

*Oswald agent in DCF*

What the FBI's Inspector General was not looking for and did get <sup>is</sup> referred to in an FBI memo headed "U.S. Senate Select Committee <sup>to</sup> Study Governmental Operations with <sup>s</sup> respect to Intelligence Activities (SSC)" (The FBI file is 62-116395) It is dated December 31, 1975.

In response to Item 15 of the SSC's requests for information this memo states that "the only Bureau official who claimed to have any knowledge of such a visit (Oswald to the Dallas office) was W.C. Sullivan. ..." In fact the IG's report mentioned also Belmont and Rosen. *and see below about Sullivan*

One of those agents interviewed in Dallas <sup>a</sup> was Joe A. Pearce." The SSC's "Item 16 requests all materials, reports, any analysis <sup>i</sup> or inquiries conducted as a result of the statement by SA Joe A. Pearce that 'Oswald was an informant or source of SA Hosty....'"

The memo says next what is not so, that "this allegation concerning Oswald's being a source or informant of SA Hosty was looked into by the President's Commission, and there was no substance ~~to what~~ whatsoever to this particular claim."

The Commission knew nothing at all about SA Pearce and what he said so it could not have looked into that. *and it did not.*

The previously referred to FBI damage control tickler <sup>#12</sup> refers to this Hosty note destruction under 1. B.3. <sup>#1</sup> which reads, "Hosty note destruction: handling by Bureau on Nov. 24 and effects in subsequent days." *So, obviously, FBIHQ did know all about it all along. FBIHQ handled it as soon as Oswald was dead and Attorney General would be the trial.*

Under 2.C.(6) it says, "Hosty note destruction: Sullivan's lack of knowledge." *Obviously, the opposite of what this SSC memo says. They have their usual trouble with truth.* Again "Bureau" is the FBI shorthand for its headquarters. This tickler states that the "destruction" of that letter was handled by it November, 24, which is the day Oswald was killed and they knew there would not be any trial.

It simply is not possible that anyone at headquarters would have risked Hoover's wrath by doing any such thing without specific instructions from Hoover or would make himself part of a conspiracy to violate the law, which that destruction represented.

6/1/96

LeFontaine insert/correction.

Where I say that Hudkins was not a post columnist I omitted the word "only" that should precede it. He <sup>was</sup> as a reporter and he had three ~~of~~ columns a week.

Or, perhaps better, just remove reference to columnist.

Hosty in art?

Hosty did more than anyone outside the government to promote his impossible, really irrational conviction<sup>sup</sup> that Oswald was a tool of the Cubans, the Russians or both,

witness<sup>and</sup> witness what? ONLY that supposed "meeting" with Kostikov of the supposed KGB connection <sup>and</sup> <sup>assassination</sup> at his supposed specialty in it. This is consistent with the and prejudice ignorance on which his political beliefs are based. He may have attracted more

attention to this political conviction of his than anyone inside the government, too. It is because of this large-scale<sup>rest</sup> and enormous misdirection of interest<sup>rest</sup> in the assassination itself that I had this long interest in him and what he said.

Whether or not that figured in the ~~atypical~~ atypical FBI failure to fire him because of <sup>the</sup> his many embarrassments he caused it, his seeking and getting attention for his zany beliefs, that the FBI did not fire him for all he said publicly, including about it, also grabbed attention. His political ~~in~~ invention was consistent with the FBI's party line, so to speak, on alleged <sup>Oswald's</sup> communism and on Cuba and the USSR. He was saying what the FBI could not say because the <sup>As founding</sup> ~~found~~ director's <sup>"solution"</sup> ~~instant~~ vision was off a lone nut assassin. It also could not and did not publicly dispute the Warren Commission's conclusions. It responded to criticism of it by referring<sup>2</sup> to the Commission's conclusions as supporting its conclusion even though the FBI's explanation of the shooting disagree with that basic Commission conclusion of the single bullet theory.

<sup>Hosty's</sup> His political insanity of his Mexico City/ KGB and/or Mexico City/ Cuban plot to kill the President, which as we have ~~seen~~ seen is without even a legitimate basis for suspicion, was attractive to a number of other writers, especially in ~~this~~ their books. Of them I have addressed the more sophisticated of them in several manuscripts. Those interested in more ~~at~~ detail will find it in those completed manuscript written as a record for our history. I deal with <sup>this</sup> it at length in Inside the JFK assassination industry Mark Riebling, who had been a Random House editor, based his book Wedge on this Hosty mythology. That imagined <sup>w</sup> "edge" of Rieblings is what he said resulted from the FBI's refusal to go for this <sup>g</sup> Hosty mythology in its earlier days.

*H, in Inside*

The JFK Assassination Industry. There also I report on the stalwart support for the official assassination mythology by the Random House book-publishing empire, which is a sub-empire of the Newhouse empire, <sup>it began</sup> which is based in that family's newspaper interest. There is more detail on this in the manuscript Mailer's Tales, of the JFK Assassination. Norman Mailer's ~~case~~ <sup>1995</sup> pathetic bomb of a book, Oswald's Tales, was the third major book in support of the official assassination mythology in three consecutive years by the Random House empire. The year before <sup>It subsidiary, Knopf,</sup> it published Wedge. The year before that Random House published Posner's Case Closed. It and the Mailer book had the most ~~extensive~~ <sup>and expensive</sup> campaigns to make them into best-sellers, which neither became. The Mailer book ~~was~~ <sup>money and</sup> was a monumental flop despite the effort lavished on it. This included the ~~whole~~ <sup>in</sup> Newhouse wholly-owned ~~Sunday supplement~~ <sup>carried by</sup> so many Sunday newspapers, Parade. When Mailer's book was ~~already~~ <sup>falling</sup> Parade gave him and it the cover and major story inside. (I addressed Posner and his book in Case Open, published by Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen in early 1994.)

As we have seen, John Newman's Oswald and the CIA, which makes no such connection between them at all, bases his more ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> sophisticated support of this Mexico City

Hosty assassination mythology of the Hostian/fiction. I have a book-length manuscript, Tragedy and Travesty, in which throughout various <sup>of this Hosty mythology</sup> aspects are dealt with at some length. In it and in Waketh the Watchman, another book-length manuscript, I go into <sup>a</sup> aspects of the 1962 Cuba Missile crisis and the negotiations with Castro initiated by JFK after that crisis and ongoing at the time of his assassination, including with lengthy excerpts from the little-known book <sup>"In the Eye of the Storm" (Ocean Press, Melbourne, Australia, 1985)</sup> by Carlos Lechuga, who handled the Cuba end of those negotiations at the United Nations. The year before the assassination Lechuga was Castro's ambassador to Mexico. <sup>Lechuga</sup> He is an original assassination-mythology invention <sup>m/</sup> by Newman, who makes his part of his version of that Hosty Mexico City mythology of the assassination.

Newman is one of the phony scholars of the phony scholarship referred to in the subtitle The JFK Assassination: Phony Scholars, Phony Scholarship. <sup>it is</sup> <sub>22</sub>

<sup>Treachery in Dallas,</sup> which is based in the Mark <sup>w/</sup> Brown indecency of what he made up, that the Dallas police were the actual assassins (Carroll & Graf, 1995). <sup>says he</sup> Brown is a former FBI agent with a

PhD degreed in history.

Scholar

(Max Holland<sup>nd</sup>, columnist/<sup>d</sup> Washington correspondent for the liberal <sup>al</sup> The Nation, is also in Inside the JFK Assassination Industry through his article The Kennedy Assassination: Why the Warren Report was Wrong - and Right. This article was published in American Heritage Magazine for ~~November~~<sup>y</sup> November, 1995. That publication also identifies itself on its cover as "Forbes American," of which American Heritage is a division. At the end of the <sup>a</sup> article Holland's book on the history of the Warren Commission is ~~so~~ announced for ~~pub~~ publication by Basic Books in 1996. Basic is another part of the ~~Random House~~<sup>House</sup> empire. Holland has his own convolution of this Cuban fantasy in which, in summary, he holds that the Commission was wrong to <sup>u</sup> accept the withholding of information from it by the CIA. <sup>u</sup> As the CIA was <sup>u</sup> wrong to withhold that information, but in the end it all turned out fine because despite itself the Commission <sup>u</sup> middle through to the correct solution, <sup>i</sup> there was no conspiracy <sup>like</sup> like the rest of the <sup>u</sup> phony scholars, Holland plays it safe by ~~not~~ assuming the Commission to have been correct without at any point addressing the <sup>u</sup> Commission's own evidence of the crime itself. Before <sup>u</sup> concluding as he did, which was made possibly by his <sup>u</sup> avoidance of the actual official evidence of the <sup>u</sup> crime, Holland devoted much space to the <sup>u</sup> Cuban myth. In this Holland mimics Hosty and most of the professional scholars in their <sup>u</sup> phony scholarship of ignoring the evidence of the <sup>u</sup> crime itself in favor of their political views and preconceptions. <sup>u</sup> That did become <sup>u</sup> of the Hosty imprint.

Hudkins insert

Honorable men?

6/11/96

Lonnie, who knew Vince Drain well, tells me he never told Drain or anyone else in or out of the FBI that his source was Sweatt<sup>tt</sup> or Alexander.

This goes where I use FBI report saying Sweatt was his source of the Oswald rumor.