

Dear Ed,

10/4/73

I'm glad to get the Harper's 10/73 ax-job on Ellsberg and sorry it doesnot include the title and particularly the author.

The parts you marked are worth comment. But first I ask what relevance is there to anything else in what takes up a quarter of the piece, the allegations that Ellsberg went to an orgy or orgies? And if this author found it really was relevant, was it possibly worth 1/4 of the space he finds it necessary to devote this man? Can that be a rational sense of values? I think not. So, as soon as I found him going into what I believe has to be irrelevant, I had doubts. After reading it they are deeper.

The quote, "You'll notice they never brought<sup>out</sup> that kind of stuff against Jack Kennedy, or against Ted." (Why not Joe, or Bobby?) This, of course, assumes it exists and that there is another deep, dark, dank "Republican conspiracy to preserve the Kennedy reputation. This is a new view of our Glorious Leader.

"Russo said it was the only analysis [sic] that made any sense to him." Prouty's. That Ellsberg is/was a CIA agent. What the hell does the man have to do besides risking a life in jail? Instead of raising substantial questions about Ellsberg, Prouty raises substantial questions about himself with this kind of ax job that just happens to coincide with official Nixonian need and appears and gets attention only when all of Nixon's efforts fail. If you read this part with care, you should have doubts about the integrity or the knowledge of the author. Prouty has "a CIA background"? because he worked in another agency and with it? Does that not as reasonable mean an anti-CIA background?

I caught Prouty on a TV talk show after the book came out. He backed down entirely on the allegation after beginning to pretend it was valid. I suspect that is the show that eneded any major promos for the book.

Why not write a piece saying that because of Sheehan's commentaries, Ellsberg is an LBJ front? Or because the Times printed it and suppressed news of the Bay of Pigs, it and he are CIA? The reasoning is as sound as the author's.

Despite all the baloney we've been fed by the pseudo-radicals, the fact remains that publication of even a bob-tailed version of the Papers ia a major American utrning point. They do expose all the people could assimilate about official corruption and much more than almost any (incouding me) did. For some of us their content didn't mean that much. But how about all those True Believers?

Perhaps it is Ellsberg's crime that he didn't deliver Marx on an H-21?

Perhaps had it been any other kind of piece, Harper's would not have touched it.

When I think of all the good pieces that can be written, incouding on this subject, an ax job and particularly yhis kind makes me have doubts about the author's intentions, whether his lack of knowledge and/or understanding really explain it.

The concluding sentnece can t be faithful. Was the author there?

After the WG disclosures, I can t help but wonder at this kind of piece and its remarkable timing. It is too literatē for Hunt. But has it a different purpose than his?

Many thanks. If you know the author, I'd like to know who he is?

Sincerely,