Director,
FBIHQ
Washington, D.C. 20535

Dear Sir,

Included in JFK assassination record referrals to other agencies sent me under date of May 11, last month, is 62-109060-7504. It relates to Hugh McDonald's book, "Appointment in Dallas." I was certain this had not been provided to me and a limited check, all now possible for me, confirmed my belief. While there is nothing in my not inconsiderable experiences with the FBI with regard to its disclosure of assassination records, particularly in but not limited to FOIA litigation, to encourage the hope, I do hope that those who screen the incoming mail will take seriously the damage to the FBI's reputation, in general and in FOIA ~~regar~~ regard, this represents.

While I also have no reason to believe that the FBI has any real concern for the historical record in these matters, as I do, I will be giving you information about this matter that from what has been disclosed to me, your files do not hold.

First, I apologize for my typing, I can't be any better.

SA Robert P. Gemberling was assigned to make an "in house" review of the book. Although it is 31 single-spaced pages long it does not include what his files should have told him and it falls short of characterizing this book as a fake. Which it is.

Gemberling repeats the phony identification of the publisher, Hugh McDonald Publishing. The actual publisher was Zebra, at the same New York City address. The book was first offered to a different publisher. He engaged me to read and give him an opinion of a lengthy summary, as I now recall of about 65 pages. I did not have to get very far into it before that it was a fake was obvious. I then decided to do more than I'd been asked to do. In the course of this simple investigation I obtained as I new recall two earlier such summaries plus other information.

In 1967 I. Irving Davidson contacted the FBI about what evolved as this book. He was correct in telling the FBI that the intent was to, and these are not his words, blame the JFK assassination on President Johnson.

This is explicit in the information I obtained, as is also the source who strongly discouraged saying it.

After I filed my report I was asked to attend a conference on the book between this publisher and his associates and McDonald, his agent, no stranger to me, and his counsel at their New York office. Anticipating correctly how McDonald's agent would react~~xxx~~ to my presence, I sat in silence for a long period of time and then excused myself. My real ~~xxxx~~ reason was not to relieve myself. It was to give this agent, John Starr, time to react. As he did!

After I returned, and the conference lasted the entire morning, I made only one comment. It was to the effect that in order to promote the book McDonald would have to

appear on talk shows. He had in this draft, I told him, what could ruin his book. He had "Saul" lurking for an hour in of all places a ladies room! And at lunchehour yet!

Starr sighed in relief and smiled and McDonald thanked me.

The publisher made what I regarded as a generous offer to contract the book as a work of fiction and it was rejected.

Davidson was correct in identifying Leonard Davidoff as a party behind what emerged as this book. He did not identify Davidoff fully, from what Davidoff told me. Gerberling failed to include him along with McDonald and Herman Kimsey as Barry Goldwater's campaign security. The published book says he was and Davidoff told me he had been.

While I'd never met Kimsey, I knew of his interest in the JFK assassination because I knew he visted the office of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations looking for information on the assassination. By coincidence Kimsey had also been the friend of a woman friend of ours, as she was of the Davidoffs. I was stunned that those who had been his friends involved the late Kimsey in the assassination. This woman, now dead, raised this with Davidoff. He said that he and his wife owned a farm not far from where I live and would like to take my wife and me to dinner and to talk to me. He began talking to me at my home and continued it through a long dinner in Frederick.

As Gemberling does not say, Kimsey was fired by the CIA.I do not know the reason. I do know that he had an extraordinary interest in the belief that the Russian royal family had survived Communist execution.

According to Davidoff, rather Davidov, his business also had offices in the Chastelton Hotel and Kimsey lived in those offices. That also is where the alleged records were, those Davidov said disappeared with Kimsey's death. To me he attributed their alleged theft to the CIA. Kimsey, I was told, also judged horse shows and took the women and the Davidov children to them. It is my recollection that I was told he spent considerable time with those children.

Davidov also told me that he was a vice president of Peoples Drugs or of the corporation that owned it, I think named Oaks. He said he was in charge of security, along with having his own Security Associates business.

In the middle of Huly, 1975, "Security Associates International," claiming it had offices in Houston and Dallas, if not also elsewhere, started the story that it represented a coming book that would identify the alleged assassin. All this propaganda was entirely consistent, in detail, with McDonald's fabrication. It also was only a couple of weeks after the conference I attended and assume that it followed the Zebra contract.

At that conference, by the way, McDonald made repeated references to what he said was a telegram to him from Directpr Hoover praising him highly. I do not recall the exact words. He also used that telegram in promoting his book.

As Gemberling also did not point out, the beginnings of what eventuated as a book that only in the last revision eliminated it was the involvement- and I do not suggest

with his knowledge and believe it was without his knowledge - of Barry Goldwater's security in a ~~lies~~ false and defamatory book that blamed the JFK assassination on his opponent, President Johnson. (Davidson spoke to the FBI in 1967.)

In the final revision, perhaps in the first revision, George DeMohrenschildt was replaced with the name "Troit."

Gemberling's report was withheld from me in CA 78-0320 on the claim that it was perviously processed as FBIHQ 620190 109060-7504. It there was withheld first as referred to DCRU and then to the CIA. The worksheets state that it had two parts totalling 34 pages. The referral sheet says that all 34 were referred to the CIA. In a 1978 lawsuit. Now, in May, 1992, I finally get it. And learn that it held 14 additional pages not listed in the processing worksheet.

So, to begin with, the FBI withheld from me one of its own records by referring it to the CIA and then doing nothing when the CIA did nothing. If the notations on the records mean what they seem to mean, the CIA finally acted after a decade but four years before the FBI did anything at all after the CIA acted. And then, by remarkable coincidence to coincide with a public clammor for the release of withheld records.

Which the administration opposes.

Why the FBI found it necessary to suppress its own review of a book is a mystery.

The book was published and distributed widely and almost all the content of the memo is the content of the book.

On Gemberling's page 8 the FBI had originally planned to withhold "taken by the CIA" relating to the photograph identified as Commission Exhibit 237. This was never secret. Nor was the fact that the CIA photographed theose entering and leaving the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City. This is repeated on Page 10. On that page part of a sentence remains withheld, what follows the reporting that the picture was published in the book and by the Commission. It seems to me to be entirely unlikely that whatever is withheld can really qualify for withholding.

(Even after reading this fake book Gemberling describes McDonald as "ah outstadning law man" on page 17. Some description of a con artist!)

There are no other withholdings from these 31 pages.

This is to say that 31 very topical pages were withheld entirely because part of a sentence was referred to the CIA. And withheld for so very many years, four after the CIA acted.

The two-page covering memo has part of the final paragraph withheld. It seems to refer to why there might be reason for "considerable inquiry should be made through CIA."

~~Like~~ why these two parts of the serial are classified secret is not apparent. It is a book review and only part of a sentence in the main memo remains withheld.

Also originally withheld is the 3/5/76 Cooke to Gallagher memo, also "Secret."

Part of one sentence in it on page 7 is withheld, what follows, "Kimsey is shown in various files as being....." That he was in CIA, that it fired him, etc. were public. And he was dead.

On page 11 the FBI originally intended to withhold the entire ~~sentee~~sentence, "This photograph was taken by a CIA (obliterated) outside the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City in 1963 and was furnished to the FBI." It was also furnished to the Commission, which published it. Even where the CIA had its cameras was public knowledge.

On page 12 what seems to be about three words ~~is~~ withheld from the sentence saying what kind of work Kimsey did of a technical nature. Certainly that was not secret.

In the next paragraph three or four words are withheld relating to what was "certainly" public knowledge at least to law enforcement people. This relates to the taking of such pictures.

And in the final parapraph on page 14 the name of a Senate committee staff member is withheld.

Assuming as I do not that these minuscule withholdings were justified, can it be the all 14 single-space pages had to be?

In general these observations apply also to Serial 7586, on the same geheral subject and particularly relating, from I know with extraordinary ~~iade~~ inadequacy, to the phony pretenses about the capability of the PSE device, to the Hagoth Corporation and its president, R.H.Bennett.

This is followed by a short covering memo from the CIA's deputy director for operations. His nonsecret name is withheld.

In the other records just sent me there are similar withholdings of what is public- by which I mean officially public - like the CIA's electronic surveillances.

Can it be that you have people so ignorant processing for disclosure? They do not even know what <u>they</u> have disclosed, and withheld it after all these years?

And with the fact of these official admissions of the electronic surveillances, you still withhild from me what Oswald said and what was said to him. <u>That</u> is a fit "national security" claim? In the cited FOIA lawsuit it was withheld in a wired summary and in the transcript FBIHQ directed be sent it.

Particularly because of the Department's public opposition to full JFK assassination disclosure can the FBI be seriously embarrassed by its record. (of which this is but a sample.) It abused the court and requesters like me and perjury, I mean this literally, was commonplace, alleged, proven and undenied. All to violate the letter and intent of the law and to frustrate and make its use too expensive. Plus, perhaps, having what it regarded as fun with those it did not like or whose work embarrassed it, like me. In this, however, it did defame itself if anyone like a Congressional committee ever develops a serious interest. In addition to which you also have files not even searched and relevant. I've identified some.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

See next page

I also call to your attention as an entirely unjustified withholding from me in the cited litigation and from the people in general in the so-called general JFK assassination releases of 62-109060-7702.

There is only one apparent reason for withholding this record - a courtesy to the CIA, which could have been seriously embarrassed by it.

Indeed it is proof of CIA perjury.

The last paragraph reports what I learned by my own means that in 1960 E. Howard Hunt was working in the Mullen Agency, using it as a cover.

Director Helms' Watergate committee testimony was that after Hunt retired from the CIA Helms recommended him to the Mullen Agency, which then hired him.

There is no claim to any exemption on the record. There is no redaction of any of its contents. All the rest relates to George DeMohrenschildt.

The legislative history of FOIA is quite explicit in stating that information may not be withheld to avoid disclosing what is embarrassing.