independent intelligence analysis of any major consequence other than that by those departments most involved, the military and the diplomat.

In early 1973 the think-pieces started rolling off the presses. But the real con-



of this vengeance against Helms is that there would be no check on the military's version of military intelligence or the ~~State Department~~ Henry Kissinger's estimates and understandings of what was going on in the world.

In the beginning it was explained as an "economy" measure, easing out about a thousand employees who were getting along in years, not generally regarded as compassionate. But when the personification of all the military errors of the age, General Daniel O. Graham, a military intelligence man, published an article in Army magazine ~~for~~ just before Schlesinger picked him for membership in the Intelligence Resources Advisory Board and that article argued that the Pentagon should have exclusive jurisdiction in analyzing strategic military intelligence, the real purpose was hardly hidden.

Helms' firing was accompanied by a drastic reorganization of intelligence back to its major defect that caused creation of an independent, civilian intelligence agency, save for the cost, estimated at a total of over six and up to eight billions of dollars a year. (Times 4/30/73)

When the military start criticizing the judgement of the military and the diplomats that of the diplomats, that will be news.

But getting the CIA pretty much out of this kind of intelligence and analysis was a nice bribe to the military, not a short-ranged gesture by a President about to be impeached, as conditions then were.

It was also to add emphasis to the least necessary and most undesirable function of any spookery, clandestine operations, or dirty tricks.

As Jack Anderson pointed out in his March 8, 1973 column, in the "Cuban exile community" alone there is "a pool of talent which was trained by the CIA and is available for 'dirty tricks.' This talent has been used at one time or another by a number of federal agencies for missions of questionable legality, inside and outside the United States."

The folks who gave us Watergate and many other Nixon operations not investigated.

The extent to which federal agencies train and equip all sorts of anti-social elements for their special needs of any whim and then turn them loose, too often equipped to wreak havoc on people, property and political affairs is not well known. It is fact.



If the FBI has done more than any agency should, the CIA is supposed not to have any domestic functions of this character. Its lack of a fig-leaf it overcomes by raw power and fear of criminalizing it. That is a political liability.

on 5 Frank Ferrini/Sturgis is a long-time Anderson informant. Anderson appealed and appeared on his behalf when it came time for bail.

Large quantities of death-dealing materials intended for but not used in the Bay of Pigs are still around to deal death.

Thanks to the folks who gave us the Bay of Pigs, from Nixon to Hunt.

"Bullets used to Kill Masvh Nashville liquor store ~~operator~~ operator Lavorte Clay Smith, 28, were manufactured originally to be used in the abortive Bay of Pigs..." the Nashville papers reported on April 15, 1953, telling of the police investigation that proved the bullets were "manufactured for CIA-controlled businesses."

Explosives used in five bombings in Los Angeles last July 19 came originally from the Central Intelligence Agency, ~~xxxxx~~...two FBI agents testified" in a case of "15 ~~charges~~ counts of illegally possessing and is discharging explosives," the Associated Press reported December 30, 1968. One of the two men charged reported accurately to the police "that after the Bay of Pigs invasion, explosives could be found anywhere in the Miami area." (A-P 12/31/68)

These five bombings in three hours are a minor sample of the death and destruction caused by the CIA trained and provided for, from coast to coast. The best-known cases are of those calling themselves "Cuban Power." It was no big deal for them to attack a ship in an American port. Perhaps the best-known case is the shelling of the United Nations building.

"CIA May Scrap Airline It Doesn't Need; Plan to Sell Southern Air Transport Stirs Controversy," is the headline on one of a series of late August and early September, 1973 stories in The Washington Post and The New York Times. The CIA has domestic airlines of its own, tax-payer financed.

Beginning with a New York Times December 17, 1972 story headed "14 City Policemen Got C.I.A. Training" it came out that the CIA had actually been training city police departments in its arcane skills. To believe the CIA explanation is to believe that without its police



could not keep records. And for what is there the FBI ~~Academy~~ Academy? From one who took that training I know the explanations is false, a cover for still another form of CIA intrusion into domestic life.

tr to 4 Philadelphia was shocked to find that the home of \_\_\_\_\_ Passnacht was bulging with the widest assortment of automatic weapons and explosives. He was CIA, then engaged in clandestine activities overseas, under cover, as the story unfolded first in the newspapers and then in court.

The slander case filed by Heril Heine in 1964 came to trial in ~~June 1969~~ federal district court in Baltimore in June, 1969. The court held that the CIA has the right to order agents in the United States to slander others. (Post 6/9/69) The Supreme Court upheld the decision. The Washington Post's May 20, 1971 account begins, "The Supreme Court refused to review a lower court's decision that immunized a Central Intelligence Agency operative from a law-suit for slander uttered 'in the line of duty.'"

There are countless cases similar to the foregoing. The spooks are part of our life and there seems to be nothing we can do about their dirty tricks. These people do what the CIA tells them to do and on their own they do what the CIA taught them to do, sometimes with what the CIA gave them.

When this is so well known in the Cuban community and when Nixon through Hunt drew not only on this Cuban community but on those who had for years been performing precisely these "duties" for the CIA, the claim of the arrested Cubans that they believed they were serving the Government on urgent "national security" matters is not without credibility, especially when the political beliefs of these revanchists are understood. Barked told the Watergate committee that Hunt told him the assignment was above CIA, that important (1H357ff) There is no doubt in my mind that not only the Cubans but the entire crew believed this fascist doctrine, as did those for whom they did their dirty tricks, all of which have not been exposed and most of which have been deliberately avoided in the investigations.

Even those confessed!  
so-called

Of all the investigations of the CIA's role ~~with the exception~~ in the activities of those charged after the first of the charged break-ins, only that of the Watergate committee was



public. It took the testimony of Helms, Cushman and Walters August 2 and 3, 1974. (SH3232ff; ~~and~~ 9H3403ff.) This testimony fell roughly into two parts, the CIA's assistance to Hunt in his White House operations and White House pressure on CIA to deter the FBI investigation and then to accept blame for the burglary.

The original request for this illicit CIA help in illicit White House acts was Cushman in a "call on July 7, 1971 from Mr. Ehrlichman who said that Howard Hunt had been hired ...on security matters, that he would be coming to see me, and could I lend him a hand, or words to that effect." (SH3290ff). ~~xx~~ <sup>Two</sup> internal CIA memos here "sanitized" to remove well-known names, expresses the concern felt inside the agency as Hunt made increasing demands upon it: (get Ex 127)



"TSD" is technical services.

This admitted help in "national security" matters was described by Cushman as no more than the Hunt representation that "he had been charged with a highly sensitive mission ....an interview of a person whose ideology he was not certain of, and that he felt he had to disguise himself to conduct this interview, and requested that the Agency provide him with the materials to establish that alias...I considered it a one-time interview, as he stated it, was perfectly OK." (8H5292)

One violation of the law, one intelligence intrusion into domestic affairs that is illegal, "was perfectly OK.")

The "technical" equipment provided Hunt exceeded what this "interview" required and the CIA knew it. Perhaps this explains Nixon's selection of Cushman, his old friend, as second man at CIA and his replacement by another old friend, Walters. He had his men where he wanted them and these two acted as his men, not as public servants, in the entire affair.

That "highly sensitive mission" that Nixon called top "national security" was many missions none involving any rational concept of national security. Besides, this is not a dictatorship and were the "national security" claim legitimate, there are agencies trained to perform these functions. Does anyone doubt the ability of the FBI to do its kind of duty?

The publicized "national security" cases were ~~the~~ "highly sensitive" because they were all illegal and all political. The best publicized was the burglary of the psychiatrist to whom Daniel Ellsberg had gone. Ehrlichman, Egil Krogh, Liddy and some of the Cuban gang were indicted for it first in Los Angeles and later in a Washington indictment of March 7, 1974, when the Los Angeles case was dismissed except for a charge of perjuring himself before the Los Angeles grand jury by Ehrlichman. This is sufficient answer to the Nixon false pretense. It was common crime for political purposes, as was the other charged break-in, of the Democrats' headquarters.

Of all the other "highly sensitive missions" of utmost "national security" need, those that were acknowledged in one way or another had never really investigated are <sup>the</sup> the Bennett Hughes and De, Motte endeavors (De Motte was to produce what could defame  
^



on 7 (A)

Ehrlichman, who sought to isolate himself from his pressures on the CIA, told Dean to tell Nixon's crony-generals how they got where they are. ( H ). This was cutting it bluntly enough, with the inherent threat that their careers could end fast.

Cushman and Ehrlichman were friends going back more than a decade, to 1960, which is eight years before Nixon took over the White House. When Hunt appeared in Cushman's office, Cushman sent a personal greeting back to his old friend Ehrlichman.



Senator Edward "Teddy" Kennedy) and a Hunt "interview" with Dita Beard, the ITT lobbyist who put it in writing that ITT had bought Nixon administration help in an anti-trust case in return for a gift of up to \$400,000 to the reelection convention.

When Jack Anderson broke the story, Mrs. Beard disappeared. There is the uninvestigated story that Liddy spirited her out of town. Hunt's "interview" was to get her to disavow her memo and to give a different story. He succeeded.

In addition to these there were a whole series of what are called "bag jobs" similar to the two break-ins that resulted in indictments and convictions. If all of them were not reported, many were and none was investigated by the Watergate committee. Putting the Nixon/Hunt gang at the scene of the crimes was child's play from expense accounts, and if the committee did not have them it did not want them. There were available under subpoena. The Department of Justice did get them and did place no charges, not even when it had witnesses, not even after confessions began.

There were also a whole series of urgent "national defense" concerns revolving around interferences with the conventions of both parties, to defame the Democrats and create pandemonium and, of course, to spy and to build sympathy for Nixon with phoney "hippies" and "left-wing" demonstrations against him.

The committee had the responsibility stated in the title it printed on its hearings, to investigate and report on all "presidential Campaign Activities of 1972" and the Department of Justice had the duty to enforce the laws, not just those it and Nixon wanted enforced and including those Nixon violated.

Paralleling the Nixon/Hunt gang operation and coinciding with the earlier work of the Nixon so-called "Special Investigations Unit" which called itself "The Plumbers" was another dirty-works operation under Ehrlichman by a couple of former New York City "red squad" veterans, ( H ) Jack Caulfield and Tony Ulasewicz. Caulfield was pushed high in the government and Ulasewicz did most of the spying. He ~~was~~ also ~~involved in~~ <sup>confessed</sup> paying off the defendants in collaboration with Herbert Malinback. ( H ) Ulasewicz's real work was the dirtiest, looking for what Nixon could use to defame his enemies, particularly Teddy Kennedy over the Chappaquiddick incident but not it alone. He was there immediately and asked the dirtiest leading questions while posing as a reporter and paid by tax money,



(Kalmbach copped a plea. He was sentenced to a soft-touch                      months to                      years  
by "Maximum John" Sirica, the original judge in the original case. Compared to the original  
sentences, over six years for Liddy and eight for Hunt, "Maximum John" like Judge Hart  
with Kleindienst minimized more the closer those he sentenced were to Nixon and the White  
House. Hart praised the felon former Attorney General and saw to it that Kleindienst  
of the only 30 to high he sentenced him  
served not a day/and paid not a cent of his insignificant \$100 fine. All the lawyers, all  
close to Nixon and all the non-operating types of "white collar" crime who did go to jail  
were sent not to the tough and rough ones but to the softer-life "minimum security"  
institutions, some even with gold courses and no fences.)



as Caulfield was in such other "national security" matters as breaking into the home of respected syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft to bug him, a project already taken care of by the FBI and requiring a second second-story job to remove the bug.

The CIA's defense against ~~the charge~~ of its criminal activities approved by all its top people in its Hunt assistance is that once it caught on it stopped. This is false and I think that the defense itself crossed over into the criminal more than once.

John Dean did try to get it to accept responsibility for the raid on the Democrats' headquarters by bribing the Cubans. The CIA's defense is that it refused. This also is false and there is enough evidence in suppressed documentary form and suppressed secret testimony to take to a grand jury.

The CIA's testimony on these matters is contained in the inadequate questioning of its tops three of the period, ~~Richard Helms~~, Helms, Cushman and Walters.

It did admit to creating a false identity and false documentation for Liddy, as "George Leonard." Liddy did use these in criminal activity, of which the Ellsberg job is an admitted one. It did process pictures Hunt took on that job, but it and the FBI both pretended that with all the intensive investigation of the leaking of the Pt Pentagon papers and the great efforts made to get information from Dr. Lewis Fielding of Los Angeles, ~~the pictures~~, of which both agencies had copies, meant nothing to either when they showed his offices, his parking lot with his name on it and a car licensed to him - and secret investigation ~~was~~ established the owner of the car.

Publicly, this story was actually swallowed, so great was the desire to cover the CIA and the FBI for their transgressions. This, too, is traditional with the Congress and with much of the press.

When witnesses talking openly and answering questions fully, like McCord, were on the stand the committee avoided asking the obvious questions. The fact is that all the Cubans were provided with false identifications. McCord spelled this out in his book (p.31), "The men were carrying false identifications, apparently from earlier plumbers' operations..."

This isn't even the tip of the iceberg.

The federal intelligence and investigative agencies know they can depend on protection from the Congress but they also know they have to make it possible. One of the means of



making this traditional protection-racket possible is having covers and cover stories. The CIA, which could not do any business without being expert in cover stories, did much less than an expert job but it was enough because there seems to be no limit to what the Congress cannot hold down in the name of "national security," which here translates into covering for the illegalities and improprieties of the spooks.



Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, former Secretary for Air, is chairman of the Military committee's CIA "oversight" committee and fourth-ranking member of the majority on the Foreign Relations committee. Amplifying his intercessions and speeches on behalf of Helms personally and the CIA in general, hardly a critical participation or examination or investigation, when Helms made his three appearances before the Foreign Relations committee, fingers the pulse of this Congressional defense of CIA improprieties when "oversight" was to prevent these proscribed activities: Lil- listed pages, parts marked in green, separate by asterisks.

The Chairman. Mr. Helms, personally I regret seeing you leave the CIA because I believe in seniority and experience, I think it has some value. I have a feeling that you know more about the CIA than you do Iran. Do you think that is a fair statement?

Mr. Helms. I think that is a fair statement, Mr. Chairman.  
(Hearings, p.2)

\* \* \* \* \*

Senator Symington. Mr. Chairman, I would first say I have been around this town a long time, and believe Director Helms has established a reputation which may well have saved the Central Intelligence Agency from a good deal of additional criticism because of the respect of all of us for him as a person and the way he has operated.  
(p.3)

\* \* \* \* \*

Senator Symington. May I congratulate you in at least one instance where it was handled. (p.4)



When Republican Senator Clifford P. Case cited law and asked "is that designed to cover domestic action here in the United States..." Symington interrupted to read the text of the law, which he just happened to have in his pocket. But as the question of Chairman William Fulbright of Arkansas highlighted, Helms had not sought legal advice:

" \* \* \* Abd, provided further, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure \* \* \*" (p.63

\* \* \* \* \*

Senator Symington. If the Chair will yield, you may not know it, but there might be other people in the Agency who went around your back on this one as they did on other things, because of their relative proximity to the White House staff. Is that possible?

Mr. Helms. Anything is possible. (p.64)



When Republican Senator Charles Percy of Illinois asked about the appointment of General Walters, who had no apparent special qualifications to be the second man in CIA, and Helms said he would have preferred a career man, here again, on so minor and ~~unimportant~~ irrelevant a detail, when Symington felt there might be a slight reflection on Helms, this is what transpired:

Senator Percy. Would it be your right, if you felt there were ~~something~~ someone more qualified, to suggest someone else? =

Senator Symington. Would the Senator yield?

Senator Percy. I would be happy to yield.

Senator Symington. It would be his right, but that would have ended his connection with the executive branch, based on my experience in that branch. (p.93)

This sycophancy, this self-appointment as political and public-relations adviser to the CIA and its former head by the man who had major responsibility for keeping tabs on it, to protect it and society from transgressions and from the temptation inherent in all intelligence operations, is typical of the failure that becomes the refusal of the Congress to exercise its responsibilities and an encouragement to transgressions and to cover them up.

In practice it meant that Helms and others could lie, in context perjure themselves, with impunity and knowing it would be safe.

Helms wasted little time lying about CIA Watergate involvement. Speaking of the six arrested who had CIA relations he said, "They had all retired, they had left. I have no control over anybody who has left." (p.10)

This was on February 5, 1973. The line and the lie was adhered to by all others, in secret and in public, until August 2, <sup>Helms</sup> when ~~Walters~~ admitted that one of the seven <sup>seven</sup>, Martinez, was a CIA employee when he was arrested, "on a ~~retainer~~ (933424) ~~retainer~~" sort of retainer" since 1969. (SH3247). Until then he had maintained there had been no CIA-Watergaters connection for two years. ~~and~~ Even without Martinez's current CIA work, this was false in a way never investigated or exposed. With Hunt working as a "legitimate" vice president of Mullen and with Mullen having clandestine CPA connections both directly



and indirectly, Hunt had a CIA relationship until Mullen fired him, which was not until July 2, two weeks after the June 17 break-in. Yet when asked by Fulbright February 5, Helms had replied

Yet when Fulbright asked him February 5, "He had no relationship to the since ~~retirement~~ <sup>CIA</sup> then [Hunt's retirement]? Helms replied, "No, sir." (p. 26)

Helms was so unworried about all this deception and misleading of the investigations which needed no assistance in going the wrong way and what I think is perjury that when had to be recalled for a third time by the Foreign Relations committee he indulged a subtle sense of humor. Senator Hubert Humphrey asked ~~xxxx~~ "Is it not rather unusual" <sup>not a member of the CIA</sup> that a private citizen be used by the White House for the clandestine "interview" had ~~was assigned and was then~~ "accommodated" by the CIA. Helms response began with the evasion "there was no indication that anybody was going to be guilty of wrongdoing" and ended, "Assistance to the Presidency has not been a crime up until comparatively recently." Here the transcript shows "[Laughter.]" (p. 78)

The "sort of a retainer" on which the CIA had Martinez was reported by the press, <sup>ions include</sup> not official investigators, ~~to be~~ still another of those innumerable CIA clandestine outfits in the Miami area.

Pick up with "Green" outfit if clip shows up

One of the big secrets only because the Congress and the press combined for it to be secret is that official lying is the official way. It permeates the government. In four suits for suppressed evidence that I filed there was none in which there was not official lying to the courts, under oath. These liars included the heads of government depts. Two were Watergating Attorneys General, Mitchell and Kleindinst. And they got away with it because the courts simply will not face the reality, that lying has become the official practise when the alternative is embarrassment.

The fourth of these was for a suppressed executive-session transcript of the Warren Commission, held to hear the evidence of the charge that the advised assassin, Lee Harvey



Oswald, had been in some capacity with the FBI of the CIA. The Commission neither then nor later ever really investigated the charge. And this Commission was headed by the then Chief Justice of the United States. Another member had been Director, Central Intelligence at the time Nixon was Ike's ramrod on the Bay of Pigs and Hunt had been ~~the~~ Dulles' political chief on that project. ~~At~~ The ~~xx~~ five other Commissioners were Senators and I lost the case and before I could file an appeal, and Congressmen. After the perjury to the court succeeded, ~~although the government knew it had committed perjury and if it was still listening in on my phone, knowing my lawyer was about to make a demand that its witness or I be charged with perjury, relented and declassified this transcript ostensible and saying in writing what I did not believe, that it was just for me. I was suspicion. Immediately I saw an ulterior Watergate purpose.~~

The Acting United States Attorney whose assistant procured and filed the false swearing was Earl Silbert who, as chief Watergate prosecutor, had managed not to file the charges that should have been, some of which later were, and had, in fact, been part of Nixon's covering up.

Why else would Nixon promote him?

If as I believe the affidavit he had procured was perjurious, then someone in the government committed another crime, suborning perjury.

Well, this transcript about which there had been endless official lying for the six years I had tried so hard to get it is official proof that official lying is the official norm - officials discussing it quite openly when they never expected anyone ever to see their words, taken down by a court report and classified -in violation of the law- "TOP SECRET."

~~Some~~ The cover and each page bear this stamp in thick black stamping top and bottom.

At that supersecret meeting, there came a point in consideration of how this "ugly rumor" also described as a "dirty business" could be swept under the rug in some way, when this is the actual expression of what I have said: L11-from 143-3, facts.



15A

Senator John Sherman Cooper's apprehension about the certainty the FBI would know it was being investigated and what it would then do is as relevant in 1974 as it was in 1964.







This appears to be a carbon of an unread chapter of The Unimpeachment of Richard Nixon with some of the documents drawn upon. I received these documents from one of the members of the Senate Watergate Committee. There are others like them filed with the draft of that ms.

I don't know how much Magruder and Haldeman or Colson knew about Hunt's connections as of the date of the memo but he then had been connected with the Mullen agency for some time and was still with the CIA.