

The Compulsive Spy by Compulsive Tad Szulc, compelled of HW 1/24/74

It is not easy to write a books denouncing a man and the greatest political scandal of 'em all and be kind to everyone mentioned - even the sometimes viciously-treated Hunt - but Szulc managed it in the course of this protection racket he wrote. And in it he does protect everyone- including Hunt and himself.

Most of all CIA. Next Nixon and the White House. All the Congress and the press. He misses nobody. It appears otherwise because he picks up some of the stronger bits and pieces. But that merely makes it seem that he is tough. It is not until you stop to remember what was known before he wrote his book that it becomes apparent that he does have and achieve these objectives.

If he has to lie to do it, no problem. Example, saying Hunt had switched to CREEP and was and had for months been working for CREEP when the first arrests were made.

This is a particularly revealing example but not the only one because he had his book done and rewrote after Hunt's Ervin testimony, 9/24-5. Szulc hides this by not having changed references to having completed it in August. Or instering them. He had completed the work and it had, according to my own and unimpeachable information, been given its libel reading when Hunt testified. He made changes after Hunt's testimony and there was another libel reading. So he had to know that as of the day of the breakin Hunt was still working for the WH. Szulc explains around this that Hunt still held onto his EOB office but he says what is false, that Hunt's last day of WH work was 3/29/72 and that thereafter he was CREEP and under Liddy.

His backgroubd to make the whole thing understandable includes hiding the Praeger name in justifying - making a real good and decent thing out of - only partly-exposed CIA illegal acts and domestic operations. He hides Hunt's domestic work, which he was onto citing the sources that lead to it and misrepresenting what he does not avoid on this. He fails to mention that this unnamed CIA publisher was also his own, and in a book that served CIA ends in the "Day of Pigs. He covers CIA repeatedly, even excerpting quotes to this end and hiding the obvious meaning of what he does quote, example Cushman's taping of Hunt's and his conversation. He hides the extent and nature of CIA's help, etc. And in mentioning these earlier scandals, he manages never to mention the NSA part, the major part. Had he he could not have praised this illegality by CIA.

If my recollection is correct, he said in nis Sunday Times piece that he had met both Howard and Dorothy Hunt in Paris in 1949. He makes no mention of having known Hunt in the book except for one dragged-in-by-the-heels reference to having met Eduardo in Miami in those days. He thus confesses to having purged the nastier stuff from his Bay Pigs book, ehich contains no reference to the man of the role. Significant omission with Hunt to have been the mentor of the government in exile and with a man of his beliefs having been assigned to write a new Constitution for Cuba. Plus the political importance of his role and its military and morale consequences.

The doctrine of the book is corrupt. Inevitably this means he has to corrupt fact. He does, whenever necessary. Those without the most intimate knowledge of fact will not be able to see this. The WH connection is merely one of these things, At first I thought perhaps it might be careless writing only. Some of it is so clever it is not possible to know whether it is deliberate. One example is his protecting of the FBI in pretending that it was days before they could ascertain Hunt's involvement and then find and question him. In fact it found him at his home before dark that very day.

His references to earlier CIA exposes are all in terms of justifying what it did as decent and liberal. He mentions foreign cultural and trade-union deals but not NSA, the overthrowing of governments without reference to Guyana- nothing anti-liberal. Not even the public knowledge of Jaworski'd connection with these things.

The CIA's Laos operations? They, he said, began under LBJ (48) when JFK had inherited it and when it was supposedly stopped by his deal with Khrushchev. Invisible Government has a whole chapter on this. He says (49) that it was not until 1970 that AID funding was used, and thus and then for the first time had "highest level" approval in Washington. False.

Except for minor and color details, he recounts Hunt's publicized CIA career only. What is new is inadequately handled, his working for Dulles. Thereafter, except for Second

1
Naval Guerrilla, Hunt did nothing in all those years, almost a decade, almost half his CIA career. He even underplays Hunt's CRC role (52).

That he did consult and didn't follow Who's Who is clear (53,97,135).

Inconsistencies about, and adjacent. In his Cuban work he was the faceless man not remembered (53) and simultaneously disliked (54).

4
4
Although Hunt was apparently in Washington in 1968 and Who's Who gives his Washington address. Szulc ignores the period to his purchase of the Potomac home (98) to say of it (99) "In 1968 the Hunts moved back to Washington and bought a property..." The fact is that for almost all the time after Bay Pigs he was Washington based. Szulc tentatively places him in Madrid 1964-5 on Second Naval Guerrilla but in reality Hunt was engaged in domestic work in Washington at least as far back as 1964, from my private information (what he told Ervin committee staff in private interviews). To make this deliberate dishonesty impossible Szulc edits the transcript of the Cushman tape, eliminating Hunt's references to his downtown, not CIA headquarters, office and the area of his interests. (He says of Cushman only what Hunt says in his Give Us This Day and hides all else).

4
His errors are minor and major, the minor often enabling the major. He plain lies about the Mullen connection. Here he protects even Bennett. He has Bennett hiring Hunt while hiding what Hunt testified to, that Mullen had previous CIA connection and two people who CIA connected when Hunt was hired. Hunt actually interviewed Bennett for the presidency. He gives a partial and false account of the deal whereby Hunt was to buy in to Mullen, does not say over what it failed, and that is relevant because that man is the one whose phone at DNC was bugged - the only one! Oliver, some of Mullen associate! He carries this further, hiding any earlier Nixon-Hunt association with extra and pointing emphasis on Hunt's "cultivating" of Colson (~~109~~) (106-7).

4
He hedges carefully (134) but spays explicitly that as of the time of the writing there had been only 3 known Hunt WH jobs and he gives three, Ellsberg, Chappaquiddick and acble but later gives other jobs. On his handling of the break-in, no mention even of Mitchell. And the others. (136-50. He thus begins his account of it by says that much less than was public and he knew was all of the work Hunt did for Nixon and the WH.

4
4
Goes to some trouble to protect Caddy (159-5) about whom he hides so much even the fact that he and Hunt shared an office or that he had been YAF director are unmentioned. Much was public that he ignored and a sensation would have resulted if he had done any real investigative reporting. In his handling of the fiasco of the breakin he pins sole responsibility of Hunt, which is not the real story that emerged, and without even mentioning Hunt's undisputed testimony that he in fact oppsed it.

4
Here he lies again, saying Hunt didn't get home until early a.m. Sunday the 18th. Then he proceeds (155) to read Hunt's mind in a way that is 100% wrong and very unkind, saying Hunt had no idea of the magnitude of the scandal, etc. In this recounting Szulc's writing is shot through with error, blatant error, and mixed with conjecture presented as fact. It is indispensable here and throughout in his protecting of the CIA and FBI.

He had access to the grand-jury testimony (Hunt, undescribed) and refers to it several times, including with direct quotes (34-5) and saw the addressbooks (158) (I also marked book up on these things.)

159- one of the areas of vicious writing, here on Hunt's effort to protect and defend himself when he was in fact ~~abandoned~~ abandoned by the WH for whom he got into trouble.

161- goes out of his way to ~~protect~~ protect even prosecutors by making up a case.

162- even protects Bittman, saying he "withdrew" as Hunt's counsel, giving no explanation, whereas Cox demanded Bittman ~~leave~~ leave the case, alleging conflict of interest. (Interesting nothing has happened on this.)

163-protects Buckley on the TV show and Buckley's editing of the transcript as well as the broadcast tape.

Here also hedges on WH with guesses, but protects it, too, by playing "executive privilege" and "national security" straight, taking them at and giving them to the reader at face value when he knows it was all fictitious, an out for Nixon.

172 ff, direct quotes from Hunt's grand-jury testimony. The ~~way~~ manner of the writing indicates what may not be true. This may be from the released pages. He writes it as though it were not. If so, where could he have seen? Only in hands of some official.

In addition to what I have marked in book, from it there are these things on Hunt's CIA career:

Paris 1848

Vienna 1949-50 (beginning winter 1949)

Washington 1950

Mexico 12/13/50-1954.

Buckley under him here 19 months 1951-2.

Guatemala began 1953

Washington 1954.

Tokyo late 1954 (actually Wash and SEAsia-this is when he shared Washington CIA office with Cushman, who was also on SEAsia.)

United States late 1956.

Uruguay 1/25/67

US early 1960 as "chief of Political Action" Bay Pigs.

CIA headquarters 3/61

Late 1963 assigned to Madrid as station chief, diplomatic cover, rejected by State (Woodward, over Uruguay incident, only time in CIA's history)

Aug and Sept 1963, acting station chief Mexico City (no ref to flap over LHO picture).

1964- Madrid 2 yrs? (p. 96) unclear, Second "aval Guerrilla *public story not fully told.

1968-late-Paris (but assigned Washington.)

Typically, Szulc has neither index nor footnotes. This makes it difficult to detect the omissions, some of which are incredible. Like no mention of General Walters.

This also makes it difficult to assign motive to error. Is it merely sloppy or careless writing? Are his unnamed (in virtually every case) sources right or wrong? Can the official and other sources indicating his error themselves be wrong? There is no way from the book this can be decided.

However, what does appear to be certain is that the error I believe it throughout is not all accidental. I believe it is doctrinal, deliberate, intended to accomplish the purposes indicated above, protection, beginning with but not limited to CIA. In order to accomplish this, there is inevitable protection of Hunt and the masking of part of his career. If this extends to Second Naval Guerrilla or if Hunt then had more than one CIA role, it is consistent with the misrepresentation of the CIA's domestic activities, for his known domestic activities are entirely unindicated.

The error is subtle in most cases and almost without exception beyond detection by even careful and informed readers. Examples are his Mullen and WH employment.

One of those borderline cases is the Julie commercial, which Szulc says Mullen delayed until after the election. My information, from HEW, is that it was actually approved for airing in Washington. Whether the filed office of Mullen had it held until after the voting I don't remember, but the full story, readily available and in my earlier notes, is not indicated. What is false is that her appearance was possible only because of Hunt's Colson connection. This is the Szulc and the official lines.

It is interesting that Szulc uses the not new story, Second Naval Guerrilla, to place Hunt (perhaps quite factually) involved in it and in distant Madrid at a time that exactly coincides with the Dominican adventure into which the CIA and his own Neanderthals entice LBJ. The basis of the anti-democratic adventure was CIA work, false lists of non-Communists called Communists and contemporaneously (but not by Szulc in his own book) attributed to CIA-Washington. If Hunt was not part of that project then he was not unique.