

Full copy CIA-domestic - 12/21/74ff; Bantam (Glencoe)

Here I digress for something I would appreciate whether or not this all interests anyone at Bantam. I learned a fantastic story, one that would make a novel, by the correct pursuit of the leads I found in standard biographical information about Hunt. So, I'd like copies of what is readily available about Barron in such things as Contemporary Authors and if you have it, Who's Who. I'm too far from the library and don't know when the missing part of my car will be obtained.

Barron's views, especially political views, are indistinguishable from those of Hunt and Angleton. As distinguished from fact, they are heavy in this book. While I would be the last to allege a writer ought not disclose his beliefs to the reader - and in fact believe the writer owes it to the reader - in this case they have a different context because they are separate from fact and because they are pro-CIA propaganda, whether or not to Barron they are genuine, as I believe them to be.

In any of the many forms official inquiry can take, all this could be relevant, particularly because of the little-known CIA involvement in publishing and I believe non-publishing.

The publishing history of KGB makes it a natural for reprint, so defenses are not unavailable. And I'm not suggesting that Bantam did this as a favor or service to the CIA.

However, it could be embarrassing, very bad public relations, especially with the young. And those with motive (which does not include me) could really make a parallel case out of what really surprised me, as you know, Temkin's unnecessary appearance and then as an unhidden partisan at the Ray evidentiary hearing. His attendance could not be compelled and wasn't. Simultaneously, all publishing information on the Frank book was denied the defense even when a court order had been issued directing that it be made available to the defense. And going along with this is the now known fact that the CIA had a domestic-intelligence file on Ray's chief counsel. I'm telling you they also have not less than one on me, Ray's investigator. And now, from what I heard of the radio during the night, TIME says they had a file on this lawyer's former boss when the lawyer was a Senate committee counsel. The combination can undoubtedly be added to.

By the way, this reminds me that anything you see in the Times, especially the Sunday Times, can be of help and I'd appreciate it. The only certain coverage I have of the Times is daily only. I can't afford it by mail, the only way it is really available here in the country, and the friend who is far away and does get it by mail does not get the Sunday edition. He also gets a different edition than you do.

Virtually nobody outside CIA can have any real notion of the ramifications of this thing. The Watergate involvement as yet unexposed are great and they do involve Ford personally and with what I've been suggesting that also can involve Bantam, if innocently. (I was in the conclusions of my second Watergate book when I had to lay it aside for my Ray work the end of September. I have not been able to get back to it except for about a day. I have no changes to make as a result of the trial. Says he, boastfully.) It is a sordid story, of the kinds of things with which a free society cannot coexist.

Ford is feeling around for a safe way out of this situation which, whether he knows it or not, is a very bad one for him personally. The control of the Congress will not, I believe, be anxious for a full exposure. That would expose the traditional failures of the Congress, not limited to the so-called "oversight" committees, which are little more than CIA fronts. There is leadership involvement in suppressions of all this. What is overt is far from all, particularly with men like Baker. He knew of all of this and was silent. He blundered into it in his maneuverings on the Watergate committee. I wrote this months ago and, stupidly, he has just added to it by admitting through his foreign counsel that he ~~has~~ such files and said and done nothing. One he saw was on Ray's chief counsel, the Temkin went out of his way to oppose, Fensterwald. Inevitably, this will now figure in at least one court case, probably more. However, this is the kind of political issue on which legislators not in leadership positions have interests and can see political gain. Inevitably, there will be much noise. The prompt firing of Angleton is a clue to the CIA's own readings on this.

This is not all. I've done it in haste on the chance your people may have some interest. If I thought it was their conscious intent to stooge for CIA I'd not be writing you this way. I have no personal axe to grind, except directly with CIA. Best regards,