

v. Schiller the FBI Informer

That the Mailer of the ~~of~~ Pulitzers, the tough and independent Mailer, the gifted writer, needed an "associate" in his writing is not easy to understand. ~~Without knowledge of their previous associations~~ Especially not on a book that was to be no more than a ~~recounting~~ ^{rehash} of what the ~~the~~ KGB files ⁱⁿ "ins" hold on Oswald and his wife ^{plus} what those who knew ~~him~~ ^{him} when he lived there would ~~tell~~ ^{say about} him. The formula is a simple one, easy to do for any writer, but for a Mailer, that he would cut someone in on it is not easily understood.

Without knowledge of their previous ^{u/} associations. Of what is known of them ~~and what can be deduced from them~~ that.

Without understanding both of them, which is probably not easy for most of us, ^{if for any!} how Mailer could have anything at all to do with Schiller in Oswald's Tale, is even more incomprehensible in the light of what The New York Daily News quoted him as saying about ~~the~~ Schiller, ~~that~~ "When it comes to lying, Larry Schiller makes Baron von Munchasen look like George Washington."

Compared with what many other have said about Schiller, Mailer's ^{insult} compliment is high praise.

But for most who know anything at all about writing and about Mailer personally and ^{as} a writer, that he had any real need for a Schiller ^{is and} ~~has to be~~ surprising

If Mailer intended writing what was both honest and accurate about the assassination and its investigations,

Schiller had a public record in his commercialization and exploitation of the assassination that no principled writer would fail to recognize was a total disqualification for any honorable ^a association with him and ~~would recognize~~ ~~it~~ would reflect ^{unfavorably} on any ~~his~~ association with a serious book on the subject.

It could also turn reviewers, who are important to the sale and success of any book. Reporters, columnists and editors, too.

Schiller's
The ~~rest of his~~ public record would be ~~is~~ ^{more} ~~is~~ ^{than} ~~more~~ ^{than} a disqualification of

him for any moral, ethical, ^{or} principled writer of any kind or one who wants to be ^{and be regarded} honest. For such a writer any kind of any association with ~~Mailer~~ ^{Schiller} would be impossible.

No, Mailer had no need for Schiller as a writer. Moreover, Schiller has a long and successful record of hiring others to do his writing for him.

Some possible explanations may suggest themselves as we examine what ~~is~~ is public about Mailer's "associate," *Larry Schiller*

Why any wet writer, more a Mailer, would want to have any use for such a "associate" staggers the mind. If he intended honest, accurate writing.

And if Schiller knew anything at all about the JFK assassination or its investigations.

Mailer's plan for the book was to have it almost entirely on Oswald and his life in Minsk. He was to get his information for it from the KGB and its files and from talking to those who had known Oswald in Minsk three decades earlier.

Why would any experienced writer need any help in writing such a book?

And why, if he believed he did, would Mailer pick Schiller of all ~~them~~ people.

That he did, however, leads to examination of Schiller as a person, of his ^{public} record in his public life and of any special knowledge or abilities he has. Or lacks.

Schiller ^{was} the ^{very} first to exploit and commercialize the JFK assassination.

In his second commercialization and exploitation of it, which soon followed the first when he ~~could~~ ^{had} milk ^{ed} it dry, he denounced those who did not agree with the official account of the JFK assassination as "scavengers."

with Schiller's own records ^{and} reporting this requires no research for me because ^{most of what I cite here, as} all I use is in my file on him, is such that to refer to him as the scavenger he is is to demean hyenas and vultures. They differ from Schiller in serving useful public purposes. They eliminate what can lead to infecting and poisoning ^{people} others.

With Schiller it is the exact opposite: he creates and spreads poison and infection of the national mind.

A He did this

For money, for ~~his~~ personal profit, and for making himself attractive to, with ^{the FBI and those others} the JFK assassination, those in official life who first poisoned the national mind and our history, including the commission, and the media

Then, rather than considering himself a writer, he had another do the writing, the sole purpose that other person ^{Richard Warren Lewis} served. Schiller did ^{do} his own interviewing and he taped those interviews himself. *Louis did the writing, as the book itself states,*

With a remarkable instinct for money without regard for how he got it, a talent Schiller continued to develop as he sensed innumerable opportunities, he latched onto the Rubys very early on. As he himself said, he was in Dallas within three and a half hours after the assassination. At first he was truthful in saying that he was there as a hired photographer, under contract with the old Saturday Evening Post. In later versions he was a Post staff photographer and a "photojournalist." So, he was there to make the move, to approach the Rubys when they had the need of an experienced agent. Which Schiller was not, not then.

That two-part project, a ^{phonograph} record and a book, is what got him his first major attention in the media. But three years before that, when he was about 27, by dint of persuasiveness and ~~chutzpah~~ ^{chutzpah}, he became Jack Ruby's agent in money-raising. ^{55A} That he was less of a success at that than he ~~had hoped~~ ^{and} Ruby and his family ~~had hoped~~ ^{Ruby's} may have been because his wheeling and dealing had just ~~begun~~ ^{beginning} as ~~had~~ ^{were} his commercializations of what shocked people. His inexperience and the fact that most people looked down on Ruby may explain it.

The Ruby's got less than half of what they expected. And as the agents Schiller took 35 percent of what he got for the Ruby defense. (14H 475) ^{By his own accounting}
^{Warren} The Commission did not have any great interest in this. It came out in the testimony of Jack's sister, Eva Grant. (15 14H 429-88) She was deposed by Commission counsel Leon Hubert on ^{May} 28, 1964, in the office of the United States Attorney in Dallas. Hubert, formerly ~~District~~ ^{Attorney} of Orleans Parish, which is the City of New Orleans, questioned ^{the} ~~the~~ wrong family member about this but what ^{little} he elicited seems to have been all the ^{Commission} ~~Commission~~ wanted to know. On her testimony about this she began by quoting what her brother Earl had told her about getting Melvin Belli as the lawyer and about his fee:

Mrs. GRANT. Let me explain that part—this is what I know. I was not in San Francisco or Los Angeles. Earl told me this—he says, "You're looking at Belli—\$75,000," and Earl thought you might as well have said \$75 million, but he says, "I will want about \$25,000 to pay my expenses and I think I could write a book and make \$50,000."

Mr. HUBERT. Earl was telling you that?

Mrs. GRANT. Earl told me words that—

Mr. HUBERT. That Belli had told him?

Mrs. GRANT. Yes; and this is what took place in their conversation.

Mr. HUBERT. When you were quoting some sentences there a moment ago, I understood you to mean, and see if I am correct, that Earl was telling you what Belli had told him?

Mrs. GRANT. Yes, and I don't know if there was a contract—I assumed it was agreeable with Earl. Earl already had talked to a fellow by the name of Billy Woodfield, the writer. Billy Woodfield, and don't ask me how they got connected—I know little about these things—he's going to write a short story for Europe, and he probably could help us raise this initial \$25,000 cash. Well, no; he didn't say that—that was for his expenses—he didn't get any money down that day as far as I know.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, the fee was \$75,000, of which he thought—

Mrs. GRANT. He could write a book and retain \$50,000 out of the book, but he would like \$25,000.

Mr. HUBERT. As soon as possible?

Mrs. GRANT. That I don't know—he says for expenses on the case.

Mr. HUBERT. How much was actually paid to him; do you know?

indent +
single
space

*vident
+ single
space*

Mrs. GRANT. Let me tell you this—the short stories were sold in Europe and some in America through newspapers. Each paper paid separately—\$400, \$300, \$600, and the story said, "My story—Jack Ruby." I gave most of the story, Jack gave some of it, but I knew this story—what would you call it—little incidents that happened in his life, some of it, and some part of the story was right on Friday and Saturday the 22d. I gave the whole story, you know, I have newspaper stories of it, and I gave it to Belli, and all these little stories, we were supposed to get \$50,000 from all the different agencies that bought this to put it in their papers—that's how it's done, but we received, I would say to my knowledge, \$23,000.

Mr. HUBERT. How was it handled?

Mrs. GRANT. Earl.

Mr. HUBERT. Earl controlled the funds at that time?

Mrs. GRANT. At that time, yes. It came to the writer and the agent, Larry Schiller and Billy Woodfield. Larry sells the story, Billy wrote the story. You know, you need a writer even though you write.

Mr. HUBERT. I'm talking about the money that came to you?

Mrs. GRANT. Well, they received some money on the west coast but they deposited it in a bank with an escrow deal.

Mr. HUBERT. In what bank and under what name was it?

Mrs. GRANT. Earl will tell you—Earl has papers from the bank.

Mr. HUBERT. You don't know that?

Mrs. GRANT. I know it's in Hollywood and I know Earl says he received about \$23,000.

Mr. HUBERT. It was not handled in Dallas.

Mrs. GRANT. Not to my knowledge—I cent of that.

Mr. HUBERT. But you say that Earl is the one who is handling the money?

Mrs. GRANT. At that time, Earl had power of attorney.

Mr. HUBERT. He had a power of attorney from Jack?

Mrs. GRANT. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, this contract was made for the benefit of Jack, as it were, and the money that came in was put into some escrow agreement and then Earl was able to withdraw from that and sign checks against it by virtue of the power of attorney; is that right?

Mrs. GRANT. That's right, that's right; these people received, I would say, 35 percent.

Mr. HUBERT. Is that correct—the way I put it?

Mrs. GRANT. Yes; but we received ourselves, I think, \$23,000—there may have been \$30,000.

Mr. HUBERT. What happened to the money you did receive?

Mrs. GRANT. Earl has checks that were made out directly to Belli, which I think he himself cashed about \$13,200.

Mr. HUBERT. Who is "he"?

Mrs. GRANT. Mr. Melvin Belli. I do know that the doctors were paid and that may have run to \$3,500, (144-474-5)

Assuming the accountings were full and complete, hardly big-time stiff s/huff. honest

no did his book,
Belli did not do very well either.) As Earl Ruby testified in Dallas, as the Washington Post reported June 9, 1967, he was paid "\$10,000 plus expenses which ran into the thousands." Ruby also ^dsaid the family had become disenchant^d with Belli even before they fired him. "That ^was when he tried to sell pictures of Ruby to Life magazine, Earl Ruby testified. The ~~st~~ new^s account continues, "The Ruby fund collected \$26,000 from the sale of a newspaper series, but expenses have run almost \$59,000, the brother said."

Never one to avoid working both sides, Schiller also sucked up to the FBI at the time it was and he had reason to believe it as concerned about the noises New Orleans

Dedicated to ~~double~~-crossing, ^{Shiller}~~Ruby~~ then also betrayed the trust of the ~~Rubys~~.
Rubys, as we see later in this chaptr.

District Attorney Jim Garrison was ~~was~~ making. By then Schiller had produced a record ~~to~~ which ~~we~~ we return and than had parlayed that into a book in ~~the~~ support of the official mythology and critics of the critics of it. 57A

Special to headquarters
Here, in the words of the Los Angeles Agent in Charge (SAC) is how Schiller began his sucking up:

*Making
a single
piece*

Mr. LAWRENCE SCHILLER, 3064 Elvol Drive, Bel Air, California, who furnished the enclosed information, was interviewed by SA RICHARD M. WOOLF. Mr. SCHILLER initially was interviewed in another matter and volunteered the information contained in the LHM. He noted he had furnished additional information to the Bureau in the nature of correspondence with Bureau Headquarters and as of March 15, 1967, had furnished to the Bureau the identity of an informant used by author MARK LANE. Mr. SCHILLER said he had made the last tape recording of interview with JACK RUBY in Dallas, Texas, hospital and also had made a copy of that complete tape available to the Bureau.

Mr. SCHILLER said he believed he has additional information concerning some homosexual aspects of the individuals involved or mentioned in the investigation of the KENNEDY assassination, but prior commitments on March 16, 1967, precluded him from discussing the matter further. He said he will furnish this information at a later date. He mentioned information concerning alleged lesbian relationship between MARINA OSWALD and RUTH PAYNE and alleged homosexual relation between LEE HARVEY OSWALD and RUTH PAYNE's husband.

[sic]

Dir
REQUEST OF BUREAU

Michael Bailey

Bureau is requested to consider whether SCHILLER's tape of his conversations with GARRISON and [redacted] mentioned in attached LHM are of value to current inquiry and consider requesting New York Office to contact Mr. RICHARD BAILEY, Editor, "Life" magazine, New York City, to have Mr. BAILEY make copy of tape available. Bureau will be furnished any additional information received.

When the FBI ~~did~~ discloses records to any ~~requester~~ requestor ~~and~~ under FOIA, it with assassination records it palces them in its public reading room. When it does not ~~do that there are available there on~~ request. So here were have that fine, upstanding gentleman Schiller telling the FBI, without any proof, that two mothers were lesbians and had such a ~~relationship~~ relationship and that the ~~at~~ fathers of those children had a relationship.

slime And it became available to anyone at all to ~~his~~ misuse in any way at all, with complete immunity. *schiller* And if ~~he~~ every supplied any such proof I've not seen it. *From him or from anyone else*

What Schiller had every reason to believe the FBI would like, as it did, was his stoolpidgeoning on Mark Lane.

It was the agent who interview Schiller who wrote the memo for his SAC. Aside from the original and three copies sent to ~~the~~ headquarters, Los Angeles^e sent copies to the Dallas, Houston, New York and San Francisco offices. Unless it has to do with that other "matter" Woolf interviewed Schiller about, there is no app^arent reason for sending a copy to Houston. In designating to all other offices the nature of the information, and this does not apply to the assass^aination, after each Los Angeles stated "(AM-RM)." I do not recall ever seeing this "AM" code in other FBI records but "RM" means "racial matters." This seems to indicate that Schiller was also stoolpidgeoning on blacks.

The copy of this memo I use here is from the main FBIHQ assassination file. In it ~~is the~~ was marked by the file clerks as Serial 4846. Duplicate filing is indicated in the right margin in five other/headquarters files. One is 94-3-4-205. The 94 file ~~is~~ classification, according to the FBI's official list and identifications of them, ~~are~~^{is} for "Research Matters." This, clearly, is not a "research matter."

At headquarters this file classification is used to hide from search information that ranges from the FBI's lobbying, polite and not so polite political blackmail, leaks to the media and records on it and on its employees, ^{information} some requests by critics of the assassination mythology and even J. Edgar Hoover's correspondence. 94-3-4-205 in other records ^a have can relate to LIFE magazine or to Schiller, as it does here.

The other four duplicate files are all in files classified 105. In those days that file was for "Internal Security-Nationalist Tendency-Foreign Counterintelligence." One of those file numbers ~~is~~ the one for the Oswald record^s, 82555. The other three I do not recognize ~~but~~ but it seems apparent that in addition to ~~his~~ Oswald's ^{Oswald's} wife Marina, who they ^{file under} did have in this classification, ~~it seems like~~ they included the Paines, too.

Nice guy, that Schiller. Who, it should be noted, wrote headquarters the day before his scheduled interview in Los Angeles. He said all these things when he had every reason to expect they would forever be secret outside the FBI.

Part of the same headquarters assassination-file/serial is the its reponse of

March 21. as with all communications from headquarters, the reply, whether or not ~~the~~ the director saw it, was in his name. That also is true of all ^{communications} letters to headquarters. It was actually written by SA Raymond E. Long, then of the General Investigative Division. (Later he ^{became an} ~~was~~ assistant director.) The initial on the copy I have ^{and his best friend} state that Clyde Tolson, next to Hoover in the hierarchy, saw and approved it. That was a usual prelude to ~~him~~ ^{also} having it routed to Hoover. Hoover ~~did~~ ^{initialled} it. It also had the fancy "D" with which DeLoach did his initialling.

Copies were directed to two assistant directors, Alex ~~Rosen~~ Rosen of the General Investigative Division and ^{ed/} William C. Sullivan, who head the Domestic Intelligence Division. Slightly above them was DeLoach, who headed the Crime Records Division. An addition ^{of} copy was sent to that of ~~DeLoach's~~ ^{DeLoach's} "number one" man ^{SA} in it, R.E. Wick.

A copy was indicated for William ^{A.D.} Branigan, who was then chief of the espionage section of the Domestic Intelligence Division, Soviet Section. Copies were also indicate to Kenneth R. Raupach and Robert E. ^{Both} ~~Penihan~~ Penihan who were supervisions in the General Investigative and Domestic Intelligence Divisions.

All of these men were ^{the} ~~deeply~~ ^{involved} in the FBI's assassination ^{investigation} ~~investigation~~. ^{That} ~~which~~ as a ~~practical~~ ^{practical} matter ~~on~~ meant ^{its} non-investigation, because it never investigated the crime itself. It was not ~~in~~ the trivialities Schiller took to it ^{it} ~~currying~~ its favor that ~~got~~ ^{got} all this attention. ~~However~~ The real reason is in the short text:

*What
is
going
on?*

The Bureau does not desire the New York Office to contact Mr. Richard Bailey, Editor, "Life" Magazine, New York City, to obtain a copy of a tape made available to Bailey by Schiller. Bureau has previously received information that "Life" magazine is furnishing some of the funds used by Garrison in his investigation and also that "Life" magazine is considering publication of an article attacking the conclusions of the Warren Commission.

71

~~Long~~ Long indicated 14 copies of this letter. One went to that 94-classification file.

What this reflects is not any interest in Schiller but concern over what the FBI believed LIFE magazine was up to. That could hurt. And that is why all the copies were designated, so many to upper echelons. (I have no reason to believe that LIFE gave Garrison any financial help ^y but it did have an article somewhat critical of the official mythology later that year. The career of the editor who wrote it did not survive publication of his article ^{by} very long. It called for a new investigation. There is little the FBI wanted less. And as Long knew all reading this would understand, when he concludes with reference to the Commission's, not the FBI's conclusions, that is the way the FBI always put it, ^dpretending to distance itself from any responsibility, but in fact any criticism of the Commission's conclusions also reflected on the FBI, which ~~was~~ ^{basic} was first with the ~~for~~ official mythology.

When I first examined these records in 1978 ^{then and thereafter} we made duplicate copies of some, and preserved the originals as I received them for the record for history. We did not make duplicates of most of them, with their volume that ^{for separate filing} was an impossibility. So there are other relevant Schiller records of which I did not make duplicate copies and it is now ^{in them} physically impossible for me to search ^{received} the original files as I received them. Thus the headquarters/serial from the same main/assassination file, 4907, refers to a teletype headquarters/sent Los Angeles before the Long letter quoted above. ~~Thus~~ I cannot ^{now} use it here. But I do have the Los Angeles response by teletype of the day after that headquarters teletyped ~~it~~ it.

Schiller was wise enough to know what headquarters could find useful and cunning enough to get it there. He may or may not have known it but they had no love for him. Over the years he may have changed that and he may have been beginning his campaign to accomplish that in those years. What he also had no way of knowing ^{is} that the FBI was well aware ~~of~~ Clay Shaw's preferences.

Skipping Schiller's finking about Mark Lane, Los Angeles teletyped this:

21

*might
single
page*

SCHILLER HAS ADVISED THAT HE IS ADVOCATE OF VIEWPOINT OF WARREN COMMISSION AND IS OPPOSED TO "IRRESPONSIBLE JOURNALISM" OF WRITERS SUCH AS LAKE. SCHILLER HAS MADE FAVORABLE COMMENTS CONCERNING BUREAU AND WORK OF BUREAU.

FOR INFORMATION OF BUREAU, SCHILLER ADVISED HE HAS KNOWLEDGE OF A WRITER WHO IS PREPARING ARTICLE UNDER CONTRACT VIA "NEW YORKER" MAGAZINE. SCHILLER SAID HE PROBABLY COULD MAKE IDENTITY OF WRITER AVAILABLE AT FUTURE DATE. ARTICLE ALLEGEDLY WILL INCLUDE FOLLOWING TYPE OF INFORMATION: ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE U.S. RECENTLY COMMENTED FBI HAD MADE COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF CLAY SHAW AND IN EFFECT CLEARED SHAW. WRITER MADE SEARCH OF MATERIAL AVAILABLE IN NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND FAILED TO LOCATE REFERENCE IN ANY FBI MATERIAL TO SHAW. WRITER RECOGNIZES CLASSIFIED MATERIAL PROBABLY NOT AVAILABLE. HOWEVER, WRITER INTERVIEWED FORMER STAFF MEMBER OF WARREN COMMISSION WHO ALLEGEDLY HAD ASSIGNMENT OF READING ALL FBI REPORTS. IDENTITY OF THIS PERSON NOT KNOWN TO SCHILLER. BECAUSE FBI DID NOT FURNISH INDEX OF NAMES IN REPORTS, STAFF MEMBER MADE INDEX FOR COMMISSION OR FOR PERSONAL REASONS OF ALL NAMES IN FBI REPORTS RECEIVED BY COMMISSION INCLUDING CLASSIFIED REPORTS. INTERVIEW OF STAFF MEMBER DETERMINED THAT NAME OF SHAW ALLEGEDLY NOT CONTAINED IN THIS INDICES. ARTICLE WILL ALLEGE ABSENCE OF INDEX REFERENCE POSSIBLY SUGGESTS FBI WITHHELD SHAW INFORMATION FROM WARREN COMMISSION. ARTICLE WILL SUGGEST THAT IF FBI WITHHELD SHAW REPORTS MAYBE ADDITIONAL, PERTINENT INFORMATION WITHHELD.

SCHILLER ADDITIONALLY VOLUNTEERED THAT THREE HOMOSEXUAL SOURCES IN NEW ORLEANS AND TWO HOMOSEXUAL SOURCES IN SAN FRANCISCO HAVE INDICATED THAT CLAY SHAW WAS KNOWN BY OTHER NAMES INCLUDING THE NAME OF CLAY BERTRAND. SCHILLER SAID THESE SOURCES WOULD NOT GIVE HIM STATEMENTS CONCERNING THIS INFORMATION AND REFUSED TO BE IDENTIFIED AS SOURCES OF THIS INFORMATION. SCHILLER SAID HE COULD NOT VOLUNTEER IDENTITY OF THESE HOMOSEXUAL SOURCES TO THE FBI AT THIS

SCHILLER FURTHER ADVISED THAT RUMOR IN LOS ANGELES ATTRIBUTED TO ED GUTHMAN, FORMER JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

[Handwritten mark]

indicate enough space
 official, and currently associated with the Los Angeles Times, indicateds FBI has identified Clay A Shaw and Clay Bertrand as being same person."

Whether or not Schiller ~~was~~ was aware of the FBI's dislikes Guthman, who had been Robert Kennedy's information officer when he was attorney general. I have some records in which the FBI actually blamed its own leaking on Guthman!

The fact is that it was the FBI which had told Ramsey Clark what Schiller attributes to Guthman, ~~He~~ could easily have ~~known~~ ^{acting attorney general} gotten that information from the Times' Washington bureau it was earlier that month and it was the day of ~~his~~ ^{Clark's} confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee when Clark ^{was} asked the question that he did tell the press that Shaw and Bertrand had been identified ^{by the FBI} as one person.

What could have given the FBI a few problems was Schiller having proof, as the FBI did and then ~~he~~ withheld it. ~~pick up with it quote and then use record in blue folder.~~

It was kissing FBI ass when Schiller told its Los Angeles office that "he is ^{an} advocate of viewpoint of Warren Commission" but Los Angeles, knowing how much headquarters like that, ^{reported} ~~did~~ it in this teletype. That ~~a~~ was also a more favorable introduction for more of Schiller's volunteer spying for the FBI about the ^{supposed by} coming magazine article he knew the FBI would like.

This from the man who condemned those who do not agree with the official assassination mythology as ^{ir}irresponsible journalists."

Schiller, like all others, was never in a position to "search" at the Archives, like all of us he could do no more than ask those in that archive if they had any information on Shaw. ^{Schiller} He did not, dedicated and ~~self~~ serving liar that he is, "fail" to find any. The archivists told them there was none. But in fact that was not true. The FBI in New Orleans did make and report a perfunctory Shaw investigation and withheld what I later got ^{headquarters} from it. I made the same "search" Schiller claims to have made, as did Tom Bethell, then working for Garrison. I introduced Bethell to the Archives.

There is no "index" of names in (these FBI) reports" because the third man in rank on the staff, Howard Willens, ^{by indexes sent to the Commission by the Archives} killed the indexing that was barely begun soon after he

was loaned to the Commission by the Justice Department. I was told this by the man then in charge of that archive, Marion Johnson. Johnson was both an archivist and a lawyer. Department of Justice ^{records} information I obtained later reflect that the then Number Two ^{his deputy, Nicholas Katzenbach.} ~~man~~ in Justice, on this subject, ~~the~~ top man because Robert Kennedy had completely disassociated himself from that area of work. ~~Nicholas~~ Katzenbach, decided to lend the Commission some one who would be his "eyes and ears" on its staff.

But ~~his~~ ^{Schiller's saying} reporting that the article "will suggest that FBI withheld Shaw reports" could have given it some concern because it had. It even lied ^{with indignation} (when Clark told the press his source on ~~Shaw~~ Shaw and Bertrand being "one and the same" was the FBI.

It could have been concerned over the supposedly ^{homosexual} coming five persons' ~~whom~~ ~~know~~ identifications of Shaw as as Bertrand.

At the very moment of the Clark confirmation testimony ^{on March 2, 1967,} the FBI headquarters prepared a memo bringing Clark up to date. It is in the ~~head~~ quarters main assassination file, 62, 62-109060, where it is Serial ~~470~~ 4720. With Shaw dead and the fact that he was well and publicly known as a homosexual in New Orleans I see no reason not to use ^{it} the first two paragraphs that refer to Shaw.

That Shaw was a sadomasochist was also fairly well known. I had two sources on that and did not use it in my Oswald In New Orleans, which was largely written by the time of this memo. One was ^{late} my step-brother, Dr. Jack ~~de~~ety, who got his medical education and training in New Orleans before setting up private practise in nearby Covington. He did not discriminate against strange people, For a while, David Ferrie was a patient of his. The other was one of the detectives who executed the search warrant on Shaw's French Quarter home, Lyn Loisel.

Despite the later ~~alleg~~ complaints against Garrison for allegedly disclosing what that search yielded, that was not true, ^{AV} reporter, knowing that the returns on such searches under ~~warrant~~ must be filed with the court, checked that court's records.

Loisel told me what is not in the return on the warrant, that there were methuene ⁱⁿ in the ceiling of Shaw's bedroom with smudges all around them looking like fingerprints. That Shaw's home also held whip, chains and ^{strange} ~~strange~~ garments was in the return ~~in~~ the

Search

warrant. When this was published Shaw's counsel said they were props for his participation in the Mardi Gras parades so important in New Orleans.

This is how that memo begins:

undent & single space

This Bureau received allegations as early as 1954 that Clay Shaw, former managing director of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans, Louisiana, was a homosexual. One source informed this Bureau on March 19, 1964, that he has had relations of a homosexual nature with Clay Shaw. The source described Shaw as a brilliant and powerful man, given to sadism and masochism in his homosexual activities. On February 24, 1967, we received information from two other sources that information available to them led them to believe Clay Shaw has homosexual tendencies.

On February 24, 1967, we received information from two sources that Clay Shaw reportedly is identical with an individual by the name of Clay Bertrand, who allegedly was in contact with Dean Andrews, a New Orleans attorney, in connection with Lee Harvey Oswald, the facts of which are as follows:

A source who participated in ~~Sasha~~ Shaw's sado-masochism was a good source. The FBI had two other sources. If it had wanted to it could have had more. It was so well known in New Orleans that ~~Jack~~ ~~age~~ gave me the name of the homosexual who first took Shaw under his wing and got him started on his career in business and in the New Orleans International Trade Mart. Shaw was also an heir of his.

I have no way of knowing what Dean Andrews told the FBI. Andrews and I had a friendly relationship. He did tell me that ~~Shaw~~ and Bertrand were one. I then had ~~not~~ written all of Oswald in New Orleans but I did not add that to the final chapter of it that I wrote after my first trip to New Orleans, when ~~Jack~~ and ~~Travis~~ both told me.

I also do not know why the FBI was so uptight about this, unless it wanted nothing to confirm anything Garrison said. But it was so uptight about it that it lied under oath to the court in my CA ~~720~~ 78-0420 in denying that it had any Shaw records in its New Orleans office. A specific item of that request ~~was~~ ^{being} litigated asked for all such records.

But then the FBI never ^{d/}worry about swearing falsely in FOIA cases to the courts.

(In one of its ^{d,} "defenses" of ~~my~~ my many attestations to its perjury, in which I

myself subject to the penalties of perjury if I ^{lied} ~~lie~~, it stated and Judge John Pratt accepted as a ~~def~~ defense of my perjury charge, that I could make such charges

"ad infinitum since ^{he} [meaning ^{it} ~~it~~] is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the F.B.I." (The names missing were redacted by the FBI to protect privacy).

So, in cottoning up to the FBI, as its Los Angeles office had no way of knowing, Schiller was not telling it anything it did not know about Shaw.

The Los Angeles FBI sent headquarters more ~~informa~~ of what it got from Schiller by mail. I did not make a duplicate copy of this record from the FBI files when they were disclosed to me but Paul Hoch sent me two pages of this memo. The first is mis-

sing in my file. What follows begins with the top of the second page. it should be noted ^{as} that ^{top} as a self-appointed spy for the FBI Schiller also included spying on John Garrison for it. This appears to be what Schiller does not regard as "irresponsible journalism":

66

Malden
Springer
Space

The apartment apparently is listed under [redacted] name. [redacted] is a steward in the Merchant Marine and has known Shaw since 1959. [redacted] visited in Shaw's home in New Orleans as recent as four weeks ago, is a close friend of Shaw's, and has received money from Shaw.

Schiller learned that [redacted] and Shaw were in the San Francisco hotel room the night of November 21 and the morning of November 22, 1963. Shaw received a telephone call at the hotel room on the morning of November 22, 1963, apparently from one Richard Randoff, 435 Frederick Street, San Francisco. In the call, Shaw was advised that President Kennedy had been shot. In [redacted] opinion, Shaw reacted as though it was an accepted fact that the President had been killed although the news media did not announce the death of the President until about one hour later. Shaw immediately made several telephone calls from the hotel room. [redacted] was not aware of the identity of the individuals called or the subject matter of the conversations.

Schiller said that on March 9, 1967, he was in Las Vegas, Nevada, with [redacted] running out additional investigation in this matter and learned that District Attorney Jim Garrison was in Las Vegas at the same time ostensibly on a vacation but in fact to interview a source. Schiller made an appointment and talked with Garrison in Garrison's hotel room at about 11:00 p.m. on March 9, 1967. [redacted] accompanied Schiller on this appointment. Garrison questioned [redacted] concerning his knowledge of Shaw, but [redacted] refused to discuss the matter with Garrison, according to Schiller.

Schiller said he learned from Garrison that Garrison's theory of the assassination is on a "homophile" basis, and Garrison is of the opinion that Jack Ruby is part of the conspiracy. Garrison did not mention names to Schiller but described three witnesses to Schiller that he apparently plans to present to the grand jury which witnesses have not been utilized to Schiller's knowledge as of March 16, 1967.

1144
The FBI was interested in getting all it could about Lane and his sources and there Schiller was helpful to it in identifying ^{one of} his source^s, a former Fort Worth *(Schiller identified the wrong paper as the one in which he had worked.)* reporter, Thayer Waldo. Waldo was then doing public relations for The University of the Americas in Mexico City. Sox, telling its Legat in Mexico City that Waldo was an alcoholic, it instructed that he be interviewed. In this two-page cablegram ^{of "arch 30"} written by Rapuch, with 12 copies indicated, of which eight were to be sent to assistant directors and their top staff people, (62-109060-4919), the Legat was "instructed" to "obtain all information in Waldo's possession," to handle it "expeditiously and SUCAB" which

means by cable, a summary, and follow it "by LHM suitable for dissemination" by headquarters. An "LHM" is a letterhead memo, not one on plain paper, and what is "suitable for dissemination" meant to omit what the FBI would give others in the government, what headquarters would not want the rest of the government to know.

But
Despite his valiant and repeated efforts Schiller did not make the FBI love him.

The FBI's review of his book with the self-descriptive title, "The Scavengers," dismissed Schiller and ~~he~~ hired his hired writer, ^{Warren} Richard Lewis as engaged on nothing more than a commercialization of the assassination, "It is obviously a commercial ~~venture~~ venture ... to capitalize on criticism of the Warren Report." That concluding paragraph after seven single-spaced pages says there is nothing new in the book, it "has no new facts," and more of a condemnation of Schiller's enterprise, it is "nothing more than a rehash of the same old story." (62-109060-595)

Only five copies were made, three for DeLoach and the two under him on this project, plus copies for assistant directors Sullivan and Rosen.

SA M.A. Jones, who wrote the memo to Wick, does include a few of the old criticisms of some of the critics. ^{on} Jones did include references to Schiller's earlier double-crossing of Ruby and his defense and his spying on them for the FBI when he was their trusted business agent, and it ^{refutes} ~~debunks~~ Schiller's later claim that he went to Dallas as a Saturday Evening Post "staff" photographer:

*indent
single
space*

No record in Bufiles on author Richard Warren Lewis. Several references on Lawrence Schiller, who is a contract photographer for the "Saturday Evening Post." Bureau Agent interviewed him on 3-5-64 relative to Schiller advising Jack Ruby's attorney Tom Howard that the "Post" was interested in a story which would be of mutual benefit to the "Post" and to Howard's client, Ruby. Schiller was very cooperative. Later he sent a transcript of Ruby's conversation with his attorneys and his family. He offered Director a copy of the tape. Mr. Hoover thanked him for transcript and declined tape. identity of Mark Lane's confidential informant *anti*

So the FBI itself is authority for the fact that Schiller had no knowledge of the ~~assassination~~ ^{not already public or was} or of the critics of it that was ^{of} any value at all. It describes him as no more than an exploiter and commercializer of the assassination. ⁹ So Mailer did not make Schiller his "associate" in Oswald's Tale because he is an assassination ^{subject} ~~subject~~, which he is not. While its records portray Schiller as a man who is without principle or ~~scruple~~ ^{scruple}, an instinctive traitor to those who trust him and a man who ~~is~~ is capable of any dishonorable act if he thinks that will ~~serve~~ ^{serve} any interest he may have at any time, ^a real and practicing double-crosser, none of this was new to Mailer by the time he made Schiller his "associate" on the book that was so well characterized by the FBI in its dismissal of ^{book} Schiller's ^{of} almost three decades earlier, as an exploitation of the assassination for money and with nothing new in it at all about the ~~assassination~~ assassination or about Oswald.

Whatever Mailer's reason may have been he did not make it ~~not~~ ^{without} knowing ^{what} Schiller's reputation and his past ^{very well}. They ^d used each other for about two decades.

When someone was here who could check the Index I have to the Dallas records for the year and half or so after the assassination the number of document listings under Schiller's name totals twenty-eight. The headquarters copies of these records reflect that as many as ~~and~~ half-dozen FBI offices got copies, ~~the~~ at headquarters as many as 10 copies were made for those under the top echelon and then as many ~~as~~ another ten saw and initialled the file copy. That they were also seen by top FBI brass is reflected by their initials on the file copy. That Hoover also saw them is certain because of his distinctive initialing and his succinct order on a Schiller letter saying he could identify someone who was a source for "ark Lane with the terse, "get it."

These records indicate that the FBI did not seek Schiller out, not once, and that he seemed to be going out of his way to stoopidgeon to the FBI what he correctly guessed it would want. In this he was long on his allegations of homosexuality in which he gave the FBI names it redacted.

He was diligent and determined as a voluntary informer for the FBI. He went to it as an informer who, with the exception of what he told the FBI about Clay Shaw, did all he could to undermine any criticism of the official assassination mythology and to malign those critical of it.

In these records he is self-portrayed as a real stinker, as a man capable of any indecency if he believed that at some point it might do him some good.

He was not what the FBI regards as an informer. To it he as a source. The FBI has its own artificial distinctions of what makes what it never refers to as an informant and always refers to as an informant. All the FBI's informers are referred to in its records as "symbol informants." That is because those who work for it in that sneaky business are paid and are identified in its records by an arbitrary symbol. The first two letters are those by which that office is identified, like BH for Birmingham. They are followed by four digits uniquely assigned to that fink. Then there is a letter or letters identifying the kind of informer, C for criminal, S for security, which really mean a political spy, etc. Engaging any informer requires headquarters approval for the period of probation, when "P" is added at the end of the informer's symbol,

where it remains for the period of probation, usually about six months. At the end of the probation ~~head~~ headquarters ~~decides~~ decides whether the informer will be made a regular stoolpidgeon and if so, the amount to ^{be} paid.

In fairness to Schiller, ^{something foreign to} what is strange ~~for~~ him with regard to others, these FBI records do reflect the fact that he was not a paid, formal ~~an~~ informer.

Only a self-seeking nasty, trouble-making fink.

Kyattstown, Maryland 20734
January 7, 1967

Mr. Lawrence Schiller
Capitol Records
1750 Vine Street
Hollywood, California

Dear Larry:

When you interviewed me, I told you I am easily gulled. You proved it.

Last night I heard your Revolving Whitewash. It is less honorable than the government's whitewash or Manchester's unofficial one. It is a shameful betrayal of the trust of decent people, all of whom at great personal cost are engaged in the most distasteful work an American can do, to guarantee the right of intellectual finks to defame them. It is your freedom and the recapture of your honor (assuming you had some to lose) they seek.

You told me your purpose was scholarly, to make a document for universities. What you did defames the gutter. In a field in which distortion and misrepresentation, dishonesty and deceit yield fame and fortune, you have achieved preeminence by a simple, straightforward device: you pretended to be a decent guy in need of help in doing a worthwhile thing. All the people you slandered had no time but found time for you, without thought of profit, to try and help. What a shabby repayment!

You and Capitol Records talk of "scavengers" and of being unbiased? The word "love" in the mouth of a whore is more faithful.

I spoke to you in confidence. That confidence has now been breached twice. I therefore ask that you return all copies of whatever form of my interview. To cover you, I hereby state that the few words you so carefully culled from the hour and a half you taped are words I actually uttered. I expect you to see to it that no other use whatsoever is made by anyone, under any circumstances, of this interview.

If you retain a shred of self-respect, you will recall this monstrous injustice immediately.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the president of Capitol Records.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg