

Dear Bud,

7/19/73

I have read the Bennett deposition without learning anything of immediate significance. It does have a few leads that could be useful in further depositions and investigations. It seems apparent that Dunie did no homework. I knew you had not been able to. I had more or less assumed that he would have.

It believe there were other Mullen/Bennett depositions, at least one or two secretaries. They would probably be worth my going over for the future. A Bennett can be expected to have a reason to withhold, but this is less likely with the secretarial help. Thye might blab out something.

I have no reason to believe or suggest that Bennet lied. He was not asked the kinds of questions that could have lead to his feeling it might be worth lying. If I think he told the truth, I am also confident that, faultlessly, he did not tell all of it. He responded. He didn't ask the questions.

Bennett's hunch about Hunt being at a distant point during at least one of his calls is true. If my recollection is correct he went to Los Angeles and from there went to Mexico, returning first to LA then home. But Bennett may have had more than a hunch.

I find values in this of no immediate value to you. One is confirmation of what was first my analysis and then proven. Some of the content of this bears much on that.

It is interesting that Bennett says Hunt did much writing for CIA. I'd not have expected it. Without giving it much thought, I'd say most of it would have been reports and what he considered analyses.

I have read the galleys. Except for insight into this strange man, they tell us nothing we didn't know. I am inclined to recommend against your taking the time to read it on two counts: it is not worth your time and unless you have a first-rate background on the Bay of Pigs you will be sadly misinformed. It is a very undependable work in which his self-justification and his politics are the important things. He is bad on names, omitting those of his friends and usually giving fictitious or incomplete ones for others.

I did have this copied. With you and Jim away I loaned his set to a mature friend who can provide me with a dependable analysis. This is a friend who has had some interest in the gentleman. They'll be back before Jim will want to read them.

The cost was only ~~\$9.70~~ \$9.70.

The writing and the editing are both rather poor.

There is this odd thing about it: it was handed in and the preteratory remarks were added well after he could have included an update on himself. He mentioned Fiorini and Barker. On Fiorini alone he has a footnote saying "later a Watergate defendant." All three were, but he says it of Fiorini only, without even saying what Watergate is. This is typical of Hunt as historian. The polemics are more important.

It is also odd or hdes an embarrassment or hangup. While his bios, of which I have given him a full set plus a tabulation, place him in Montevideo at the time he was reassigned to Bay Pigs, his book is evasive, never mentioning the country. Instead he makes casual reference to having a cup of coffee with the President.

You were perceptive or had a good hunch to go into Des Barker, of whom I know nothing. However, I also have a hunch you dropped it and what I would take to be related to it much too soon. I think it could have led you to something.

It is unfortunate that lawyers don't have time for adequate preparation for these kinds of things. If this one is a sample, great opportunities were missed. I suspect this will be more true of the tougher and more important witnesses.

There is nothing in this that discourages my belief that Hunt was more important than he had been made out to be and there are things that encourage the belief.

I had thought his wife returned later than this says. I could have been wrong. This says she was in NYC the Wednesday after the breakin, or about 6/21.

Sincerely,