3/11/76

Mr. Gary Cohen
c/o Jack Anderson
1401 16 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Gary,

As soon as I heard from my source today I called you, without thinking, because it appeared to me you and your associates should know and assess the import for yourselfes. However, when I had to leave I was not preoccupied with my own work, did think a little, so I take the extra time to write.

He had three anonymous calls, 2/7/2/11 and 3/1. His caller said he was aware of a Mr. G. who would soon publish "full details of the MK groups in which he would say that MK ULTRA was formed just prior to 1963. In order to correct "Mr. G" my source was asked to place an add in a specified paper. He did. I have it.

He now says he fears he too quickly and carelessly to what he now says is a "hoax."

He did not respond to the second call, which told him "Mr. G." had two matters mixed up and should be straightened out. The request was that he place another ad.

The third call, the last as of the date of this letter, the 8th., used your name and Jack's immediately. The story then was that "Mr. G." was upset because you might scoop him. My source went to some trouble and expense to determine if the column was done and if so when it would appear. His idea was that it might spur Mr. G to get into print rapidly. On the third call he again decided against placing the ad.

I am now more than ever convinced that he is the one who called you. He is explicit in his uneasiness about you people but not in any sense personally. For the time being he has forbidden me to identify him to you. This will become more clear, I think.

He says this experience is going to deter his use of the phone. He also apologizes for unspecified inaccuracies in talking to me, saying he had reasons. I presume this is because I asked him if he had called you after you and I first spoke of this and he denied it.

I assume he is being truthful. Therefore, someone had to know you were working on this. Obviously, those to whom you spoke knew. But if not one of them then had did anyone know and why call him? If it is one to whom you spoke, then that one got word back to others. If you spoke openly to someone at CIA, then that someone or those to whom he spoke had reason to connect it with my source. And had him phoned. I don t believe he is making up an elaborate story and see no reason for it, including the ad. It was printed and the date is with it. And the ad is addressed to Mr. G.

This was before your column by close to four weeks, with what appears to be the identification of the man who confirmed to you, Gunn.

You know when you spoke to whom about this, I don't. This is why I've given you the dates. It seems pretty clear that someone passed the work back.

It comes at a bad time for me because he was opening up more all the time, in part at least for guidance, I'm sure. He does appear to trust me. He will speak to me more if I can get to where he is, as I now cannot. However, I have proposed to a college not far away and in the same part of the country that I be invited to speak on the JFK or King assassinations. If this happens I'll be nearby and have the funding to stay and visit after I go see him.

What appears to have triggered this is my telling him about not getting through to Les and asking him if he would be satisfied with a first-rate investigative reporter on the National Enquirer, a personal friend. I told him my friend was on vacation and if he did not have a go-ahead when he returns I'd like to talk to Les. Then most recently, to you. I had told him I believe his immediate interests are served by anonymity. However, it appears he is not anonymous.

After our last conversation I wrote and suggested certain steps to him and a reasonably safe way of filling them if he decided to. Now I'll have to wait and see if he does.

When last I wrote Les I gave him my schedule for the coming two weeks, when I'll be where in Washington if anyone wants to talk to me.

Best,

Harold Weisberg