

DEC 22 1973

Re: Witness Summary, Everette Howard Hunt

25 pp. but will copy & send if you want. Thank you should

Thanks very much for this, Mr. Holloman. It is very helpful, it does help my understanding very much and in some areas it does increase my knowledge, as on the plans for Bennett, Hunt and Caddy to buy Mullen. I regret the need for the masking, particularly because in some cases, particularly the first, page 2, I may have already put together what might be of interest to you.

Of course, you may also have done the same thing. I don't believe that jazz about the hot stuff on Muskie Greenspan is alleged to have had and didn't. I did that writing the day I saw the testimony. I believe the attempted break-in that, as I recall it, was exactly a year before the ^{fielding} job, was to get the Hahea papers on Hughes' notion that he could buy Nixon. Enough on this was in my files, old newspaper clippings.

There are some areas in which I find myself wondering why the staff was so much less informative than it could have been. Senators are too busy to keep up without being informed. This begins with the first item, the biography, which says much less than is public about Hunt's career, particularly where it is relevant in his CIA posts. One aspect of this I have not been able to follow and would like to if you have any suggestions or information is the Dominican fiasco of 1965. The spurious list of so-called communists used as a basis for the United States invasion and intrusion into the domestic affairs of that country is exactly the kind of thing one could expect from Hunt. It was a tragedy for the Dominican Republic and a disaster for United States foreign relations. I have a file of old clippings on this. They say the forces opposed by the United States were not communists.

This also has to be true about Mexico and about domestic intelligence, both areas I am following as best I can. I believe both are relevant to the inquiry and thus should have been in this summary.

Your letter concludes with a kind offer of more material if you have it. If it is not too much trouble, I have special interests in Hunt, Caddy and Bennett and the Mullen agency, so anything you might be able to provide that is not reproduced in the hearings I would be especially happy to have. I feel fairly confident of being able to come up with what has not yet been adduced on this. It will take time, has taken much time, but I think it will be worth the effort. When I have completed this work, I believe it may interest you and Senator Weicher.

This summary does not so indicate, but Hunt was a Mullen vice president. Based on what I have from Bennett in a civil-suit deposition, page 2 is wrong in that Bennett says he was hired as president before the purchase, which I believe he does not mention in that deposition.

Of course you should know much that I do not. However, as I read page 17 in particular I wondered if you have compared this and other matters with the Hunt and Middy expense accounts. Two parts of this page seem to have been masked, one for sure. I have a story in which Greenspan is quoted as saying there actually was the break-in. This page says the plan was vetoed by the Hughes company. Unless Greenspan lied, somebody did break in and left proof of it.

A number of items on page 21 seem to be inadequate or inconsistent with what is publicly available. Incompleteness continues to the top of page 22. This and what follows give me more interest in the so-called Hunt blackmail letter, which I have not seen, if you can spare a copy.

If you are interested in these things and I can help you, please let me know.

Thanks for what you have done and what you may do,

Sincerely,

Memorandum for Mr. Richard McGowan on Senator Weicher's 12/12/73 Congressional Record
 "Nixon Papers Tax Deduction," from Harold Weisberg, 12/22/73

What I suggested in my 12/14/73 letter to Senator Weicher is supported by a hasty reading of this reprint, received late yesterday. Senator Weicher's focus is on the tax deduction and he has made a valuable addition to the record on this. However, I am more than ever convinced that the other possible Nixon interest should be considered.

The other interest I have in mind is a mechanism for suppressing his own records.

Whether or not he had this in mind, he has achieved this, with regard to all his pre-Presidential papers.

As Senator Weicher noted, only about a third of these papers are included in the "gift." But all are covered by the conveyances. This would seem to mean that until there is a final determination of what is included in this "gift," the imposed and inherently accepted conditions apply to all, the third given and the two-third not given. Could this be the reason (page 2, C.) that "The 1969 deed has never been accepted....," because until final determination of what is included it can't be? If so and if the Nixon lawyers understood the manner of making this "gift" was clouded, I wonder if the ulterior purpose mentioned in the fourth paragraph of my letter was important enough to risk clouding the tax credit claimed. In part Senator Weicher begins to address this on page 3, the paragraph beginning at the bottom of the first column and concluding, "It is impossible to relinquish physical dominion or control over something if there is no way of physically knowing what that something is." On page 5, C. quotes, "Since the papers for the most part are not yet deeded to the United States..." Perhaps relevant also is page 6, P., "There is no explanation or reason for the differences in the 1969 deed, such as the attempt to use an agent, or the absence of a signature block for the General Services Administration." Could it not at some later date be argued that without GSA acceptance the whole deal is off? Or ~~how~~ how to have the eaten cake.

Exhibit 1 on page 7, 1., denies access to all Nixon papers as long as he is President. So does Exhibit 3, 1. Both also give Nixon "the right and power at any time during his lifetime to modify or remove this restriction..." I suggest that if the mind is not captured by "remove" and focuses on "modify", one modification could be to extend the period of total suppression.

If I am correct, Nixon has created a machine for the total suppression of any of his pre-Presidential papers he wants suppressed and for as long as he wants this. I believe there are such papers, those he does not want seen by anyone who can use them. And from my own experience in C.A. 2569-70 in the federal district court in Washington, the federal government will undertake to press the right to suppress for the donor. In that case perjury and subornation of perjury were the federal way. Were this precedent followed, Nixon would not have to defend the case himself. The attachments in that case say the precedent is followed without deviation. There is always the glib explanation, the need to induce such priceless gifts that otherwise would not be made.

While I want to keep this short, I do ask you to consider why with all the legal talent he had and with the clear intent to use the tax-reducing potential of the law, and particularly with the pending end of that capability, there was all this fuzziness, all the possible jeopardy to the making of an easy half million dollars. I believe it can be explained by what I called "ulterior purpose" and that suppression is one purpose.

These documents are referred to as "deeds." I am not a lawyer, but I believe they are rather contracts. Thus terms can be extracted from GSA and they are not valid without GSA signature. Can you think of any good reason for them to be drafted with no provision for GSA signature aside from this?