

Dear Jim,

3/18/76

Lil has read your excellent review. I'll now lend it to Howard. You did it impressively and informatively. While it is a first-rate review or the kind we do not often see it is more. It will inform those relatively well informed, as few Americans are. Shame so small and audience.

Your 3/15 was not delayed. Postmarked 16.

It is a sad Post story. And now a sad paper. I hear the Star is improving.

I also have an interest in Peroff, so I'll be watching. Lil generally goes over Cheshire. She also has personal reasons, so we'll be watching her.

You concludes with a Ray comment. I've sent you one or more Jerry steamrollers. Indication are that they have been somewhat effective if against personal interest. I've wanted out for more than 5 years. There will probably be more.

You will have gathered that there is a Playboy problem. I don't recall a previous case of deliberate breaking of confidence. And out-of-context, incomplete use of some can present physical dangers. Dishonesties of other sorts abound, like Crewdson, but the breaching of confidence, especially today, is a shocker. And here wholesale.

I may hear from them again today so I'm using the morning to catch up on mail. This afternoon I plan to get back to reading and correcting the draft. I hope I have a typist for less than two days a week. My next chapter is an easy and I hope short one. Once I do not expect phone interruptions I'll dub a tape of a chapter I wrote on the train to NYC on the sunminerature Lanier. Then I think go back and fill in my skips on Foreman. It will require hours of listening to tapes, thus the skipping which, as it turns out, was wise.

Today I received from Schweiker duplicates of Church committee's Covert Action In Chile report and that on Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders (want?) and Vols. 2, 3 and 6 only of their hearings. 2 on Boston Plan, 3 IRS, 6 FBI.

Also mailing from Gonzalez indicating Rule committee will do nothing, no surprise. Downey is to make a speech. I suggested simplified, limited use of some of PM, restricted to enough to make a case of no homicide investigation, the seamier of the suppressed evidence on it and the asking of proper questions. I hear he had Bud writing the speech, so I know what to expect: more of what hasn't worked, never had a chance and has ruined other and more likely prospects. I was asked to be there and sent apologies of a prior obligation. I'll hear what happens. He has an hour at the end of today's session. The college kids will be there and here Saturday.

Best,

15 March 1976

Dear Harold:

I had to copy the Anderson column on Hughes for our files, and while doing it made one for you too. The reason it had to be copied is that I want to send the long Kaiser account of the Post strike to some Guild friends who are interested. I've followed the strike casually, both in the Post and the NY Times, so was much interested in seeing what Kaiser would do with it. He played it quite straight as far as I can see, not an easy thing to do. He confirms my long-standing impression that all sides made almost unbelievable mistakes and blunders from the beginning. A sad story, and the Post has emerged more like a shopping news than ever before. It may be remarkable that it held out against the corrupting environment of the system (of which it is a part) as long as it did.

We shall keep an eye out for any reference to MK Ultra etc. I think I've seen one, but have the impression it was an Anderson column you've seen. In any case, if we do have such a reference, it's buried at the moment in the daily holding files, where it will turn up soon as we work through the material. We'll keep a sharp watch for you.

Thanks for your offers, but we do NOT need any of the things you offered to send: The CIA IG report, 1,000 pages on domestic intelligence you're getting from Schweiker, the original Greenspun story on Castro-JFK, nor the Chicago Independent's treatment of what Skolnick got from Valle. It's very good and thoughtful of you to offer these, but we try to pass up what seem to us to be marginal items, especially if they're bulky. And these seem to be marginal for us as we continue trying to narrow the area we're trying to cover. In general, I'm most interested in China, of course, and the STM is still concentrating on Nixon and Nixon-Watergate angles. We do collect other stuff, but those are the areas where we try to be as thorough as possible.

Example: The feds have extradition scheduled for one Frank Peroff, a former federal stool pigeon they've had on the string for years, mostly in narcotics areas. However he has links with Vesco and possibly Rebozo, likewise the mafiosi, hence our interest. The Times and Chronicle have been ignoring him, but the Post has been running a little stuff on his fight to avoid extradition to Sweden on a fraud rap. If the Post disposes of his case, we'd be glad to know what happens.

Another thing you might keep an eye on is the Personalities column (and Maxine Cheshire) where we've frequently found missing bits in the Nixon story through references to Julie, David, Tricia, Korff and other marginal characters who get relegated to the gossip columns.

Otherwise, use your own judgement and don't go to any more trouble than you absolutely have to.

It strikes us, from some reference you made recently to Jerry Ray getting media coverage, that someone may have him in tow in order to influence Jimmy, and that the ones who are being got rid of are not Bud but you and Jim. Just an off-hand reaction from a long way off.

Best,
Jim jdw