

79
80

When the FBI saw an opportunity for ~~which~~ mischief-making it passed around some of Novel's more extreme nonsense, with ^{out} regard to hurt to anyone and without concern for misleading and misinforming the President, the Attorney General or anyone else. It also disclosed 62-109060-~~6840~~ and 5545, which are attached.

If it disclosed the records based on which it provided this misinformation I have no recollection of having seen them.

Novel did not have to have a symbol. He was in regular touch with the FBI, which has provided no record I've seen of anyone ^{in the FBI} in it - anywhere - refusing to accept a call from him or refusing to talk to him. Even when he was a fugitive, when it sheltered him by not disclosing his whereabouts. For mere mortals this is a crime the FBI charges and based on suspicion of which it makes threats.

81

I came accross 62-109060-~~6864~~ ^{and 6859} by chance while preparing this so I attach ^{them} it for a facet of the larger Novel/FBI picture.

I also appeal the withholdings.

Next there is reference to one Hal Verb, of whom I have written you in connection with my PA appeals and non-compliance by the San Francisco Field Office, which I knew had to have a file on Hal because of his SWP activities. I asked that such files be searched for JFK and PA information. I have had no response.

With the 1969 date on this record the first paragraph seems to me to be inaccurate in reflecting that in connection with a ~~group concerned with the JFK assassination~~ ^{Mark Lane speech on} these PSI's attended a meeting of Verb's group. There are two reasons. The ~~group~~ ^{Verb} initially was part of ^{Mark} Lane's self-promotion called "Citizens' Committee of Inquiry." He had abandoned his support of it when in 1966, or three years earlier, it invited me to speak in ~~San Francisco~~ ^{San Francisco}. In addition, by this date Lane was not sponsoring any JFK group. After the Shaw case decision he looked for other cows to milk.

The obliterated third paragraph appears to refer to the 29 pages. So first of all I appeal the denial of what is reasonably segregable in it.

The last paragraph begins, "A copy of these papers is forwarded for your information..."

If these are papers distributed by Verb or the group there is no protection for them. If they were stolen then absent something quite unusual there also is no exemption that is appropriate.

Meanwhile, were these among the informants whose identities were disclosed in the SWP case or are they and these records withheld in the SWP case?

And if the informations relates to the assassination should it be withheld?

If it relates to members of the Verb group, is it not known? I have spotted references to some of them in other disclosed records and some was not otherwise secret.

The worksheet for 7654 gives its date as 2/1/77 and describes "Enclosure to ~~Peelman~~ to Gallagher" memo of 53 pages, 33 withheld under an illegible claim and claim to b7C and D and referral of a single page to DOJ and 19 to CIA. "Senate documents" is added.

Section 189 has an entirely inconsistent description in the single referral slip that replaces ~~it~~ ⁷⁶⁵⁴ - of two pages only and those referred to the CIA. No DOJ reference.

(Which reminds me of the failure ^{to respond} to my earlier appeals from all denials of all DOJ referrals, ^{is} There ~~being~~ no backlog and more time expired than if there were the largest withholdings.)

backlog in government.)

83

There is further inconsistency in the Bulky, which has a single referral slip of general nature, not identifying either the agency or the number of pages referred. There is reference to a single agency only. (See 54A)

83

What appears to be the present cover refers to a ^{New} ~~different~~ set of files, "Excised Encls. Drawer at end of Warren Commission" followed by some illegible writing. Do I have these

This file is not a Commission file. It is the ^{FBI's} assassination file, 109060 rather than 109090.

in what is disclosed of the underlying record

What follows relates to the Senate Select (Church) Committee and in theory only to JFK assassination records, so there should be a separate claim for each withholding,

FBI names are withheld on the second page, claim to 7C. Also 3rd page, which identifies the information as relating to the assassination.

Next is a WFO record of the day after the assassination with withholdings the need and legitimacy of which I question. There is little with which Andy St. George has not gone public relating to Castro and anti-Castro plots.

The next record has withholdings for which no claim to exemption is noted. It also is of the day after the assassination. It holds information Congressional investigations allege was withheld from the Commission. I believe all such information, as the allegation Castro would have JFK killed, should be disclosed in keeping with FBI and Department representations about the nature of the releases and in response to my requests.

No claim to exemption is noted on the next record, a DeLoach memo of the day of the assassination. It is about a call to him by the leader of an anti-Castro group offering alleged information on Oswald. All such information was disclosed without any excisions prior to FOIA and should be now. In addition, given the disinformation role played by the anti-Castro organizations, many of which were connected with the CIA, there should be no protection for them and their misleading operations and allegations. They did launch persisting mythologies.

(ccfc)

Most of the following pages relate to the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, well known as CIA and CIA funded. The withholders get so carried away with their withholding function they even withheld the registration required by law under the registration Act so

The FBI appeals to have a new referral slip from which it has eliminated space for indicating the agency to which referral was made.

In court the FBI and its counsel claim that if there is a referral the requester/plaintiff has no recourse from the court or the FBI, only from the agency to which referral was made.

If the requester/plaintiff decides there is no choice but to follow the FBI/DJ Catch 22 Exemption the switch to this kind of referral slip makes it impossible because the FBI withholds the identification of the agency to which it made the referral that was not acted on - in this case for going to two years.

people would know. Then, after not withholding ^{CCFC} the name, it is withheld on the 8/9/63 record. Here the names of those prominent people it used in solicitations and advertising and public relations are withheld.

Serial 7755 is described as "Report of Interview," no date given, of 62 pages of which only 15 are disclosed. Again, copyright claim.

In Section 191 there is none of this Serial. Even the worksheets ignore the Serial entirely. It is ^{listed} NOT in them.

However, there is the ^{NY} Blky. The interview is of the nut Thomson and his wife on 10/8/74, but it is represented only by a cover ^{page} that does not even indicate the source. "Federal Government" is stamped on it but no claim to exemption is made, therefore it must be disclosed. (I have no interest but historically all this nutty stuff is important. As is the agency that would at that ¹⁹⁷⁴ date waste that kind of time and effort.) What is not withheld is in the same typing, has no origin indicated and is a transcript of what is called an interview but is more of a speech by Thomson on ^{KOY} radio, Phoenix, Ariz.

In the course of checking for 7654 I came upon 7653 and the entirely improper and unjustified withholdings in it. The garbage is from the ^{NY} mind of one Howard Donahue. As those processing the records much later had to know from the content, all was being published in the Baltimore Sun and as Baltimore FO ~~should have~~ ^{FBI} informed the HQ, it was ^{published}

This is a ^{monstrous} ~~monstrous~~ and entirely baseless - in fact impossible - fabrication of a self-important ^{gun} nut who is a crack shot with a head to match. It is as terrible a defamation of the Secret Service as is possible, that it killed the President.

Now the FBI's files overflow with the allegation that "public source material" is provided. (Naturally, only public material.) But knowing this was about to appear and would be very ~~hurtful~~ ^{and others} hurtful to individual Secret Service personnel the FBI failed to offer from its files "public source material" that would have ended this monstrous business once and far all - ^{and other records} photographs (proving the impossibility of the Donohue concoction).

I believe this is enough to question the legitimacy of every FBI claim for the protection of the rights of its own personnel if not of all others. It cannot consistently make such claims when it knew of this wretched business in advance and made no offers.

I would like to have every relevant FBI records, wherever ^{they} ~~it~~ may be, in a single file for historical purpose relating to ^{this assault on} the Secret Service. I say this because Donohue was also involved in testing for a CBS TV special ^{and because I know of other records.}

I regard this as an appeal, not a new request. The FBI ^{here} has made partial and knowingly partial and defamatory disclosure.

This reminds me of records not provided by the same Baltimore Field Office relating to my PA request, records I believe WFO and FBIHQ should have.

William Manchester had a variant of Donohue's frightful mishmash in his book. I regarded it as a ~~rotten~~ rotten business, too, and I made some effort to counter it then, in the interest of history, of the Secret Service personnel who I am sure were dedicated men and of their families. My comments, defense if you will, appeared in the Baltimore Sun, I believe were picked up by a wire service and were broadcast in Washington. Having seen the nature and extent of the FBI's records of my public statements, real and ~~imagined~~ as altered by the FBI, I believe it has records relating to my comments about Manchester's attack on the Secret Service escort and has not provided them. I now also recall that ^{earlier} CBS News broadcast me on Manchester, originating in Los Angeles.

84
These two records duplicate records I provided earlier. They are copies I made for you and forgot I'd made. The note I made for myself when copying 62-109060-4192 is that at that point there were eight other similar meaningless records. I believe these were made to be meaningless so that a normal search of the files would not disclose what they relate to. I have had a search of the records provided to me made to see if it is possible to determine which records were enclosed by the Lab and it is impossible. Yet the records must exist somewhere or the forwarded records are lost forever. Please note that as with Item 78 above the date here also is 9/1/66, which appears to be the time of a Lab unloading if not hiding.

Some Lab records are relevant in some of my litigation. Before this date I had made FOIA request for Lab records.

85
Serial 62-109060-6594 was changed to 62-112771-1 on March 10, 1969. The reason cannot be irrelevancy. This is not a usual practise. Duplicate filing is. I believe this record should be provided, I have in the past asked for others also removed from the so-called assassination file.

86
Also duplicating earlier appeal relating to referrals is the attached several worksheet pages relating to Serials 168, 169 and 238 of the so-called "Commission" file, 62-109090 and to the FBI's having both tape and film, not merely stenographic transcripts, of the Hoover and Belmont testimony before the Commission. From what to now has been made public I recall no disclosure that this was even possible. However, I regard the demeanor evidence of the Director as he gave this testimony to be quite important as history and would like copies.

There is another aspect of deliberate waste and escalation of FOIA costs in these worksheets. (86) This is the referral to the CIA of the 29 pages of the already-printed CIA testimony. This is to say that more than a decade after it became part of the public domain by Government publication the FBI referred/withheld ~~pages~~ to the CIA. As a matter of fact the FOIA people even obliterated the formalities of witness introduction at the bottom of the last page of the Director's testimony. And ^{for} almost two years the CIA has accommodated the FBI by not acting on the referral of the public domain

37
38
9
Three attached records relate to FBI contact with Oswald and Oswald's with the FBI prior to the assassination and to my earlier appeals relating to now safely retired and atypically vocal SA James P. Hosty. These are a worksheet for 105-82555-4313 ~~EBF~~ EBF; page 5932 of the typescript of the Commission testimony of also retired SA John Fain; and a page of an interview log from 62-109060-7314X2 Part 1. (~~The~~ retired SA then being questioned is Urial E. Horton, Jr.)

I have placed an X in the margin of the worksheet, to which I also added its identification. With the exception of the cover page all/except 3 of the records listed precede the assassination. ~~One~~ one in particular, of 10-18-63 is withheld in its entirety, as are others I also appeal, on claim to ~~b7C~~ b7C and D. (I also appeal the b1 and b2 claims and the denial by referral.)

As I have indicated earlier, there is reason to have doubt about the Commission testimony by Hosty, particularly about when he received the Oswald file. There is testimony to his having prepared this 10-18-63 memo, I believe, and there are references to it in other records. The claims to exemption are, I believe, quite inappropriate, particularly if Hosty gave any testimony relating to its content. There is no apparent need to withhold if he wrote about only what he testified to, before the Commission, in the subsequent FBI internal investigation of the later Congressional inquiries, of which there were several. Withholding is also inappropriate if there is content to which he did not testify or about which he was not asked in the internal investigation.

I do not appeal the entry referring to alleged communists, of 5/28/64.

(88)
The testimony of Fain states that he made handwritten notes that have not been provided and I believe should be, as also should any remaining Hosty notes of Oswald family and/or related interviews, memos, etc. ^{Fain seems to} The testimony establishes the existence of the information I seek. *(Hosty told the Commission he destroyed his notes a month after the crime.)*

Nothing caused more total silence within the FBI, where many knew of it, that Oswald's going to see Hosty just before the assassination and leaving a note allegedly threatening in nature, which Hosty then destroyed after many others knew of it. The withholding of any relevant information, as on the log, I believe is inappropriate.

90

Serial 236 of the 62-109090 file, dated 9/29/64, is of interest from its content and from added and I believe important notations. I therefore provide an explanation in more detail for this part of the appeal.

The memo was written two days after the release date of the Report. The date the first copies reached the FBI is the date the Report went to press, which is pretty fast service on a 900-page volume.

As the note I've added indicates this copy comes not from the main file but from the bylks, an EBF.

In its entirety the memo and its recommendations were approved by the Director.

Of these of most interest to me and a significant historical record ^{to} ~~of~~ which I have seen no prior reference ~~is~~ the last typed material, that the Files and Communications Division "thoroughly" indexed both the Report and the subsequent volumes. *regard this*

Of course this is an invaluable record and I do request it, ^{I do} ~~not~~ as a new request, but I ask you to forward ^{it} ~~this~~ as one if you disagree, ^{It is} ~~but as~~ part of the promised disclosures by the ~~State~~ Department and the FBI. *and my requests included indices*

Once extra copies of the Report were obtained five were provided to this Division.

Sixteen copies were made of the memo. All are accounted for in the distribution noted. *of any copy.*

But not until 1972 is ~~there~~ any record of any destruction. ^{only} They ¹² it is noted that four copies were destroyed. The others, therefore should exist and I would like copies of them.

This gets to what I have asked of the FBI often, a search outside Central Records for important records sent to the various Divisions. ^{It} ~~The~~ FBI's reaction to the Report is important, historically important. The purpose of the distribution of the memo and the printed copies was to inform and to obtain information as well as to prepare for what requires other records to exist.

Aside from the leaking - and the FBI did leak coinciding with the release time of the Report, of which no records have been provided - the preparation of memos and other records was right and proper, in some senses necessary. I would regard as necessary any explanation the FBI made to the Attorney General, for example, of (what I regard as) unfair criticism of the FBI by the Commission.

a notation relating to the destructions on the first page refers to a record not provided, from another administrative file I believe should be searched and I ask that it be searched. ^{the citation} is 66-3206-1119,

This notation, of more than eight years after creation of the original record, notes that the original appears not to be in Central records but in another place not all of which can be made out on this copy. If so this confirms my repeated appeal that Central Records searches only are knowingly incomplete and cannot comply with my requests or ^{truthful} permit affidavits of compliance in my law suits.

There is another partly legible notation indicating an index as of 11/64, on page 1.

I believe it would be helpful to have an earlier generation copy on which the notations are legible. They appear to be significant and important. This appears to be a remote generation copy of a General Investigative Division copy. If so then the notations added by ^{those} ~~the others~~ to whom ~~and other~~ copies were sent likewise are important to have and understand, including as a guide to still withheld records.

The second page appears to be of a different copy from its greater clarity. It also has ~~the~~ different numbers stamped on it.

91

Serial 6642 of 62-109060, of 1/7/69, also requires some explanation because it is in part a self-serving record and in part because it is written in a manner that masks actualities and provides a cover for the existing records not provided.

In a context that does not limit it to his Division but includes the entire Bureau Branigan states the FBI "never investigated Clay Shaw nor did his name come up in the course of our investigation."

He could get an argument from Attorney General Clark, who told the press what the FBI had told him (on leaving his confirmation hearing), that Clay Shaw and Clay Bertrand were one and the same person. I was sought out about this by the press at the time it happened and remember it clearly. The FBI can, I am certain, provide you with a copy of the Washington Post's front-page story and of other accounts.

Moreover, were this not true it is true that the FBI could not have conducted any investigation to identify Clay Bertrand without considering the possibility it was Shaw.