

Dear Jim,

10/6/73

Because I read the last half of Meyer-Szulc/ The Cuban Invasion first and because I am reading the beginning only when too tired to write and intermittently, when other matters are on my mind, my impressions and conclusions may be colored and may be undependable. However, after completing the second chapter, and with the impressions I carry from the last half, I believe this is indistinguishable ~~with~~ from a job subsidized by the "liberal" wing of the CIA. It is precisely the kind of job they would sponsor, with enough criticism of the US Government and the CIA to give it credibility and enough hidden to accomplish the purposes.

The technique is traditional and simple. They report selected facts only and of these they report out of context. One conspicuous example of this is the total avoidance of reference in the first two chapters to U.S. economic warfare against the Castro government. Thus they fail to show that what Castro did was not initial reaction but was counter-reaction to what the US did. Oil is one example.

Through the first two chapters I recall no reference to the CIA, so the reader is led to assume that it was entirely inactive during the crucial days. There is also the bland assumption that US reaction to a "Communist" dictatorship nearby was "inevitable" and in no sense without sanction or wrong. Calling it communist was all the legal and moral justification required, thus what the US and the CIA did is really Castro's fault and both are justified at the outset.

What I have observed can't be accidental. Nor can it be honest. These are two experienced reporters who had to know better. They also had to know the subject well enough to know precisely what they were doing, so I assume deliberateness that can't be attributed to space when the book is so tiny.

Perhaps they are disillusioned "liberals". The alternative is CIA. For such dishonest writing there has to be an explanation.

With two authors it can be both, belief and sponsorship. I have met neither.

I am prejudiced by knowing that Szulc knew Howard and Dorothy Hunt in Paris, when both were with CIA and he doesn't say what he was doing, but it was before he went to work for the NYTimes, hence I asked you for his Who's Who listings. Having known Hunt and knowing enough to write a Cuban Invasion book, he makes no reference to the role Hunt filled in it, no reference to him by name or code name and it was not possible to speak to any of the politicians in the story or <sup>those</sup> who had information for it without learning both, the role and the name. This is why I asked Howard to check the index when I did and how I knew before you xeroxed the book that he engaged in this censorship that served only CIA purposes. And now he is the ~~is~~ one who goes after Hunt psychologically, which also serves CIA interest. First in the NY Sunday Times piece that must have usually-secret CIA sources and then in the book due as I recall fairly soon. The Compulsive Spy.

This makes for the simplest addition. I see no reason to resort to complex calculations.

Have you a contrary opinion? Or have you what is consistent with this?

Sincerely,