

9/18/72

Dear Mr. O'Brien,

At the risk of seeming to coal Newcastle, not my intent (your counsel and investigator are of unquestionable competence), I write to make a few more suggestions about what should now be known as The Watergate Whitewash.

Enclosed are clippings dealing with Dwayne Andreas' past and family past, which may or may not be of interest to or provide leads for your people, and some FBI reports relating to one of the Nixonian second-story men and his associates. A similar file on Barker's associate Suarez is loaned out.

In your recent appearance on the Today Show you suggested the FBI might have been less than thorough in its investigation of these crimes, a rather considerable understatement from my extensive study of the FBI in political matters. The enclosed reports were for the Warren Commission. On page 2 of that dated 12/3/63 you will note that the FBI managed to avoid telling the Commission about Fiorini's Bay of Pigs past. At the same time and typically, it uses languages that gives it an explanation, should it later find one necessary. This is a minor but fair example of its typical method.

At some time Fiorini's devotion to lies, marked in red on the first page of the report of 4/21/64, may be of interest.

Despite all that has appeared in the papers about the connection and financing of these crimes, and particularly with election day getting closer, I believe more can be done with tying the crime and the criminals with their sponsors and beneficiary. The White House told lies that can be nailed as lies and today, after the indictments, would have more meaning. Hunt did not end his White House employment on March 29, as claimed. He was fired after the arrests. So, he was not only then a White House employee but it is not publicly known whether his criminal activities were paid for with White House funds, or if his pay did not come from public funds, whether his travel and other expenses, including a trip to Miami, did. This Miami trip seems to coincide with Barker's processing of the film of your files.

Hunt's connection with the Mullen agency did not end as alleged and his position was grossly misrepresented. He was not a mere writer of copy. He was vice president and a director. The agency had acknowledged federal clients. If not paid by public funds from the White House, is it not possible he was paid by public funds from the agency? One of the federal clients was the CIA, and in Cuban matters. The explanation given for another, HEW, is ludicrous. So, what I am suggesting is the possibility, perhaps remote, that the secret Republican funds may not have been all of the funding of the crime, that some may have been milked from the taxpayer.

With all that has appeared, I remain convinced that the probability is high that Hunt and Barker are "Frank Bender" and "Bernie", No. 1 and No. 2 in the Bay of Pigs fiasco. The names used by both men and immediately leaked to the press, "Eduardo" and "Macho", do not appear in any writing on the Bay of Pigs of which I know. It seems quite unlikely that any men could have had the top roles in that adventure and not have been mentioned in such works as Haynes Johnson's The Bay of Pigs. With the passing of time, people forget what "Bender" really did, without authority and contrary to orders. He almost started World War III and he deceived everyone, including his supposed friends, many of whom died as a result. He made policy for the United States, on his own and off the top of his head. If he is Hunt, then he was known as a self-starter, Mr. Dole's phrase, when the White House hired him and the self-starting figleaf does not exist.

With the ability of the government and the defendants in your civil suit to stall and delay, there seems little likelihood of any court proceeding before the election. Such a proceeding after the election will not inform the electorate in time for it to reach an evaluation of the significance of the revelations of the trial. There is a way in which this might be done or, in failing, give perspective to Republican pretenses and sanctimony. I think they have been a bit hysterical and overplayed it.

Mr. Stans has filed an action against you. It is, obviously, frivolous and can't succeed. Instead of the usual motions to dismiss and other such customary legal moves, could you consider, as soon as Judge Ritchie rules on Wednesday, filing for immediate trial of the charges against you? I think it could be an important move. If the Republicans demur, claiming they are not ready, then they are in the position of filing an unprepared suit, of misusing the courts and the judicial process. Either way they will look bad. They will be exposed as fakers in filing the suit or they will lose it in court.

You have not exaggerated the seriousness of this matter in a society such as ours. However, you also have not been able to cope with the skilled administration news management, either, and I take the liberty of suggesting that some means as yet not used should be attempted. Without it the clear White House involvement in it will not be apparent to most people. Hence I suggest inquiry on Hunt and the Mullen government contracts. Another off the top of the head might be Freedom of Information suits for withheld information. These can be moved to trial after 20 days and under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552 go to the head of the docket. I am not a lawyer, but I believe the exemption of the law in the case of Hunt's employment has been waived under existing decisions. And might not such matters fall within the jurisdiction of Congressional committees other than Judiciary and Banking and Currency?

I am aware of reports that Senator Edward Kennedy's subcommittee might look into some aspects. With the known involvement of some of the principles in the investigation of the President's assassination and the involvement of most of the criminal defendants in peripheral aspects, there is the possibility of pain and embarrassment for him.

There is another area of the campaign where the lack of orthodox political research shows. This is the Nixon play for the Jewish vote. Adequate research in the public press alone should show his associations with anti-Semites. Memory is not always dependable, but I believe there are reported instances involving ethnic groups and the Republican Party and a case in which Nixon helped an Ustachi with a vicious World War II Nazi record. I believe Jack Anderson is among those who reported this. I may be wrong, but I believe that man's name began with a "V". I enclose Anderson's August 2, 1969 column connecting Nixon with Nicolae Malaxa, "a one-time fascist and partner of Herman Goering".

In any event, good luck.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg