

1/25/75

Dear Mr. Heineman,

I'm sorry that other work, chiefly mailing out copies of the new book, have stacked some of my mail and that I could not get to your letter of the 29th until now. Thanks for the clear enclosures.

With Congressman Rice a member of the CIA subcommittee, it is a fair assumption that the propaganda he put into the Congressional Record of September 28, 1965, was prepared by it, perhaps for a hearing or a briefing. It certainly can be considered CIA propaganda, a kind of justification of its excesses and costs. And it sure smacks of the Angleton kind of thinking.

I doubt that the 20-page CIA briefing to which you refer would be available under the FOI law because I know of no way to rebut the argument of "national security" on it.

While the Gestapo memo on Joesten to which you refer from Lane's book could have been a Gehlen forgery, I can see a much simpler explanation: it was exactly the kind of thing the Gestapo did. And less notorious counterparts do. If that ^{was} part of the Gestapo files that were captured by our troops, it ~~was~~ was probably forwarded to Washington, where it would have been preserved. If it was not forwarded or not captured it would have remained in Germany. And if there had been no earlier inquiry on Joesten, as soon as there was interest in his assassination work, Washington would have made inquiry about him in Germany. Wrong as they are, these kinds of interests are also close to automatic. I know of some with regard to myself.

I have never prepared any literature on my court actions or studies so I have nothing like this for you to give to your local stations. They do not need it. I have made not fewer than more than 50 phone broadcasts on this new book without anything like that. Most are spontaneous: they call and I'm on the air. Less frequently they are scheduled in advance. In most cases the newsmen or talk-show host hasn't even read the book. If the host knows his business he just points me the way he wants, I follow his leads, and the show has a more spontaneous nature. The last of these, to San Antonio the other night, ran two hours.

Topical as anything on the CIA is today, I think it likely that there could be interest and that if the local papers had carried the stories of either of the wire services or the Wash. Post one of the producers of these shows should have noticed it.

Thanks for the suggestion on Tom Snyder. I think it would be more graceful if you did write them instead of me and there would then be a greater probability of their repaying my expenses, an important factor to me.

You have an awareness of Department of Disinformation type operations. There have been some in connection with the assassinations. One was expensive and sophisticated. In this case there is no doubt about auspices. I am interested in them. There are other and similar activities that may be independent and may be no more than commercializations or self-promotions, even just carryings on by the dedicated wrong. However, they all serve spook purposes, whether or not they are sponsored. You may not have done enough work to be able to determine which commentaries are extreme. For the most part those that mention the spooks are without foundation, there being no solid evidence. This also is the kind of thing the spooks can use behind the scenes and in self-justification. So, if you see any reports of any appearances or writings of this nature, I would appreciate copies. I am trying to keep up on these things. One of the consequences is the destruction of all credibility, and that is serious. There is a Cambridge-based gang of young men who are milking the campuses effectively and commercializing the cleverly-packaged irrational, often complete fabrications. With this the fact, sponsorship becomes irrelevant. This is a sample of what I mean.

Thanks and best regards,