

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DIRECTORATE CANDIDATE TO DISCUSS KERMIT ROOSEVELT MANUSCRIPT

FROM: [Redacted]	EXTENSION NO. [Redacted]	DATE
		26 July 1978

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		

1. DDO	27 JUL	1978	J	<p>John: The attached speed letter seems to be the most expeditious way to get a proposal to you for the handling of the next step in the negotiations with Kermit Roosevelt on his manuscript, now being considered by the Publications Review Board.</p> <p>Agree re [Redacted] but I will not approve any publication which in any way refers to CIA activities abroad.</p>
2.				
3.				
4. [Redacted] via C/IMS	28/7/78		[Redacted]	
5. [Redacted]				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

501012-6211/1

SPEED LETTER

REPLY REQUESTED

DATE

26 July 1978

YES

NO

LETTER NO.

TO : John Mc Mahon
ATTN: Deputy Director for Operations

FROM: [redacted]
DO Alternate, Publications
Review Board

1. C/IMS has outlined for you some of the objections that this Directorate has to a book manuscript which Kermit Roosevelt has submitted to the Publications Review Board for approval. Other objections are outlined in C/IMS' memorandum to the PRB, a copy of which is attached.

2. The PRB on 25 July authorized the OGC advisor [redacted] to contact Roosevelt to convey to him that we have "major problems" with the manuscript. Out of consideration for Roosevelt's role in the events that he describes (the overthrow of the Mossadegh regime in Iran in 1953), the PRB asked [redacted] to arrange for [redacted] and a DO representative to discuss our objections with Roosevelt at his convenience. Roosevelt chose Tuesday, 1 August and Nantucket Island (where he now is) as the time and place. From the Agency's standpoint, the purpose of the discussion is to bring Roosevelt to understand the legal and statutory bases for our objections. In the longer term, our hope is to avoid litigation.

3. The thrust of the DO argumentation can be most effectively placed, given earlier court decisions, [redacted]

SIGNATURE

REPLY

DATE

[redacted] Additionally, of course, our other objections are soundly based, relying essentially on the statutory requirement to protect sources and methods.

4. To accompany [redacted] in the meeting, I propose that you assign [redacted] [redacted] has the distinct advantages, additionally, of (a) having read the manuscript, (b) knowing Roosevelt socially, (c) direct awareness [redacted] and (d) knowledge of disclosure law exemptions in general.

5. John Waller, who served in NE contemporaneously with Roosevelt, is a possible representative but he has other concerns and prefers not to participate at this stage. David Blee has area awareness and would reluctantly brief himself to play a role. I, of course, have technical knowledge of details but Roosevelt probably would not even know my name.

6. Since it is possible that, at a later date, you may have to take a direct part in negotiations or litigation, may I have your approval of paragraph four or other preferences?

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

RETURN TO ORIGINATOR

