Dear Jim, He the Hoover O & C File on Fred J. Wook HW 6/21/78

The copy you sent is incomplete, as perhaps the copy you obtained also is. The last page, 5, has the note "continued - over" at the boottom.

The information also is incomplete, I'm sure much less complete than was in Hoover's files/office. Perhaps the explanation is in one of the hand notes at the bottom of the Jense to Bishop mono of 7/2 14/71, "GC in P.P." I believe this may reaflect the fiking of a copy in "performal files" of Hoover's, this being the likely meaning of P.P. I understand Hoover had such files, too.

This record is stypical in bearing no file designation, by number and serial.

The withholds are dubious in some instances.

Lust graf, p. 2 the FEI voluntarily discloses that Boris Morros "was a Bureau informant." I had a file on him and gave it to Dave.

The selfGeerving paper in the MURKIN pecerds states that the FMI does not provide information to reporters and writers. On page 3 that the FMI did provide information to Gook on two different subjects is explicit.

Relevant in 1996.

CON2

Belevant re my PA request is the penalt. graf on p.4 about the Writers and Editors V.N. protest. I also mas a signatury. In the copy I obtained from the GIA I was one of only about a half-doman maximal for special interest. (Dec Speck I recall of the others you have a copy.) There may have been an ad that did not include me but I have no knowledge of any. I think this also means that the FNI had a file on this particular protest that include information on me, in general and as a basis for demanfishing a search of the Director's files. Or have I already? I think I have. I know I did for King redords.

Rissing in this memo, I think conspicuously missing, is any reference to Gook's writing on the JFK accessination/Warren Consistion. I think it probable thatJenes and Bishop were not unaware of it.