Js-confidential

Dear Wwlter,

Were I not a meter-miser, watching even the cost of postage, I'd have sent you all but this before this. When I put all the things in the envelope it was just over what one stamp would carry, so I was awaiting something else, there being no rush.

Then I got your note o f the 12th, to which I now respond.

Unless Marc said his doubts were sponsored my my comments, there was no reason for anyone to know they did - not properly, let me say. If he gave me as his source, I have no objection and I'll stand on what I've said. Face to face with anyone, should the ned arise, as I do not anticipate. I have not disclosed to anyone that I have been in touch with you. I have asked several for anything they may see, but not with mention of you or Bantam. Nor for an explicit reason, only general. I think three friends, none of whom know or are in touch with the French publisher, if they know his identity, or the agent.

I have never said I have seen the ms. and I haven't seen it. I have seen that to which I have referred and that is all I cited. I'd already put a copy of the L(Aurore xxxxxx article as translated in an envelope for you.

Do I need to see the ms with what this article says? This is to say nothing about the INSIDER piece, to which I'd also referred.

Remember, Walter, aside from my recent work I was in intelligence in World War II, and I have professional intelligence-analysis experience. Ix was, in fact, a trouble-shooter in an agency of them, and this included for the White House and under time pressures when all others had failed. If I had any doubt about my analysis, I'd indicate it and in the area of inspiration I'm confident I have indicated uncertainty. On fact I had and have no doubt at all: this is a fake.

I can conceive that the publisher and the agency are being conned. I cast no aspersions on either.

Earlier I was gentle in suggesting care to you. Now I want to be quite pointed. You have discharged a loyal employee's obligations to his employer, I have assumed those of a friend, and you want to be careful about how you go how far. Don't get yourself hurt. If this has the kind of backing that is possible, hurt is possible, too. So, do be careful. I have no personal interest in this thing, whether or not it is published or by whom. As I said earlier, I merely wanted Marc to know what he might be getting into. I presume he is in solid enough with those above him in the corporate structure, and I'm without doubt about his business or personal judgement. He knows, he has made his derision, I am sure he knows what he is doing, and that is it.

It is possible, not certain, that this is only a literary hoax for commercial interest only. I have made suggestions in the event it is of other than simple commercial origin, so he can protect himself. The resources that have been used in the past for such a venture would surprise you, so there is an existing record of another French assassination fake that is completely open to your people should they ever want to consult it, with the one reservation of confidentiality on my sources and nothing be said to hurt any of the people in these files, some of whom did some pretty stupid things. The money spent was astronomical, the names used those to be conjured with (even deGaulle's, with his personal card yet!), so there was not, as with your thing, even the possibility of recouping the costs.

In the case of that book, I have a xxx copy given me by the director of the project himself and I can tell you how to get your own copy. I had a copy of the ms., but I gave that away to one libelled in it. I think I have one chapter in ms. If there is any interest, I'd prefer that a copy be bought, as it can, or I can have it bought by a reporter friend who would mail with a closed mouth.

I take the liberty of suggesting that you drop this unless you consider there is danger to your people. In that event, subject to interference with communication, you know you can depend on my preserving confidence. You can let me know anything you thing I should and if I see anything in it, I'll tell you. Sophistication in such operations, if they are by spooks, exceeds what has been published. As I think I showed you, they now use commercial services. I got a letter today from one who was once part of such a thing.

So, personal caution and best regards.

MEMO

2-12-73

Dear Hal,

Just this instant reaction to your three letters of February 1 & 7, which arrived today. I showed Marc the important passages, but he had no further reaction, beyond the one he had had to your information before. He, on the other hand, showed me a cable he received from Paris which stressed that no one had seen the ms. nor excerpts from it; and he showed me a letter from Scott Meredith in which --apparently the result of an inquiry on his part--the writer said he (or, rather, she) resented that Harold Weisberg apparently tries to undermine the reliability of the ms. Hal, you understand that this was shown to me as confidential, so please don't refer to it in your correspondence to the office, or write to my home address--which I am putting on this envelope for the same purpose.

(CBS?)

Thanks for the Jack Andersen column--which is full of factual errors, but interesting.

Best,

Walter

Walter Glanze