

Re: Witness Summary, Everette Howard Hunt

Thanks very much for this, Mr. McGowan. It is very helpful, it does help my understanding very much and in some areas it does increase my knowledge, as on the plans for Bennett, Hunt and Caddy to buy Mullen. I regret the need for the masking, particularly because in some cases, particularly the first, page 2, I may have already put together what might be of interest to you.

Of course, you may also have done the same thing. I don't believe that jazz about the hot stuff on Muskie Greenspun is alleged to have had and didn't. I did that writing the day I saw the testimony. I believe the attempted break-in that, as I recall it, was exactly a year before the ^{fielding} ~~masking~~ job, was to get the Maheu papers on Hughes' notion that he could buy Nixon. Enough on this was in my files, old newspaper clippings.

There are some areas in which I find myself wondering why the staff was so much less informative than it could have been. Senators are too busy to keep up without being informed. This begins with the first item, the biography, which says much less than is public about Hunt's career, particularly where it is relevant in his CIA posts. One aspect of this I have not been able to follow and would like to if you have any suggestions or information is the Dominican fiasco of 1965. The spurious list of so-called communists used as a basis for the United States invasion and intrusion into the domestic affairs of that country is exactly the kind of thing one could expect from Hunt. It was a tragedy for the Dominican Republic and a disaster for United States foreign relations. I have a file of old clippings on this. They say the forces opposed by the United States were not communists.

This also has to be true about Mexico and about domestic intelligence, both areas I am following as best I can. I believe both are relevant to the inquiry and thus should have been in this summary.

Your letter concludes with a kind offer of more material if you have it. If it is not too much trouble, I have special interests in Hunt, Caddy and Bennett and the Mullen agency, so anything you might be able to provide that is not reproduced in the hearings I would be especially happy to have. I feel fairly confident of being able to come up with what has not yet been adduced on this. It will take time, has taken much time, but I think it will be worth the effort. When I have completed this work, I believe it may interest you and Senator Weicher.

This summary does not so indicate, but Hunt was a Mullen vice president. Based on what I have from Bennett in a civil-suit deposition, page 2 is wrong in that Bennett says he was hired as president before the purchase, which I believe he does not mention in that deposition.

Of course you should know much that I do not. However, as I read page 17 in particular I wondered if you have compared this and other matters with the Hunt and Liddy expense accounts. Two parts of this page seem to have been masked, one for sure. I have a story in which Greenspun is quoted as saying there actually was the break-in. This page says the plan was vetoed by the Hughes company. Unless Greenspun lied, somebody did break in and left proof of it.

A number of items on page 21 seem to be inadequate or inconsistent with what is publicly available. Incompleteness continues to the top of page 22. This and what follows give me more interest in the so-called Hunt blackmail letter, which I have not seen, if you can spare a copy.

If you are interested in these things and I can help you, please let me know.

Thanks for what you have done and what you may do,

Sincerely,