

Dear Js,

5/25/73

That old ESP is working again. (Ref. your 5/19, here today, postmarked 22.) You conclude, "Now, aren't you sorry you asked?" Ans.: No. Of the things you say the real problem, aside from the complexities of my normal writing, is brevity. That does worry me, particularly when if there is to be a book, there will be no time for me to do any real editing.

Comprehensibility has been a concern, for I have no way of knowing that the paisanos will take the time to try to understand, as they did with the assassinations. And I've been wondering how to say that fascism is not new here but is a gradual development. It came to me yesterday, while driving into Washington, that the way to do this is in a personal foreword, drawing upon what you refer to, my "own background and experiences." If it had not been as noisy on the road, if I'd taken the tape-recorder out of the case in which I had it for a planned interview that was not possible, and if I had a wife who is not as overly-busy, I'd have written a rough of it while it was hot in the mind. The topic sentence was "American fascism will have no gas chambers. It won't need them." n And then go on to explain that here alone it is a gradual growth, rather than the sudden, violent transition it has always been else, detailing the growth in terms of my personal experiences and observations. Which also lets me give a background that makes me a credible expert. I have also come to think that unless I am to eliminate what I think I should not, all my experiences with so many of the central characters, including some ~~xx~~ rare quotes from the judge, I can't avoid personalizing. And as I've said in a letter to Dick, I think competitiveness with the books that will have steam and are responsible requires it.

You have much to support a short book, including the commercial, but I fear I have too much to say, too much that I think should be said, too much of a record to make. Thus I'd prefer, if I can get a contract, not to see the manuscript against after I turn it in, not to have to feel that I have to argue with an editor. I'd accept any judgement I could trust because I know the value of shortness and an independent judgement. However, as of today, this remains but a dream.

Let me rush through the rest so I can get back to what I must do for my lawyer.

Brussel: note my enclosed letter to Bud. My only interest in the tapes of her would be as an historical record, for completeness of the archive I'd leave. I've taped 14 hours of the hearings, on C60s. I don't know how many I'll be able to afford to keep. If I get the hearings, as Mac has promised, I'll need very few. Barker is precious! I wish I'd taped him separately, instead of in sequence. I have to measure pennies so I didn't think of it. Also, I fear some editing. I'll want to keep Hunt separate, too, and any other Cubans.

Now the problem of time that you face and depending on the judgement of those who know nothing of the subject or people in depending on the edited versions is that it is the little things that count. I wrote you of two early this a.m. What I find significant in Caulfield I find edited out of the Post's verbatim. Iⁿ this case, I doubt anyone else would have spotted its significance. It is the little slips that can be so material! And so revealing. Alch made a few, too. I became aware of this editing thing yesterday when walking around listening to WTOP on a.m. CBS was constantly coming in at the wrong times and overriding testimony its reporters did not understand, important stuff.

Hunt: I have an interesting letter today, ~~mf~~ and I'll send carbon of response.

Sign of cracking: hollering for lawyer in jail, excessive reaction to wife's death. He is supposed to be the stern-stuff type, so losing all that weight was my tipoff. Copping out, too, as he sees manhood.

I have no trouble explaining his burning to burn the CIA. He feels betrayed by the changes in it and its policy. For all we know he was asked to retire. What the hell use did it have for him anyway? Even if he had been good, which is impossible, his day was long past. And now for the first time he has one he can regard as a hero, GL, and faced with divided loyalties based on beliefs, he'd opt for GL and his new authoritarianism. In this analysis, the dirt he has on GL isn't that relevant, although in fact it is very much. If he has enough, it is also possible to argue he has taken an irrational line in which he still conceives he can make some kind of deal. However, I doubt it.

Dorothy Hunt: I assume they shared his wierd politics. Her Spanish employment is consistent with this. Barker gave a minor sidelight. He took her to the 10Th Bay Pigs anniversary. With all those young kids at home needing a monther and that in the middle of the school year, she had to way to go, and I don t think if the kids were a real confem she'd have been anxious enough for a junket to Miami in April. Also, as the mess got slimier, she may have been more rational than he. This doesn t require much of her. And it could have turned her off. She'd have had to realize that she was living with a zany. Especially if, as I assume, he behaved other than as he'd always posed.

Press and WG: there is an added justification for some of the shortcoming I'd add to yours, esp. with the Post: the few men working on the story were overworked. And, they were already too busy with leaks. More than they could handle. And the limitations of lacking a context, regardong the story as merely larger crookedness and more lying.

Short note of 5/20: First Times use anything on Pentagon Papers 6/13/71. I think I've already written what I have in mind on this and note the justification of Nixon in the Hunt cable faking.

Your ref to Dulles in 1954 and Nixon's support makes me wish I'd kept Nixon's wanting to use atom bomb there and could bracket with his I'm the only man of peace speech, the one in which he said he alone had nothing to do with beginning that war, only ending it. So, aside from the possibility the faking was done to enable Nixon, there is what I regard as the more likely one, that it was done after he sounded off so he could be defened.

McCord date birth: I think 1924 more likely. 1918 could come from false ID and he was probably bald enough to get away with it. I heard all that testimony. They didn t name universities or what he studied. He is not unusually expressive, has limited vocabulary.

Your 5/21 note on CIA is more persuasive in theory but without the unexplained, which from my ~~me~~ experiences of the past I find not abnormalities: no second guard, overtiming cops. I have skimmed Hlem's testimony only and only as reported in Post. Your doubts are quite valid and I'd add to them that with such a request and from a guy who was a former spook, especially one with his background, I'd say the agency started taking a quiet look at what was up. If not before, then when he asked for the transfer of the gal from Paris. Which males her also interesting, assuming his~~m~~ mind was higher than the bed. Were it not that Helms was offer, I'd say they were in a blackmailing position on this or should have been. A leak would have been the greatest sensation. In turn, this makes the whole thing more complicating, suggesting, if remote, possibility Hunt et al were into more than suffaced, Agency is more involved, or the thing got caught between or the two major factions or wound up in the hands of the wrong one. Except by low estimates of everyone involved in the CIA, this is not really a credible story. There is something missing. They may be used to doing the illegal, but they are not used to doing it with others and untrust-worthies. Meaning Hunt and WH Nazis.

Clips going to stack. If rain continues and no heavy mail tomorrow, hope to clean up over weekend. Thanks for them. Unread.

^dy the way, I expect much more from GL, now that he has recovered his spirits with some of the red blood he shed. Even if on TV he still looked like the Much Older Old Nixon.

Best,
h