

Dear Jim,

6/30/94 5/14/94

The student who is doing an honors paper took the time yesterday to do some searching for me. To my dismay she reports that the file drawer I have on the nonpublishing history of Whitewash has been misused. For example, the folders are no longer in alphabetical order. I know of nobody who has ever had occasion to work in that file. Not one has asked about it or spoken about it to me. I have had no such occasion. At first I kept those records to help me in trying to place the book and then for a planned book, "Dick Daring in the Hell-Box; or How I got Rich in Six months." I do not take you time for explaining the title and the subtitle but can if you'd like.

The records on the German publisher Fischer end with their writing me and asking for a little more time so their reader, who was away, could read it for them. While I got no further letters from them, I did have notes on what I'd been told, that they had written me several times that they want to publish the book and when they got no response mailed it to me. As I told you I did not get the letters or the manuscript.

My Leslie Frewin file does not include some of his letters that I recall. For example, his telling me that he had been a spook or the letter with which he sent me several of the books he had written.

The photostat of the Times obit on Littauer is unclear but you can read that he had been in intelligence in World War II.

My 5/14/75 letter to Gallen I do not recall at all. It seems to say that a former CIA person confirmed to him that Littauer & Wilkinson "was a CIA agency," agency there I suppose meaning literary agency.

I do not recall what I had in mind, or who, in the postscript.

Note what my 6/30/72 memo says about Hunt and L & W.

My June 3, 1965 letter to Wilkinson was in response to his having in writing that I wanted him to represent me. He did not agree until after he read the book. And the deal with the SEPost was soon dead. He said he liked the book very much.

I did find the telegram my London agent Harbord wrote telling me that all my mail for a long period of time reached him that day.

I do not know who the don Frewin used is. Collins used Sir John Sparrow. As of the time of Frewin's letter to me Lane's book was far in the future over there and it was later there and if Epstein's was the other book to which that don referred, it's pub date here was the end of June. But Lane's would not be published here, after rushing, until September.

So with regard to Lane's at least Frewin would have been first by far. And it would have been Lane's that suffered in the marketplace.

I have no further information on Gollancz.

My friend Sidney Kaufman who was sinking all these efforts for me told me that his friend Budbergh had gotten Collins interested I think first, that Collins had liked the

book very much and that consistent with what ¹ seems to be a British practise had given it to its don, Sparrow, for his opinion. Sparrow, who it later turned out was a fierce partisan who supported the official mythology, killed the book.

When I discussed this with my friend Steve Barber, Washington correspondent of the conservative London Standard, he told me that Sparrow was an aging homosexual who was well known as a recruited for intelligence services.

After a number of books appeared and the controversy was greater Sparrow wrote a lengthy defence of the Warren Report for the Times of London Literary Supplement. I then wrote him and asked that he dispute what Barber had told me. He did not respond and I know of nothing additional he said or wrote in public about the Report or its critics.

What was rather unusual is that his article was published here as a book. It was in fact the size of a pamphlet. I have it somewhere, as Bud also probably did. My recollection is that it was given disproportionate attention by the media and that publication was by a subsidiary of a defense contractor, perhaps RCA. Publishing and selling so small a work in every way was unusual as a book, particularly after it was a magazine-type article and had attracted such great attention. It had few pages and they were of an exceptionally small size.

A Hunt wiretap that was disclosed during Watergate has him telling I think it was Conein that he had a New York office with a phone there, rather a connection that led those who phoned him to believe that he was in New York when he took the phone but that he had a tie line to his Washington office and that when he answered the phone he was in Washington, not in New York.

You have his Who's Who bios in which he lists himself as with Wittauer & Wilkinson at their office address, 500 Fifth ^{Ave.} for several years while he was with the CIA. As I now recall, that lasted until the 1969 edition, when he gave a Washington Building address that I identified as that of an answering service and then confirmed. That was when he was also with the Bennett Agency. *It was their service, too.*

Among the records I got from the CIA are several relating to my having given Jimmy Roosevelt material his father used in a fireside chat. I wrote a ~~memo~~ memo on them for other purposes. I include these records and that memo. Among the records of which I forgot to make a copy but can if you want it is one signed by an FBI SA saying that he had gone over that, meaning this file. That was in the 1950s. My point is that nothing I got from the FBI reflects this. *that I recall* At the least he made notes about me. The request was of FBIHQ and of all field offices. It is obvious that with the FBI's interest in looking at those records being me, this had to surfade on any genuine search. The CIA should also have records relating to me of the request to be able to search the file, etc. None disclosed.

The CIA numbered what it disclosed to me. I go to its Item #21 first because it is what I remembered and spoke to you about. It refers to the request made by the CIA's

general counsel Laurence Houston after we say him. He had told us that the CIA did not have any record of my ever asking for its information about me. When we went there I showed Houston carbon copies of two of them. That appears to have been the cause of these incomplete disclosures.

#21 has written on it "Not Sent." There is a diagonal line through both of its pages. This line was drawn through them before the excisions, as you can see on p. 2 and I think also on the first.

No replacement for it was sent in its stead. This is to say that it either deliberately deceived the CIA's general counsel by not giving him any replacement for this memo that it did not send him or, if it was replaced, did not give me the replacement as it was required to do by the Acts.

The excisions on this record include even the title of the man whose name is typed on the second page, Charles W. Kane. Why his title was excised is not clear because it was also disclosed in the same release. See for illustration #15.

This memo reports that Houston requested a "close" search. He did not get it. It also discloses in its first paragraph that he asked for any other references to me in ~~any~~ other CIA files. From this memo he did not get them, and they exist.

He asked for information on whether I "had ever been subjected to surveillance activity of any type by the Office of Security." The response to this at 6. is evasive, as Houston should have known and OS certainly did: "he has not been personally subjected to any electronic, mechanical (which I think means bugging) or human surveillance of any type," the latter I believe referring to shadowing only. My appearances it did surveil, as we know and can prove, but that was not done by OS but was contracted for by the CIA. There is also a prima facie case of my mail being intercepted, overseas mail, during the period the Church committee said the FBI was getting it and delivering it to the CIA. (Some of this was done for the Public Affairs Staff. I do not know whether it was under OS but I presume it reported to OS.)

Where they got the misinformation that I "served with the Office of Strategic Services in North Africa I do not know. I did not. I was there as a soldier, an MB only.

You can see that about half of the text of this page^w as was covered when it was xeroxed. I did not locate what explanation, if any, I was given. There is no claim to any exemption of PA or FOIA for any of the withholdings.

4. says I do have an OS file, "Mr. Weisberg's Security file." I doubt that what was sent me is all of that file and this does not say that it is. In this paragraph it also says that OS has "summaries prepared by the Office of Security" of my books. None was provided. There is a single memo on Frame-Up, #20.

5. says that my name "appears in several other files maintained by the Office of Security." It suggests that these other files consist of clippings only. Whether or not true, they were not provided and they obviously exist. If only clippings, even any

notations can be important, as can the clippings themselves be.

If all of this were as innocent as the memo suggests there is no apparent reason for not sending it or any replacement to the general counsel. That does suggest that it is untrue in its incompleteness and that what it does refer to is not as innocuous as made out to be.

#21 refers to a letter I wrote Helms. That is #14. #21 is undated. It is in response to Houston's memo of January 2, 1975. In it OS says this letter to Helms is the last thing added to my OS file. That letter is dated 4/5/71. I did tell Helms that in saying the CIA "does not engage in espionage of any kind" ^{on Americans} he said what is not true and I have the proof. I do and did. It was not asked for. Nor is this address ^{ed/} by OS in the memo it did not send Houston.

#15 is a separate memo of February 5, 1975 to Houston over Kane's name confirming what he had been told earlier. It says that OS "files contain no information that would indicate that I have ever been the subject of technical or physical surveillance by it." This excluded by anyone else of which it knows or has some record, it eliminates the other types of surveillance the CIA did practise on me, and it eliminates OS having surveillance information on me of which I was ^{NOT} the "subject." It does not say that I am not included in surveillance information OS has of which someone else is the subject. As for one example other persons like Jim Garrison. (Not him alone, of course.)

What was not masked on this record reflects filing in 5 OS files, with no indication all were searched, and it has an OS number that may be of my file, OS 50254/A. I have no document with that number on it.

#16 is my 5/4/75 letter to Colby, This is obviously later than the Helms letters OS says is the last item in the file on me. In it I again report surveillance on me. There was no response, no denial, no request for any information about those surveillances, and that was when my request had supposedly being complied with. Houston also never asked for any of this kind of information of me.

And in this regard, I note that there was no compliance at all by any component other than OS.

Yet four days later, in #17, "DCI Security Staff," which may or may not be part of OS, has a record of only my writing Helms. This letter also says that it sent Houston a reply denying any technical or physical surveillance on me. This one is signed "DCI Security Staff." I have no such records signed by it. I have ^{only} ~~only~~ #15 above which is signed by the head of OS. While this can indicate that DCI Security Staff is part of OS, it does not include what OS recorded having on me and then withheld from me and did not send that information to Houston,

#18 is headed, "KEEP ON TOP OF FILE." The retire disclosed text reads, "Subject of this file was a member of Presentation Brnach, OSS. For further information see MS-2000-0." Where the signature usually is there was obvious masking. It is in the heading

identified as "FROM: PSB." I do not know what or who PSB is but the S can be for security and the B might be for branch. Nothing that was disclosed to me is in any way identified as from PSB and nothing was identified as from MS-2000-0.

Presentation was not the only OSS component in which I worked. I was also in the Latin American Division.

Because I am reminded of it the CIA has to have other references to me in the records of other OSS components for which I did special jobs they were not able to do. One in particular that I do recall, and I do not recall whether any of the other special jobs I did ~~was~~ ^{were} for it, was for "X-2" or counterintelligence. I believe I also did some of the intelligence branch of OSS.

#19 has at least one masking on its first page and at least 3 on its second page. It begins by referring to my transfer from Presentation to Latin America part of the Research and Analysis Branch.

What appears to be its third paragraph reveals the existence of records not disclosed to me. Only some of it could come from such sources as clippings, which were not disclosed. The rest reveals careful reading of my books, also not disclosed. In any record, that is. But such records have to exist.

#20, which also seems to have parts of it masked, has this number written boldly on it: "#18281." It may be possible that a sixth, last letter was masked. With six digits or if an initial "0" was not included, this could be consistent with CIA numbering. It then could be my number carried over from the OSS. If not it could be a file number. I was given nothing identified with any such file number. Where there is a clear masking on page 1 it says that a summary on me dated January 11, 1968 by the "undersigned" whose name is masked on page 2 is attached. Not in what was given to me. What is masked at this point is the purpose of that January 11, 1968 summary.

It says that on page 237 "Weisberg alleges that the FBI liaison man with the White House is also a CIA man. OS records were negative on his individual." I referred to Courtney Evans by name and said he was the FBI's liaison with the attorney general. I did say in parens that Evans was also CIA. That appears to be wrong. I do not recall my source but it was most likely a newspaper story, the source of most of that book.

Under where the signatory's name was masked is "SRS/OS" or this is an OS records. It also lists or refers to attachments in the plural. ^{None} ~~None~~ were disclosed to me.

The last of the items that I believed could be of interest to you is #22. It says ~~there is~~ an ad from the February 1968 issue of Ramparts is attached and it is. This page is correctly titled, "WRITERS AND EDITORS WAR ATX PROTEST." Of the hundred plus names the CIA placed check marks before ~~xxxx~~ or after 3, lines before or after five and it underlined three of whom I am one.

While there is no explanation for these marks, I presume they reflect CIA interest. If so I am one of the ten in which it had this special interest that is not reflected in any record it disclosed to me.

There has to have been some reason for this expression of special or more interest in those of us marked on this ad, which lists all our names.

What I mean above is that no record disclosed to me reflects any basis for any special interest in me in connection with this ad against the Vietnam war.

I believe it therefor is reasonable to believe that some CIA records that provide the reason(s) for reflecting this special interest in me exist and were withheld improperly.

Otherwise there is no reason for the marking.

If I have not noted it above, only one component made any response at all. There is no reason to believe that only one component had any interest in ~~marks~~ me or any records about me. There is reason to believe that other components did and do have records within my requests.

And it is obvious that the Office of Security does have such records because it refers to them. + note that the manner of references while probably designed to give the impression that they are all such records, is not really that explicit.

I do not know what components were involved with the Warren Commission but at the very least Angleton's counterintelligence was. It thus could reasonably be expected to have a special interest in my work. Helms was then Plans or dirty tricks and he was not only involved, I wrote him when he was DCI. The copy of my letter provided is a remote xerox, visible on its face. It is not unreasonable to presume that at times of greater controversy and attention to the book and to special developments, like Garrison, there were other CIA interests. From what it disclosed, Garrison was one about which it informed the director, in writing. Nothing reflecting anything about what I wrote, said or did in any such connection is disclosed to me. We know from what was disclosed that the CIA made analyses of the assassination books. None of mine are disclosed. It is inevitable that it paid special attention to Oswald in New Orleans. ^{and we know it did to me - ATR we have} Not a word disclosed on it. ^{there} The CIA is in its subtitle and in its text, particularly where I report other Shaw CIA connections than with Domestic Contact Service. (I think you should tell Newman about that so he can be alert to it in the records he is going over.) The CIA was sensitive to suggestions of connections with it, like by Ferrie. In that book. No such record disclosed. And I think it is likely that the CIA prepared rundowns on all of us writing such books, at the least its own biographical data. None disclosed. There may be other reasons for believing that it has other undisclosed records on or about me. Other than what we known about.

It inherited the OSS records, as what is enclosed from David Bruce to Ernest Cuneo reflects. I got that and a few other records separately from the CIA. ^{purchase} I have a memo with them.

7

As the memo and the records reflect I gave FDR through his son Jimmy what FDR used in one of his "fireside" chats. Jimmy was in what I recall was called The Coordinator of Information office, COI. It preceded OSS. OSS had its records. I think it is likely that what I gave it through Jimmy Roosevelt led to some COI records on or about me and that in its functioning it should have had others that the OSS got and that the CIA got from the OSS. The subject ^{was} on one was such an interest at COI, Nazi Propaganda. The information I provided actually referred to a planned coup, pro-Nazi, by the Falange, certainly a proper COI interest. As perhaps the speech itself would be. So I think the CIA had such information and withheld it. A possible explanation is that none of the agencies wanted to disclose anything good about any critic. But even that request was not included in what was disclosed of the COI's records.

On the 10/14/42 record you will see that ^{CIA} identifications numbers were of six digits. Also on other of these records.

It is not unlikely that because of what is inferred about Chaikin and because I had this connection with him, even if we'd had no contact of any kind, there could have been some additional interest in me and/or the magazine. No such records disclosed.

At the very least we have the CIA's interest in and surveillance on me through Radio and TV Reports solidly documented and none of that was disclosed. We also have the Washington manager's evaluation of the ^{high} degree of its interest in me. With transcripts, bills, checks in payment and even the envelopes. We have the names of some of those in the CIA involved in that and, as I told you, at Watergate time the CIA let them go and at least some transferred to NSA. (Harold Ober seems to have been in charge of the Public Affairs Staff.)

If you have any questions, please ask them.

Best,

Herold