

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701  
301/473-8186  
5/14/74

Mr. Ron Plesser  
1712 N St., NW  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ron,

I got to read most of the Nosenko documents I got for you while I was waiting for the doctor yesterday. I had decided to tape a fairly long communication to you after supper but this became impossible because of telephone calls. As a result of one I may have for you by the weekend an affidavit that may or may not be of use to you, filed in Las Vegas in the Johnny Meier case and executed in Mexico City by one Virgino Gonzalez and a lawyer named Villanueva. You know people to whom it may be of interest if it is not of help to you in the case of your unnamed client who, were I to make a wild guess, may know me. (An intelligent, slightly portly gentleman with a good command of English and a heavy Russian accent. One not without his own knowledge of intelligence.)

Because there now also will not be time to put this all on tape as a substitute this hasty letter on the chance it can reach you before this weekend if you do come up and as an aid to my own memory if you do not. I am into much too much, can't keep all in mind any more, and I do forget. So, please don't misunderstand anything in what you may take as the tone as I rush through this before the sun in order to do it. And if I have to mail it prior to correction, I'll have a corrected copy I'll exchange your's for. I'll ask my wife to read it after she gets up and I am doing other things. Those familiar with my terrible typing know the mistakes I make automatically.

I told Jim yesterday that you could help this case much by filing two FOI suits for me. They'll be for you and your client, too, but there are only three people I know who could be the right client and the other two are unavailable to you but could help me.

Before I forget, I strongly encourage you to get from CBS at least the sound of Dan Schorr's aired interview with McCone I think this past Saturday night.

Speaking not as a lawyer, which I am not, but from long experience, which I have and as an ~~analyst~~ analyst, which is where I ~~am~~ am in this business, at some point you are going to want to impeach the hitherto unimpeachable. You will surely want that interview, if they give you only what they aired, if you get into court and perhaps prior to that, depending on how you handle your case. I presume you'll also want to impeach both the federal agencies and Nosenko. You can and these documents I have for you now can serve either to impeach both or to divide them or both.

I think you will want other records that can be available through these FOI suits. One is for the secret evidence in the Heine case in federal district court in Baltimore (Roszel Thomsen, judge) on which I have a rudimentary ~~summary~~ and if you'd like will undertake to get what the Baltimore papers have in their morgues on it. It is going to be used against you anyway, as precedent. The file I have is of a couple of clippings only but it will give you the thrust and the names of the lawyers. This crosses into my interest, <sup>at least</sup> one of which Jim was to have spoken to you a while back.

There should be an FOI suit against both the FBI and the CIA over these Nosenko documents. In the trial if not in the FOI suit you can have a lawyer's dream of a fun day with what you can do with all these lying, selective, misrepresenting bastards. These papers largely duplicate themselves in their content and with rare exceptions also filter out what Nosenko has to have known. So, they or he deceived.

If you doubt the value of getting the McCone interview this will remind me. He lied so extensively with his bare face hanging out that he turned the whole thing around to the wrong question and on that also he lied. The real question was not was Nosenko dependable, <sup>not</sup> but was Oswald a Russian agent, but was he CIA. You'd never guess this from the McCone interview or the Nosenko papers. Nobody in his right mind ever dreamed that Oswald was a Russian agent. McCone lied even in saying the papers had been withheld from the Warren Commission. I have for you the staff evaluation of them.

These papers were never properly subject to classification (Confidential only). My preliminary inquiries indicate they were declassified in the government's interest, a strong hint, virtually a statement, that the CIA did it. They were declassified at ~~least~~ two different recent times. The first coincides roughly with the appearance of a delayed story in the New York Times, a ploy I killed in a WTTG Panorama broadcast versus the planter, one Jones Harris, and Howard Willens, whom I freely predict will not again appear on TV on the Warren report. It was a fake story that the members of the Warren Commission (read the liberal Warren) deliberately suppressed even from its trusted staff the sainted Hoover's fear that there was an Oswald imposter in Russia. The actuality is that the suppressing was by the FBI and the papers were never withheld from the staff. But the time of declassification of the first of these Nosenko papers coincides with the appearance of that story in the NYTimes, by Ben Franklin. The second declassification, of the staff memo, roughly coincides with the Schorr story. It was declassified the 7th and used four days later. Misused, that is.

One of the reasons these papers had to be withheld is not to destroy their disproof of some of what the Warren Report intended to say from the first (I have the first outline of their work).

I think it is transparent that the FBI questioned Nosenko while he was in CIA protective custody. It is also obvious that the CIA did its own questioning and there are no such papers in the file. However, for both of us, I have asked for all the papers of the Warren Commission declassified out of the regular order and for all declassified CIA papers. I'll be confirming it in writing and I did it in such haste that I didn't have my checkbook with me and borrowed a blank check from the right official, wrote in my bank and name, and paid in advance. If I'd not been overworked and ill I'd not have forgotten this and would have done it Saturday, by mail.

Everybody will invoke national security and I think that depending on the judge they can be beaten. There can be quite a press conference if not, with a lot of relevant stuff on why the court will have been lied to in the invocation of national security. If you decide you will want to go the way I recommend, don't be too discouraged by the thought of beating a national-security claim. Jim and I have done it because of the amount of work I've done in the past and the evidence I've accumulated. It is not a discouraging prospect in this case and can you imagine not having to face it at some point? If you agree, I strongly encourage you to pick your ground for this fight, not theirs.

What we would want in this FOI suit is limited to what the CIA and FBI got from Nosenko about Oswald and his connections and the family into which he married, all of which Nosenko has to have gone into more than these papers show. There is an enormous void and the CIA has to have intercepts of mail to Oswald if not from him. I have just learned of 16 letters he wrote from Minsk not published and a friend is going to look ~~in~~ at one soon. The mother has them and while she is a nut there is prospect we can get something from her. So, we sue for what was withheld that could not properly be under the law. I hope the value of this is apparent to you as it relates to your suit and client and as it relates to the weight that can be given to the word of your adversaries in court.

This may all seem hit-or-miss and far out to you and I realize that I'm jumping around in an area with which you may have little familiarity. Please if you have this feeling ask Jim what my track record is on it.

What follows I ask you to keep in confidence. I'm giving you an idea of the potential and of the risk I personally am willing to run to help you, because it can endanger a book I laid aside and sued for that 1/27 transcript to get. (I have another on this for you, too, real Orwellian.) One of Oswald's friendly contacts in the U.S. embassy in Moscow figured in the Penkovsky case. He serviced one of Penkovsky's drops. His cover was that of a doctor. His official employment was Air Force. None of this is in the Warren materials. It was all hidden from them. As I recall. I have enough collected for the partly-written book Agent Oswald.

All of this, of course, is without knowledge of the nature of the damage to your client. Perhaps if and when I know more I'll be able to make other suggestions. You can be sure that the CIA will lie. Sometimes, like the FBI, they depend on semantics. Thus when I tell them that I have copies (and they are carbons) of CIA surveillance on me they lie and say there was none. When I ask for copies of what they got from other agencies they also lie and say they have nothing. It is par. The Air Force, whose files on me I have in one case examined and in two cases have the file numbers of, tells me they have and had none. In writing, I am certain the CIA intercepted much of my foreign mail and can't imagine their not having intercepted that to behind the iron curtain. Some was actually stolen when there was the chance a book that suggested Oswald was an agent might be printed. Other was delayed until a deal for a book in England was killed.

I encourage you to master the doctrine in the 1/27 transcript in Whitewash IV: perjury is the CIA's highest dedication, the ultimate in patriotism. Authority, Dulles. (Elsewhere. Richard Russell.)

There seems to me to be a number of connections possible between your case and several I asked Jim to speak to you about that he has for me. Time will tell. I believe mine can be much more extensive, involving a large number of agencies and all violative of the first amendment and having no other real purpose. The most subversive thing I've ever belonged to was a CIA front, the Newspaper Guild.

In the Heine case the E.B. Williams firm was part of the defense. They really represented the CIA. And when they learned I was writing a book critical of the Warren Commission they let the statute of limitations run on a case already won, as Jim can tell you. I had established the precedent and when I was pro se because of them the judge told the government that he had already ruled (in the first of two cases) and the only question was proving the new damages. The Warren Commission's first crisis, in the words of that eminent expert Gerald Ford, was what to do to get around the evidence that Oswald had been a federal agent. Maybe just coincidence but the fact is fact.

The Meier case affidavit deals with domestic operations and the kinds of people who were of interest to the CIA. Like Teddy Kennedy, Hugh Hefner, Tommy Douglas (Canada), Hubert Humphrey and many others, all, clearly, not of proper intelligence interest and none within the CIA's responsibilities. The story is that this was done through an "asset," Howard Hughes' operations. Here I have done an enormous amount in a book I had to lay aside in September for my work on the Ray case. I've never been able to get back to it. It needs only editing. A very rough draft is completed. But the unexposed domestic operations and their Watergate operations are mind-blowing. So is what is still not reported about Nixon's connections with Watergate figures prior to Watergate. And Ford's! Including assassinations planned and currently in the news.

I've run out of time. Don't be scared. Much of this will fit together.

astily,

Harold Weisberg

*Book KGB possibly Angleton job  
similar unidentified Congressional  
Record insertion*