

Bear Jim, CIA appeal; Hunt/publishing

2/2/76

I've used much of today trying to clean up, in part (mainly) to be free for any call from Playboy and because if students come tomorrow I can get some lowest-drawer filing done. So, I finally read the Kempster piece on CIA and publishing and Hunt.

So what else is new? And why now?

I told you this in I think 1972, with details Kempster didn't have. I offered it to the Post and Woodstein.

The publishing part is not new, either. It came out, I think, in 1967. Including Praeger. The strange girl in New Orleans needed me about going to "one of our publishers," Praeger, citing Layton Hartens as her source.

The who now also involves the ~~xxxxxx~~ how now.

I think there are two possibilities only: a Congressional leak to Kempster or an indirect CIA leak because it knows the story is going to break anyway. If we take the second alternative, by seeing to it that the story is leaked the other aspect is entirely ignored: seeing to it that books are not published.

The second alternative, as I think you may remember, represents the belief I've had about most disclosures: the CIA took the initiative and with it took control, working on the sound principle that they could take and keep control because they knew there were going to be disclosures. This permitted them to prevent real disclosures.

Now why do you think they are stonewalling on my appeal? Do you think it is only because of RTVR? I don't. I think they know pretty much what I do about that, although they were careful not to give me any clue to their having this file on me. Then why not? Simply because of what it could lead to - the second side of the publishing coin, non-publishing.

How we can do it I don't know, but I think we should now move speedily, filing a combination of complaints and asking for a large sum of money in damages. I think the complaint can be amended, I think today it can attract some attention. And I think that all the press will not fink out on the Schorr deal. (I warned him more than a week ago, as I recall, and offered help without response.) I may have a connection, maybe two now.

(Notice, by the way, that Williams was Helms' lawyer.)

There are other advantages in rapid filing, for you. I can prove they have more than they've give, so that much they'll have to come up with. This will enable you to invoke the law for fee.

Maybe I'll write Young again tomorrow morning. I'll think about it abed.

Maybe I'll take it up with Les, who is to be here next week. A new break could help.

Other factors to be considered include the current campaign to succor the CIA and the fact that Congressional committees have not yet died and there will be some lingering Congressional interest.

The FOIA complaint is, I think, simple. The damage action should, I think, hub around First amendment allegations. They have carelessly give me one new paper on that where there a) is no possibility of foreign involvement and b) they used Haile's language.

If the Williams suit could go at the same time it could help some with both. I think they can do simple arithmetic.

Where the time will come from I don't know but I do believe the time is now.

Best,