

24 December 1972

Dear Harold:

In recent mailings you've sent us a photocopy of a CX Sun-Times clipping, "Crash victim's \$10,583 attracts Watergate Probers." A boldface insert mentions two other stories in the same issue: "Crash pilot's wave-off came after report of slick runway, Page 24," and "Reveal Watergate suspect held passport faked by CIA, Page 26." I imagine you have asked LF to supply copies of these, and if he does I hope you can make copies for us when convenient.

You also have sent two CDN clippings: Dec. 12: "2 mystery names may hold key to cash on jet," and Dec. 13: "Watergate SluethSees Jet Crash Tie."

Since you don't ask for these to be returned, we presume you've made your own copies before handing these. If you do want them back, be sure to say so. We'll hold them apart until we hear.

On the first of these, "2 mystery names may hold key to cash on jet," there is another teaser insert referring to "Ex-airline pilot doubts "Mistake" caused jet crash, Page 2." We'll need this, of course, if you get it.

Your thoughts to LF on the hypnotist and neurologist angles duly noted. We can contribute nothing here beyond what I've written to you earlier. My feeling grows that she was a marked woman, and most likely for the reasons you seem to be suggesting. And marked by whom? I suspect we would have remarkably similar ideas in this area.

(12 Dec.)

You already have the NY Times interview with the gentleman involved, so we are not making a copy for you. It appeared way back in the paper in the second section, page 58, between 56-7, devoted to women's page stuff, on a page devoted to weddings, and before 59-63 which carried theater ads, reviews etc. This, taken with the fact that the story carried no byline but simply "special to the New York Times" suggests it was "must go" copy which someone buried about as deep as he could without going to Garrison's usual spot on the shipping page. In other words, he was told to run it, and did, however unwillingly. Or the sequestered spot could have been deliberately sought.

Our predominant thought about this piece is that the granting of an unprecedented interview to a newsman (who either must or wants to remain anonymous) is a measure of his realization that he's on his own now and needs help wherever he can get it. Helms' departure may be a factor, one can't tell, but we find on checking back that apparently the first reference to Helms leaving was carried by UPI on Dec. 4, in the NY Times out of Key Biscayne and attributed to administration sources. This was an item buried on Page 70, an entertainment page. It even mentioned Schlesinger as a likely successor.

Another straw in the wind may be a NY Times Service story that ran in the New Orleans States-Item for Dec. 13 (copy enclosed) but not in the Times itself. It concerns a pitch made by Lyman Kirkpatrick, inspector general of the CIA at the time of the BofP who now teaches at Brown University, Hunt's alma mater, and who delivered a lecture at the Naval War College at Newport, R.I., (date not given) and which was published in "the current college review" but doesn't say whether the review is that of the Naval War College or Brown II.

It is of course dangerous to draw a firm inference from a news story about such an article, but what Kirkpatrick seems to be saying is that yes, the CIA goofed at the BofP because of lousy intelligence and training the invasion force "in a goldfish bowl" around Miami and in Latin America instead of doing it at some military base in the United States where security would be good, but that covert operations are essential and good to have and that the whole disaster really was due to JFK's lack of understanding of what was involved. He claims JFK tried to place the blame on the military. I'm not sure what this is all supposed to add up to, but it's appearance under the circumstances undoubtedly has some significance.

Getting back to the ruins-after-six-months heartrender, you probably noticed that the first part is unusually sympathetic and could have been written by some genuinely sympathetic person who had nothing to do with the NYTimes except to have the clout to prepare such a piece and hand it in with orders to print. The latter part, the background and filling-in details, is less tender and well could have been tacked on by a Times staffer. For instance, whoever did the latter part certainly did not go out of his way to make Carlstead's "explanation" of the cash transaction any more believable than it was.

We note you also have thoughts on this interesting piece and look forward to hearing about them.

jdw