

Mr. Les Whitten
1401 16 St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20036

5/11/77

Dear Les,

Bease, freind- no hassle. Even if I don't correct the typos.

While I rest up from a little physical work outside I return to one of those stern letters I had hoped might get through to 'ack.

First recent leak, if I recall ~~xxxxxx~~ correctly, was in the Schweiker silliness. It has been repeated. No, it goes back to the Rockefeller Commission, in the more recent period, when they called Rocca back to CIA, I suppose because there were no competent ones kicking around (with that political perspective, anyway), to prepare a special report for Rockefeller and Belin. Then that, naturally, reached AP's attention in one of the releases everyone else got. (My FOIA requests are years old, going back to 1971 with CIA.)

Big kickback deal, Castro offered JFK in retaliation.

This particular variant was hung on an AP story out of Havana 9/9/63 by Daniel Harker. (Odd that one of the assassination novels is titled The Harker File.)

The bludgeoning of the federal agencies was that they had withheld this from the Warren Commission.

False. The COMMISSION knew about this and asked the Secret Service to get the very paper Rocca referred to. Odd how all these prestigious lawyers of the Commission were silent over this abuse of the agencies, isn't it. The one who made the requests used to be a professor of law at UCLA and I understand returned there, Wesley J. Liebeler. Dutifully the New Orleans Secret Service obtained the Times-Picayune and States-Item stories and sent them.

The anti-Castro New Orleans papers did not headline any threat to off JFK. The head was more faithful to the story. "Castro Blasts Aids on Cuba in the morning paper and with some of the head missing in the p.m., it is clear, and the rewritten lead also is clear, that the big thing was not any threat against JFK. It was Castro's saying that Goldwater would be the GOP candidate and that Cuba would not be afraid of his tough talk.

I did not have these earlier because the Secret Service misled me in 1971 and I did not as a result of being misled file any FOIA against it. However, these pages were in what was given to Hark, who was not anxious to let you or anyone else know. He is selling books by whipping the FBI, remember?

This kind of abuse of the agencies makes it easier for them to avoid the necessary and overdue cleanings. It also tends to exculpate them from their real sins, which are serious enough. And in my view it prolongs the agonies over the assassinations.

If you want the antecedents on how the press would be manipulated get CIA # 1035-960. All the not really relevant arguments used against critics of the Warren report are laid out in it as of 3/1/65. Lane had been vocal then but had no back. There had been foreign books none of which made a big splash here. And the only U.S. book then in publishing houses was my first. What I am saying is that all the arguments used against us came from the CIA, no matter how ~~ign~~ innocently any reporter may have parroted. I doubt any reporter knew his reasoning came from CIA. And I know nobody has asked any questions about why the CIA should have had this interest, debunking criticism, and of a Commission, not it.

You are welcome to copies of my copies but the stories are cut off, not complete. If you want to get them from Secret Service, it is File No. 2-34-030, Control Number 1760. Not sure about the \$ but more like it than an 8.

Best,