

SEP 4 1972

# 5

Pacific handling Richardson substitution for Kleindienst. One of the more interesting if outrageous suggestions is that Castro was behind the Watergate Caper. It is a rumor Richardson suggests he heard. This is just too suggestive of the smatter if no less irrational line J.J. Kilpatrick was peddling at the same time, that this was a Cuban operation, of the anti's looking for the goods on the pro-Castros inside the Demo h.q. Is it not sufficient to add this went unreported in anything I read, saw or heard, save that Kleindienst didn't show. ...Star has fullface picture Hunt, but my Apeco copy so unclear nothing shows except hat. H

Je's tabulations put things together. And when, as today, I can hardly keep my eyes open, the red underlining helps. As soon as I saw the tabulation reflecting the Banco International drafts were two days before Strugis/Fiorini's visa expired I phoned Bob Woodward who says thanks and is surprised he didn't see. He was unflattered at my citation of NYT sources but I explained I don't get NYT and friend who called to my attention does. HW 8/31 Think I'm more tired because we soon leave for Lil's sister's home where 19-year-old nephew said he'll prepare supper and we are going to his meeting with his parole officer with him to corroborate improved behavior (even if he did lose one of world's worst jobs, in a carwash).

8/31/72 One of the more fascinating aspects of John Kifner's long NYT 8/15 piece, "Informer Appears Key to MS Case" is the parallel, your p. 2, col. 3, with the Tackwood legations about San Diego. If am I not mistaken, these had not been published at the time referred to. Emotional illness another consistent recruitment factor in selection of finks. Interesting that of all available federal prosecutors, that of the Berriagn case is the one assigned this. They have to be serious and to be seeking more than convictions. Legal precedents in the drive to ake repression=law=justice=national need. Thanks, HW

8/31/72 Graham's 8/11 piece on Kunkin-Narcs tears me because if it goes to Supreme Court first it is most prejudicial possible form and can becloud the constitutional issue in the Ellsberg case. I have had dealings with Kunkin that tell me he backs scriple, esp, with money, and is more a commercializer than a man of principle. Perhaps I'm wrong, but this has been my experience. He owes me over \$75.00 and hasn't answered half-dozen duns. I note Je's prescient marking of "stolen property" and "Government property" and find it not irrelevant to the letter to Tom Kelley I have already sent. I made this point in a suit where it was ignored by the DJ as it was by the judge. I make it at more length and direct citations in PM. There is another side of this rarely discussed; how the xerox robs the writer. It is not a simple issue or problem and, in fact, for Graham I find the treatment sympathetic. Guess maybe it helps him feel better about himself. When I consider the harm done by the hard stuff, I find myself wondering why printing the names of those who could get pushers with users, all of whom need an effort at kicking the hard stuff, a socially-useful venture. I guess these same people also get the grasss mokers and maybe Kunkin justified it that way. He was later, as I recall, to be proclaiming that "Speed kills". After how many? There is no black and white in that part for me. Thanks, HW

