

JUL 27 1973

Butterfield, your 7/21: Your comment on most cultured foreigners equating the disclosures with the practise of cannibalism reminds me of a short bit I did what now seems like long ago. Nixon once called Republicans cannibals. When I anticipated the cannibalizing of the guilty by the guilty, I roughed that out.

Your comment on letting things out to lessen the impact. If you missed it today, in one of his moments of less control, Ehrlichman ~~was~~ blabbed that Dean had fantastic sources of accurate information, esp. prosecutors and asst AG, that provided him with accurate information and ample lead time, usually, I think he said, 36 hours, which was all the time they needed to anticipate and deal with coming events.

In FAA, aside from the D Hunt crash investigation, which I think was CAB's, he is in an ideal spot to render dollars' worth to heavy contributors. He was taken as a devoted loyalist.

Ulasewicz: you size it up right, but you missed much in not seeing the face. He never smiled. It was not atypical New Yorkese, which is strange in DC and most of the supposedly civilized world. This mixed with cop and underworld jargon, and a very keen insight. He is a real pro in his dirty business.

GL's air of triumph. I think this is his typical euphoria. He is happiest when he is dirty fighting, and as the notes I sent earlier, if not herewith, indicate, I believe the illness was his turning point. He will keep attacking, and it will be something to behold, as long as it lasts. He has no real adversary, only a couple of competent showmen. He is unhurt by moralizing, couldn't care less about being caught in the wrong (make) bed, so he assumed the role we forecast long ago and is about to enjoy it. His is his life. He really isn't good at anything other than dirty fighting.

Hoax call: I found myself wondering the same way immediately. Not so much to test the reaction, where excess would have been a real profit, but to make the committee look ridiculous and overly trusting (as with Dean?).

He is a copier. Bet the idea came from Martha's ghost.

Je's 7/22 on Edward V. Hamilton: If I saw the NYT 7/10, I missed this. I'm inclined to think a typo more likely because of the higher chance of his making a mistake in use. But with that character, anything is possible.

This note reminds me. Everyone has forgotten Mr. Gray, but he hasn't and I suspect the bar won't. It will not be a surprise or a disappointment if he comes out swinging from that hardarm on which he was turning slowly, slowly.

Fielding breakin, your 7/17 note. I don't remember this one. But I do remember that the apt was cased. Maybe they did break in. Crazy enough. My belief is that if the shrink had papers, the Cubans couldn't find them.

You know, using these zany Cubans was a stroke of a kind of genius. There was nothing of value to come of the work, unless the anti p.t. work on Ellsberg could have influenced jurors before the trial. Or from the other nutty projects. But most people would never believe GL would have anything to do with him. Nobody can figure him to be that crazy. I don't think the genius was GL's. I think it was Colson's, unintended. Deniable they are. And have been. And, predictably, they pinned it all on Hunt, from whom GL has, to not, safely disassociated.

Glad to get <sup>+</sup>opkin, your 7/18, his 7/13 with Deom Council. Without checking it, because my legs barely will accept the order to move, I have a hunch he was really referring to an interpretation someone had given him of an outfit calling itself Nixon in '76. As I remember it, it was some kind of p.r. man's lark. I have a story on it.

On the publicity men, I could be wrong but I think I recently saw an item, perhaps in skimming the Post's government-employees column, that there has been a large cut amongst them.

HW 7/26/73

