AN

JDW-

## Once again fill-in time response, to your 2/21 on several matters:

2/27/74

Felt it best to be forthright with Stanley, from whom silence. But he talked about a review in his quarterly review section, distant.

Agee: be assured no sweat. LF was getting some from Canada anyway and I'll let you know cost. I did not see and would like Colby's "vow" you say "anew" to prevent US publication. This (these are) is the kind of thing I can use to illustrate the real reason for most secrecy: to keep it from the US people only.

Your beautiful stuff on my losing my clout deserves better than a few words I'll try to think of as soon as I out the heat under Lil's morning herba mate.

The problem is not topping them: it is coming even close to equalling them. They delighted us! A curt bow and a sworling cape to you!

Maybe by now the Times has let you know.

Perceptive as you are, it is surprising you did not see an alternative: I'm one of "them," "thers have seen this clearly enough and have not shunned the saying.

Pursuing this line of perfectly clear reasoning, I'd have been putting a hex on you.

Now I have no choice but so say this also can say I'm losing my clout. The hex didn't work.

Ya got me, pahdnah!

My, my, what won t the Times do next?

\* \* \*

I tried to phone Ben Franklin yesterday before I had to go to Lil, when I'd assembled what I'm taking to the Panarama TV show today. I put enough together to leave no doubt at all that whatever his reason, Jones Harris took them in and they failed to do the most perfunctory checking. A single call and they'd have learned that the Commission did, too, have that stuff and the late sainted personally downplayed it. I have both and more. It was <u>never</u> secret. Ref to Sunday piece on Oswald imposter in USSR.

I left word when he was not there to please phone me after 7:30, which would get him past his deadline and us past supper. My phone was a bit busy. In fact, I got a long one just as supper was ready. But no call from <sup>1</sup> ranklin. I'd prefer not to air this kind of thing, no matter how I do not make it a charge against the <sup>1</sup> imes, without letting him/ them know in advance.

Could the GL/Ambassador deal be a kind of blackmail? His going back into the fray would hardly help the GOPs, any of them. ...

I see you did consider the possibility I am secretly serving "them" as I reread.

That is the line Goulden took in his "response" that the WTTG producer called a "shit letter," a phrase I'd never heard before, used as standard slang. He concluded with advice that I look under my bed. He began by saying he feared he'd been kind. In between he said he'd joined the company on a ppecific date, etc. I don't recall saying anything like that. If I didn't, his taking that tack is interesting. Añyway, I have an extra of his piece if you want it, and an extra of the throw-away that accompanied <u>Executive Action</u>.

He didn't call me a "hot-headed youngster" buth he as much as implied it. Guess it must be so, regardless of how I feel.

The most interesting part of his otherwise fine <u>Superlawyers</u> is the extent to which he went to hide the Dept Disinfo. involvement with the firms he did go into and his total omission of one that also did CIA work also Superlawyers, E.B.Williams. To the extent that more references to CIA on the text are omitted than included in the index. And none at all in his Tommy the Cork chapter. Not even when he mentions the Dragon "ady herself. I find this very hard to allocate to ignorance or sound editorial judgement, most of all in the <u>One</u> chapter on the one lawyer form that makes it by connections rather than legal skill.

Let's see if you can make it without my loathing! Best,