Dear Les, 8/11/84

Thanks for the call last night. I appreciate and respect your care and scrupulousness and I agree that the use of "observe" can be interpreted in other ways than were clearly intended. In thinking about this since I have come to believe that "closely" and over a five-year period can fairly be interpreted as limiting "observed" to the meaning of "saw."

8/14. But I have no argument if you feel otherwise.

You lack the context of the other government dirty-works throughout this litigation. I do not remember that it was even once truthful. The briefs could not begin to go into all the abuses.

When the totality of official dishonesty became apparent in my FOIA suits and with it the silence of the courts, which either accepted constant lies that I believe were perjury on many occasions or became lusty partisans of the government, I decided that the least I could do for history was to document all this mendacity thoroughly. That I have done, in permanent records, for whatever use others may find in the future. In all my cases I have done this under oath and myself subject to the penalties of perjury and the record I have made is entirely unrefuted.

It is this bad: when I proved an FBI SA who was the FOIA case supervisor swore falsely to the material, which is perjury; had presented and sworn to the genuineness of documents which were phonies (I gave the court copies of his phonies and the originals); and exposed the fact that he was used as an affidant when he was at the same time an unindicted coconspirator in the Pat Gray case, all the judge did was banish him and what the DJ did was to defend him and castigate me for telling these truths. The judge was silent when confronted with these castigations.

I do not recall what records related to you I've sent you in the past. If you did not read or do not remember, the stamp on the DeLoach to Mohr memo of 11/29/63 indicates a copy was sent you. It has DeLoach saying that the FBI did not give you any information about the major JFK assassination report it had leaked. Hoover has DeLoach's word for it! Not Tom Bishop's, of course. I'm not certain about the initials, but I think that outfit them had an SA named R.E. Wannall's. This and another were in a collection on my desk so I've added them to the one I mentioned.

The one I mentioned is the 12/18/75 Deegan to Wannall (which tells me I'm wrong about his initials,) with the attached column. There is no stamp indicating that you were provided with a copy, although your name is on the column. (Could have been done from a different file, however.) This record indicates how they "leave no stone unturned," Hoover's favorite cliche, yet manage not to go to the right stones.

By this time Hoover was dead and the others at the top were well aware of the

10AJ

built-in conclusion when only the wrong divisions were "canvassed." No mention of "Crime Records." (I think that JTA is Aldhizer.)

When DeLoach floated his idea for a book on the King assassination that would praise the FBI - and asked for and got approval for a campaign against Mrs. King, apparently - he was not losing any time at all. This was, I'm pretty sure, the day after Ray entered his guilty plea. The squiggly lines in the left margin I added to draw you attention to what he planned to do to the widow. Real gent!

The later "investigation" of Frank's use of FBI reports in his work of sycophancy, triggered by my allegations in my King records suit, did not disclose that the FBI let him have even a single piece of paper. They didn't handle it that way and they did not investigate the way they did handle it. It was all done through the local prosecutor, who was much indebted to the FBI. He gave Frank the FBI's records that it and he wanted in Frank's mind and book.

I don't know how clear your recollection is on dates but I'm sure you'll recall doing another story on this first and major FBI report, officially CD1. You'll recall your sources. It went into what the report did say and it was accurate. It appeared 12/5/63, when there were no copies outside the FBI. That report wasn't sent to the Commission until 12/9/63. Your story was not the only one of that day and there were earlier leaks of which I have records from the FBI's records, if you have any interest. No trouble to get and copy. **

As you can see, those who did the leaking were not afraid of reaction against them from Hoover after his note of 11/27. If I were considering this alone I'd believe that he was making a self-serving record and I'd believe he was well aware of who did what leaking. But there are many others of that period and at least some of them appear to be genuine. He then was older and less vigorous, whether or not there was any senility. I think the question lingers, were the others manipulating him? He certainly spent what I believe is an inordinate amount of time pawing over and annotating wire copy. And there was nothing too trivial to be given to him and annotated by him. The funniest one was used by the Wall Street Journal after I gave Jim Lesar a copy. It is a clipping about Jean Paul Sartre being on a French who killed Kennedy committee. This greatest red-hunttr of them all, Hoover, wrote on that less than a stick of clipping, "Find out who Sartre is." I have a xerox on the wall.

What I wrote (enclosed) yesterday is a sample of what extremes they will go to to stonewall an old man who remains determined and unafraid, two things that seem to throw them, and of the permeating dishonesty and shamelessness. One has to ask why they hide so much and go so such extremes if they have nothing to hide.

** A few within five feet of my desk and thus no work enclosed

Thanks and best wishes,

Hal