

DATE: 11-14-2017

JFK Assassination System
Identification Form

Date: 5/1/2015

Agency Information

AGENCY : FBI
RECORD NUMBER : 124-10283-10484

RECORD SERIES : HQ

AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 100-401762-1ST NR 69

Document Information

ORIGINATOR : FBI
FROM : LEG, LO
TO : DIRECTOR, FBI

TITLE :

DATE : 04/20/1964
PAGES : 5

SUBJECTS :
[Restricted]

DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT
CLASSIFICATION : Top Secret
RESTRICTIONS : 4
CURRENT STATUS : Redact
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 03/19/1996

OPENING CRITERIA : INDEFINITE

COMMENTS : INC LTR

Director, FBI

TOP SECRET

4/20/64

Legat, London

SUSAN HEILIGMAN FRANK
IS - CH
Bufile 100-339235
Lonfile 100-2198 (RUC)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
EXCEPT WHERE SHOWN
OTHERWISE

RICHARD CYRIL FRANK
IS - CH
Bufile 100-401762
Lonfile 100-1695 (RUC)

10/26/94
Classified by SP8 mac/gcl
Declassify on: OADR (JFK)

ReBulet 2/18/64 enclosing NY letters 1/27/64, 1/29/64 and NY LHM 2/18/64 [instructing London to contact sources, request coverage be assured JACK PERRY and TANG Ming-chou; ascertain contacts these individuals may have with Chinese Communists, the FRANKS, other U.S. residents, and to be sure the British understand the importance of the Bureau's efforts to penetrate Chinese Communist Intelligence.] (S)

[London, by letter dated 2/27/64 to British Security Service, MI-5, furnished a copy of New York LHM 2/18/64 and made known the desires of the Bureau. Subsequently, this matter was thoroughly discussed with RALPH WHITBY, MI-5 officer on the Chinese Desk.] (S) [As a result of the discussions, WHITBY by letter dated 4/13/64, classified TOP SECRET, furnished his analysis and conclusions concerning all subjects. Three copies of WHITBY's letter are enclosed herein to the Bureau.] (S)

London indices denote that the Bureau in the past has had direct correspondence with MI-5 through MI-5's Washington representative regarding TANG Ming-chao and ISRAEL EPSTEIN; however, London files have been destroyed. (S)

- 4 - Bureau (Enc. 3)
- 1 - Liaison (sent direct)
- 1 - London 100-2198
- 1 - London 100-1695
- 1 - London 105-1151 (Jack Perry) (P)
- 1 - London 105-1743 (Tang-Mingchao) (RUC)
- 1 - London 105-1744 (Israel Epstein) (RUC)

JTM:vw
(10)

100-401762-
NOT RECORDED
128 APR 23 1964

72 MAY 1964
ENCLOSURE

TOP SECRET

100-339235-164
ORIGINAL FILED IN

339-10081

DATE: 11-14-2017

London 100-2198, 100-1695

TOP SECRET

In view of this and MI-5's request (page 3, paragraph 9, of enclosed letter) to treat its information with the utmost discretion, the information in the enclosures has not been incorporated in LHM form. (S)

It is suggested that copies of the enclosure be disseminated to the New York Office with a request that the information be analyzed in conjunction with complete information available to the Bureau and New York. Any information developed as a result of such analysis that would be of interest and assistance to this office and MI-5 should be furnished in a form suitable for dissemination. (S)

It is noted that MI-5 states its coverage of PERRY is quite good but it is seeking ways of improving it. (S) For the Bureau's information only, WHITEBY orally and confidentially advised he would attempt to have a mail cover placed on PERRY and if successful, furnish this office results of U.S. interest. (S)

Since TANG-Ming-chao and the EPSTEINS are resident in China and the FRANKS are in the U.S., London files concerning them are being RUC, (to be reopened if MI-5 furnishes pertinent information regarding them.) (S)

PERRY's file remains pending (to be closely followed with MI-5) and the Bureau will be kept advised. (S)

-2-

TOP SECRET

100-401762-

383-100000

TOP SECRET

Correspondence to this address must be under double cover.
This outer envelope should be addressed to:
THE SECRETARY, BOX 500, PARLIAMENT STREET B.O., LONDON, S.W.1
and not to any individual.

Telephone Nos. REGENT 6030
WHITEHALL 6789



BOX No. 500,
PARLIAMENT STREET B.O.,
LONDON, S.W.1

Our Ref. SP.411/18A/10 (277)
Your Ref. No. 11443-100-1595

15th April, 1964.

Dear Claude

Thank you for your letter of 27th February, 1964, the contents of which I discussed with John Minnich on 1st April, 1964. I agree to provide a note on the most recent information available here on the various persons mentioned with special reference, where applicable, to their known contacts with Chinese Communists.

2. The pattern of the business activities of Jack PERRY have remained essentially the same as outlined in Phillip Osmond's letter. The London Export Corporation (L.E.C.) with the British Council for the Promotion of International Trade (B.C.P.I.T.) are in the forefront of the movement for the expansion of trade with China. As a result, the firm's relations with the Chinese are very good, and its more senior members are in close and frequent contact with the Commercial Section of the Chinese Diplomatic Mission (C.D.M.). One of the consequences of this association has been that PERRY supports the Chinese line in the Sino Soviet dispute and with the connivance of the Commercial Section has been instrumental in distributing New China News Agency (N.C.N.A.) propaganda on the subject. PERRY's contacts are not limited to the Commercial Section and in recent months he has acted for the L.E.C. advising the C.D.M. on questions of office and residential accommodation. Amongst those members of the C.D.M. with whom PERRY is known to be in touch and apparently on good terms are one suspected and two identified Intelligence Officers (I.O.)

3. We would agree that the TAI MING-CHOU mentioned in your letter is almost certainly identical with TANG MING-CHOU (0701/2434/356). TANG was born in Kwangtung in 1910. At the age of ten, he went to the U.S.A. where he remained for close on thirty years. His activities there are well documented for he is said at one time to have edited the "China Daily News" and to have been regarded at the Headquarters of the C.P.U.S.A. as a specialist in Far Eastern Affairs. He returned to the Mainland some time after 1949 and in 1952 was reported to be working in the Foreign Affairs Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peking. In October 1953 he was described as the Deputy Head of the Liaison Department of the Chinese Communist Committee. In November, 1953, he attended the 1st Session of the (Comm) Executive Committee of the World Council for Peace (W.C.P.) in Vienna. In April 1955, he attended the Asian Nations Conference in New Delhi. A report dated February 1956 described him as a member of the Department for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. In April 1955, he was a member of the Chinese delegation to the Congress of the Communist Party of New Zealand. He is currently the Vice Chairman of the Editorial Board of "China Today" and a member of the China Peace Committee and of the World Peace Council. You may recall that as a member of the Chinese delegation to the World Peace Congress in Warsaw in 1954, he caused a sensation by protesting against the Congress paying tribute to the memory of President Kennedy. We have no information to suggest that he is currently in contact with any of the I.O.s mentioned in your letter.

ENCLOSURE

100-401762

He visited the U.S.A. in 1958 and in 1961. On the last of his visits the object of his visit was not immediately apparent but it was mainly concerned to establish a "bridge" between the Chinese and the U.S.A. in the field of cultural relations.

TOP SECRET

Correspondence to this address must be under double cover

The outer envelope should be addressed to —

THE SECRETARY, BOX 500, PARLIAMENT STREET D.O. LONDON, S.W.1.

and not to any individual

Telephone Nos.

REGENT 6080
WHITEHALL 6789



BOX No. 500
PARLIAMENT STREET B.O.,
LONDON, S.W.1.

Our Ref.

Your Ref.

-3-

Professor Barmel. He took the opportunity to make contact with a number of prominent supporters of the Chinese line. He was entertained to dinner by Jack PERRY, and in this particular context, it is of interest to note that arrangements for his visit appear to have been handled in the C.D.M. by those I.O.s with whom PERRY is known to be in contact.

5. There has been correspondence about Israel Epstein in the past under your reference 7334/100/1209 of 17th April, 1956, and our reference SF.197/China of 1st October, 1956, W.F.96,067 of 14th May, 1956, and PP.74,757 of 10th April, 1959. EPSTEIN and his wife, Si-ta have resided in China as employees of the Foreign Language Press. EPSTEIN is said currently to be the Editor of "China Reconstructs". Both retain their Chinese nationality. They re-visited this country between July and October, 1963. As might be expected, they expressed themselves in favour of the current Chinese line, contacted pro-C.P.C. elements and were in touch with the C.D.M. where they were dealt with by the suspected I.O. mentioned in paragraph 2. Their visit to this country coincided with attempts by the C.D.M. to recruit non-Chinese for service in the Foreign Language Press, Peking, as a means of increasing the flow of C.P.C. propaganda to the West and there is evidence to show that EPSTEIN influenced at least one person to apply for such a post.

6. Mary Jane KERRY as you know arrived in this country on 27th July, 1963, and departed on 15th September, 1963. Immediately on her arrival and again on at least two other occasions she was in touch with the Consular Department of the C.D.M. in circumstances that suggest that she applied for and probably received a visa to visit China.

7. In the preceding paragraphs, mention has been made of contacts with officers, identified or suspected of the Chinese Intelligence Service (CH.I.S.). Some of these contacts at least can be explained away in terms of the cover activities e.g. commercial, cultural etc., of the individual I.O.s or of the Chinese cultivation of support in the Sino Soviet dispute. The position of Jack PERRY, however, vis a vis the Chinese I.O.s is not entirely clear and warrants further investigation. Although our coverage of his activities is quite good, we are seeking ways of improving upon it and it is to be hoped that as a result some information might be thrown up on his relations with the FRANKS. The others are beyond our immediate reach.

8. I discussed with John Kirsch the significance of the numbers shown in your letter alongside the names of TANG and EPSTEIN. We could read no significance into them other than that they might be telephone numbers. Since they do not correspond to any system of telephone numbers in this country and they are probably too complex for any current Chinese system, we agreed that they might refer to telephone numbers in the U.S.A. where both persons have been resident for a considerable time and where no doubt they first came into contact with the FRANKS.

/...cont...

TOP SECRET

