

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg JFK assassination appeals 3/30/79

"Privacy" his historical cases for newspaper editors who write page-1 articles  
Oswald's visit to the FBI and alleged threats against it and an SA

Previously I have written to ask where the records relating to the above-captioned  
subject ~~are~~ are. From the "previously processed" notations in the Dallas files and the  
absence of any index or guide it was impossible to locate any such records.

By accident I have located some but not all in the voluminous <sup>records</sup> ~~files~~, not in con-  
secutive Serials. As of now I have not located the FBI's own final report or the materials  
it gathered for its internal investigation. I have found many of what the FBI regards as  
affidavits and references to the results of investigations of the matter not included in  
the statements.

I attach page one only of 62-109060-7226X. It typifies all that is wrong, wasteful  
and entirely unjustifiable in the FBI's attitude and processing of these records which are  
so embarrassing to it.

Make any kind of bet you want: the withheld information is the name Johnson and the  
newspaper The Dallas Times-Herald. Now this is not an educated guess from a subject expert.  
It is because all is public domain. This clearly is in the FBI files. It is in many if not  
most of the statements. It is in, very prominently in, the 8/31/75 issue of that paper,  
which made a big front-page splash. The extensive attention includes Johnson's taking the  
entire matter up with FBIHQ, in a separate box as I recall.

But were none of this true, how can these withholdings possibly be justified? And  
what need could have been served? Given the subject matter, carefully obscured in this  
self-serving FBI cover-the-ass paper, how could the withholding be justified under any  
conditions? Is there anything that better fits the description of the Congress of what can  
not be withheld? Of course, this is an historical case. Someday and through you the  
Department and perhaps in time the courts will have this view of the FBI's performance in  
historical case maximum disclosure.

There also was a public House hearing on the matter, about 11/75. This also is long  
before the processing of the records. In fact, one of the records I have found is the  
transcript of Adams' testimony, so the processors did not have to have any other knowledge  
to know this was all public domain. However, the statements I've read to now include  
specific references to the extensive press attention. Radio, TV, the Dallas papers, Time  
magazine, the wire services - all in the statements taken from various FBI people. All  
read by those who perpetrated these withholdings.

If by chance claim to 7D was made, that also is fraudulent, obviously. I'm not taking  
time to check the worksheets.

You will recall that recently I've note how unusual it is that some FBI people were  
sounding off to the press, one James <sup>K</sup> Patrick Hosty, Jr., in particular. He has since

retired but his blabbing of what ~~is~~ not even good propoganda preceeded his retirement. It is not often that the FBI telefates a public attack on a Congressional committee by a Special Agent and I can't imagine that many Special Agents within days of retirement have ever done this. Nor can I imagine that Hosty endangered his retirement by doing it.

What is involved is the suppression by the FBI of an extraordinary matter for almost a dozen years. Dozens if not more FBI people of all ranks knew about it and not one said a word until, by one of those remarkable coincidences, the retirement of the Dallas SAC was safe and secure. Then only was there a leak to the Dallas paper less inclined to publish any criticism of the official account of the JFK assassination.

It seems that the only official candidate for assassins, officially elected to that ~~position~~ <sup>distinction</sup> went to the Dallas FBI office two or three days before the assassination. He asked to see Hosty, who was not in. So, without bothering to seal it, he left a note or letter for Hosty. With it sticking partly out of the envelope the receptionist read it.

Then the President was killed, Hosty head <sup>I</sup> Oswald's name and recognized it as a case he had, and with what is decribed as "the memory of an elephant," never once gave thought to this letter. It turns out that in all the varying accounts the one consistency is that it was a threat. The more common versions of the threat have to do with the bombing of the FBI office and/or the police headquarters. Naturally the FBI assured the Warren Commission and the country that Oswald had no history indicative of any tendency for violence.

Even when Hosty was rushed over to interview Oswald, he claims, this note "never entered my mind."

That this was widely and apprehensively known throughout the entire Dallas Field Office is clear in the statements I've read. <sup>It</sup> was known on high level in FBIHQ.

There is more. Like Hosty's complaint prior to the leak to the paper. His complaint was made in person to Director Kelley, who then made some inquiry no records of which I've yet seen. (What does this do to any ~~7D~~ claim?) But I think you need no more. (There is other ~~7D~~ ~~claim~~ claim written on some of the ~~xxxxxx~~ pages I've read.)

Until Watergate I never believe that any number of Americans could conspire and not one of them let a word out. <sup>This</sup> was years before Watergate. And oddly enough the Commission was supposedly investigating a report of Oswald's having an FBI connection, which the FBI and its Director assured the Commission was false. Only several of the SAs whose statements I've just read state they understood Oswald was a source or informant. So it is only natural that elephantine memories should fail and that none of these people would think of providing any information to what after all was only a Presidential Commission. Or to the FBI's own inspectors, one of who was assigned to Dallas immediately.

In this connection you might find <sup>appropriate</sup> the content of the Commission's 11/22/64 executive session transcript, the one they decided to destroy. <sup>It</sup> is in Post Mortem.

*Handwritten signature*