

1/29/75

Mr. Bill Gill
ABC News
1124 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gill,

Last week you aired some documents on domestic intelligence, I think from Watergate committee sources. I did not catch that broadcast. I believe it also dealt with Howard Hunt.

Others at ABC News are aware of my interest in this area. I gave ABC an advance exclusive on my newest book which was ahead of the current disclosures and contains what is quite relevant to them and to any official investigation. They did not go for it. I then promised that if they did there would be much more available. Only some of that has since come to light and that part not fully. I gave part to a reporter friend whose syndicate did carry a story.

It seems to me that documents of the kind you obtained and aired may well have content that can be obscure or meaningless to those who have not specialized as I have for the past decade. This was not uncommon with Watergate investigation materials. To say this is no reflection on reporters whose daily work covers all the news. It is to say no more than that when one specializes he accumulates what others do not.

It is because I believe it possible that these documents may mean or indicate to me what they may not to others that I ask if you can let me have copies of them. Thanks very much if you can do this.

So you can understand more, I ask you to keep what follows in complete confidence.

I am one of those who was under surveillance. This was not for any of the reasons thus far used in explanation. I was never a peace activist, although I was from the first opposed to the adventures in Southeast Asia. I have copies of some of the surveillance on me and have substantial reason to believe I know of more. In an effort to do something about this, I am using my own approach. I began the effort almost four years ago, with Helms. Other work prevented my pressing it until after the recent evidentiary hearing in the James Earl Ray case. (I am his investigator and my colleague in the new book is the young lawyer who has actually done just about all the legal work, including what has not been recognized, setting a new precedent on which the Supreme Court ruled for us only this past Monday. I think there is a good story in what my colleague has done.)

Once we had all the legal papers filed in the Ray case we arranged a meeting with the CIA to seek redress of grievances, going back to my effort of the Spring of 1971. At first the CIA tried to b.s. us. When I ticked off what they should seek - and said that if they did not I'd go right to court - they did. And stalled. They have finally admitted the fact and are to be back to us soon. If when they do we are not satisfied I'll still go to court.

Theirs is not the only improper official interest in me. All are a violation of the First Amendment and all are because of my writing.

My problem in dealing with them and others is the disparity of power and means. Their problem is that they do not know what proofs I have in hand. Except for friends who hold duplicates for me, only my colleague/lawyer, Jim Mesar, knows. I feel that if

I am to succeed, whether out of court or through litigation, I have to keep them in doubt. This will become more important if we have to sue.

They have not yet disclosed to us the "few things" they have admitted finding about me in their files.

Aside from my personnel records from my days in O.S.S. they ought have nothing about me on file.

I have proof in hand of something similar in the military. Back in 1969 I asked the Department of Justice to respond to what had been reported to me, similar to the recent disclosures about the Arizona college professor, defamations in private by FBI agents and similar improprieties. We have again taken these matters up with both the Department and the military.

So you can better understand the nature of this interest, all my writing for the past decade has been about the political assassinations and only in the context of the official investigations of them. I am the writer who has made most use of the Freedom of Information law. The reasons given in the Senate for the need to amend the investigatory-files exemption last May 30 have one of my suits at the top of the short list. What I forced the government to disclose to me in the last is the unprecedented content of this newest book that I suspect scared everyone.

What you aired and I did not catch and can't include all the documentation holds may well fit with what I have not been able to investigate completely. It and anything else like it can be very helpful to me.

So, I hope you can let me have copies. Either way, thanks.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

bcc: it dealt with Hunt, CIA reports on what he did