

90/1/73

Dear Jim,

Last night I got a good night's sleep, over six hours. It always leaves me a little tired and ~~fitzy~~ ^{fuzzy}, and my mind is and must be on other things, so perhaps this hasty response to your perceptive 9/28 may not be as clear as I'd like it to be.

Let me begin by telling you a little story. Once when Dione was in one of her nasty moods, when she wanted to annoy me, she told me that I had done a stupid thing, that I had gone to one of "pur" publishers, big joke. I wasn't angered. Intrigued. So I asked which and she said she couldn't remember but it began with a "P". I asked her how she knew and she said Layton (^MMartens) told her. Well, the odds against a good guess, is she was guessing, ~~was~~ were close to 26-1, long odds. If you want, I'll tell you the Praeger story, but the editor, who was a friend of a friend and more than an editor, a director of special projects, told me that while he did not think Praeger, then in your area, would go for it, if he did there'd be an initial print of 25,000. Praeger's reason for turning it down was that I'm not a reknowned scholar. So, if not earlier, from that moment there was no secret. Without checking my records, I'd say this was by 3/1/65. My deal was to deliver the ms by 2/15, and I did, in takes. I then went to NYU and Obolensky (yeah, the OSS prince's son) hemmed and hawed and I couldn't even get the ms. back. Clue enough?

Remember my excitement when I learned, I think from a Miami story if not from the Who's Who copies Je sent, that Hunt was at Littauer & Wilkinson, or used that address? From that moment on I've assumed what you do, at least as it relates to me, and I think the probability is as you think.

I don't want to burden you with copies of things in which you may not be interested, so I don't recall what I've sent. In May I spoke to the ACLU, having had unsatisfactory correspondence before. The reception was very favorable. Since then silence. I wrote again recently. No answer.

My offer to Hunt's new lawyer was sincere. I think I carboned you. No response. Not even formal thanks. I asked him to see if Hunt were willing to accept help from me. Now, unless eh assumed I'm a nut, why would a lawyer in such a case not be willing to at least find out what kind of help, whether there is any basis? One of the more obvious possibilities is that he doesn't want it, and then another immediate possibility is that the reason is a deal of some kind. All of Hunt's testimony, quite separate from the committee's whitewashing, is consistent with this. And the reason is former associations, not the work he was doing about which he could talk.

So, we are on the same beam, and I do hope both of you can find time for more thinking about this, all aspects. I think that in time Lesar and I will file against CIA for interference in my rights, and include other agencies. I've been looking for a lawyer since that Who's Who or Miami story. I've been told I have a case.

I don't know how you can find time for it, but I'm sure glad you transcribed that critical part of Hunt's testimony. Perhaps these things crossed in the mail, but I zeroed in on the same kind of thing and asked Bud and Lesar for help by getting the transcript and that stuff biography. There are several other parts, particularly where he blurted and especially on domestic intelligence, if you ever listen to those tapes again. By the time the printed transcript will be available it will be late, very late.

I can't take time for a full analysis, but let me not some things.

1st graf, Baker, perhaps but I think not misspeaking, says not that he went stall testimony but "won't extend our conversation." This is consistent with the norm in exceptional cases, the Senators spoke to Hunt before he testified. In ordinary cases they don't take the time. So, they went through this before Hunt testified. Because of Baker's ambitions, it is urgent that he cleanse his record in some delicate areas. His is one of them.

Long graf, esp. the part where some was unclear to you below the middle: there are really two blanks, the one you note coinciding with early assassination publication and one that centers around the 1965 Dominican adventure. I think it is obvious that for a "cover position" with DOD he did not have to be a "political advisor on half the world. One country or one part would have been enough. I don't know the answer. A side issue:

his period as station chief in Montevideo coincides with Uruguay's having the most liberal government in the western world. Thus the CIA sent one of its wilder fascists there. There was some risk in this because of Guatemala. I had a Uruguayan friend, a general, who was outraged over Guatemala and saw through the pretense. He returned to become chief of staff of the Army at the time Hunt was there. (By the way, I hope I sent you a carbon of my letter to Nando Castillo's wife. The General hated him. The general's mistress, who Lil and I took in when he would not again take her back to Uruguay - she turned out to be a bitch - was full of tales of intrigue. This is how I know of Johnny Abess - phon- Trujillo's assassin. Nando was in on Guatemala, from Venezuela.)

Perhaps it is innocent error, but Hunt was not the CIA's delegate to the CRC. It is over the inclusion in the CRC when it was organized of the Ray people that he quit. It is interesting that Baker understand what Hunt did not spell out in Give Us, that Hunt's objection was to any "liberal" voice in the government in exile to be established. He'd tried hard to exclude them and had until it became obvious in Washington that this guaranteed disaster because the right had no following at all.

There comes the one thing new in all of this, and here also I have a story to tell. I did not know only that Hunt had been a Dulles assistant. One of Bud's nuts had picked up word that he was Dulles' ghost. Impossible. Dulles was much too good to use a hack. If I have not sent you carbons, I have suggest to Jim that they consider he was doing for Dulles, aside from what you and I think, research for which he had clearances and the right political perspective. That was the one way to keep a fascist on ice. He could be used and justified on the payroll. Now for the story.

We had a friend who was salesman for Harper's and Norton's in this territory. However, he is more than a salesman and his wife and Lil got along swell. We used to visit with them and he tried to get Whitewash published early, without success. Then there came a time when Dulles' new book, his last, came out, and Giac(omini)-a (a Californian of Swiss extraction) went around in this territory with Dulles as Dulles promoted the book. From then on we have not heard from them. I think there is a connection.

If it is important, as it could be, I did not know that the U.S. ambassador to Spain would not accept Hunt in 1963, a key date. Do you know who the ambassador is? The, of course, attracted my attention when I heard it. What is needed here is something everyone forgets. My buried notes on 1000 Days spots this. JFK issued orders that all spooks had to be cleared by the ambassadors and had to be responsible to them. Not just those on his staff. Among other things, in Hunt's mind, this makes JFL responsible. It seems that Hunt wanted much to be in Spain then, perhaps the CIA also wanted this much, and for an unknown part of that period, with a different cover, he was. Baker says Hunt was away from Washington until 1968, regardless of what Who's Who says. He also skips here for Hunt did not immediately go to Potomac. He also goes out of his way to lie, and the staff could not have made the error, to say that Hunt quit Bennett/Mullen to go to work for the White House. This, I think, is one of the key things, that he worked for both at the same time. There are elliptical references in what I've sent Jim, carboning you. Asked if Baker had given a "fair sketch", Hunt doesn't even agree with "fair", saying instead "reasonably fair" or not accurate.

It was not possible for Baker to avoid the Mullen/CIA connection completely because it was in the papers.

Here something in Hunt's prepared statement is of potential importance, a reference to work that was for HEW, where it did not sound like HEW. I find it interesting that all papers ignored his opening statement, as they and the committee ignored what he said about domestic intelligence.

Unfortunately, the last quotes of each are too elliptical. In context I think this means that prior to Ehrlichman's call to Cushman, Hunt told other spooks. The questions seems to separate this from the Cushman part, as I read it. With some of that already in the records and hence not secret, I regard it as interesting that there is this indefiniteness at this point. It coincides with lies I've earlier noted that I think are really perjury, or, important enough for some risk.

When I put the Who's Whos together, I think I noted that Hunt's use of the L&W address coincided with the active period in assassination publication. It did. I do not understand your "I feel you do not like to comment in this area for obvious reasons" because I'm sure I have and there is this record of my trying to arrange to sue so long ago. As soon as I could I traced that part of his career enough to satisfy myself, enough to have hard evidence, and as much as with my resources I then could. One part I think I have never put on paper is my belief that in addition to Hunt personally the Mullen agency figured in this. Remember, I asked if you could get the Mullen and Bennett bios from Who's Who after I got more on Bennett? I have no reluctance, I do think it is important, and if you have any questions after reading this, please ask them, as pointedly as you would like.

Let me digress for something of which my thinking reminded me and of which I intended writing you, got busy and forgot. Saturday night, before going to bed, after hearing no news all day, I tried to get some by radio. In turning for the Phila CBS station by accident I got a other, with a former FBI agent on a talk show. He is the guy who wrote, "Don't Embarrass the Bureau." He said the CIA assassinates its one, including its own agents. I presume if he is on talk shows, unless this was where he lives, he is on the circuit and will be there. This station came in poorly. It was after 10 p.m., so it could have been anything from a non-clear-channel DC station to one at some distance. Reception was terrible from interferences from other stations and fading.

I am fascinated by Baker's feeling the need to make public Hunt's post as Dulles' assistant. This has to mean that he or CIA brass told him what was not known, and there has to be reasons.

There is an element of your own reasoning I would like you to carry further, and I agree with both parts. On the one hand, he was the honcho on assassination writing and publishing. On the other, "he was, after Dukkes was fired, anyway, regarded on the whole as a liability by the CIA," followed by powerful sponsorship. I believe all the parts are true, and I also believe we have not done all the arithmetic. Arithmetic: his CIA retirement was \$20,000 a year. Doesn't that seem a bit high?

Sponsorship: there are complicating factors. Hunt was Cuban-revanchist in sympathy and connection. This is plus or minus but not neutral.

Here I want to intrude a conservative note. There are what for a spookery are reasonable and innocent grounds for interest in assassinations in general and that of JFK in particular, because of Oswald. Assume a low-grade Oswald connection, as I do, and they have what for them is basis for interest, if only to suppress. Assume no such connection, only the ostensible part of his USSR career, and his appearance in Mexico gives them a proper spook interest. I think our figuring should include all the possibly innocent, in context innocent.

Perhaps it is irrelevant, but I remind you that one of the two people who correctly understood the meaning of the Cuba (not Cuban) Missile Crisis, on his own or with counsel, was McCone, and others in his agency talked him out of it. I don't know who. But some Cuba "expert" is most probable. Maybe "experts".

I'm rushing because I want to do a number of things before I go back to town for Lil. Back to Oswald: assume as I do an FBI connection, at least from Fort Worth thru New Orleans. How does this effect CIA and its interest(s)?

From a belief in my understanding of how spooks work and think, I have always considered it possible that if the SEAsia boys wanted to off JFK, one of the things they'd consider is rigging it to look like those from another area were involved. This would mean those those other-areas, says Cuba, would have an immediate self-protective interest and would have much work to do. And everyone else would have real problems. They had motive.

I'll read the tapes enclosures when I can pay attention, Glad to have because I have done more than accept your(pl)views, I have gone further.

Have you considered that at some point Agnew may become an ally? I've been toying with trying to contact Victor Gold. There was what I could not make out on radio news as I was preparing for bed last night after a rare social evening, something about WH lawyers rigging the anti-Agnew situation. Nothing in (unread)Post. HW 90/1/73