

94 files

7/30/79

→ References to JFK assassination records not provided
(Hall, Howard, Seymour, Odio matter)

RHL (Domestic Intelligence Division) Tickler?

FBI's generation of self-serving records

FBI's overt lies relating to its JFK assassination information and FOIA attitude

105-82555-5582-3 relate to a National Enquirer request for information; 5573 to an inquiry by a private citizen. The dates of both are subsequent to enactment of FOIA.

Overt lies in the letter are "The results of the FBI's investigation were transmitted to the President's Commission ... since furnished all data ... to the National Archives..." and "The FBI has no authority to independently release any information contained in these reports..."

Most of the FBI's records ~~was~~ never reached the Commission or the Archives.

I know of no prohibition against the FBI's disclosure of "these reports" or any others not covered by exemptions to the Act. In fact the FBI had been making disclosures all along, particularly by leaking what it wanted out. (Note that as of this date the FBI was very worried over the Garrison thing, of which it had known for months.)

In writing about the processing of the Dallas index and Metcalfe last week I made reference to other relevant records of the same period, one listing interviews conducted by the FBI relating to Sylvia Odio, to which the matter of the three men relates.

The actuality of the Odio matter is that about 12/18/63 the FBI was told the Odio story by a Dallas social worker named Lucille Connell. The FBI thereafter undertook to break down Odio's credibility but I have seen no records of some of these effort and none at all of any investigation of the men she reported had visited her just before the assassination and made reference to killing JFK.

My letter refers to my knowledge of interviews not listed in the other memo.

Even this 5/18/67 memo makes no representation of any earlier investigation of the three men (~~one~~ of whom I interviewed on a number of occasions) than is reported elliptically with the date 9/21/64, or 10 months later. In fact the FBI's initial and less than accurate report to the Commission was hand delivered the evening of the 23 or 24 just before the presses rolled on the report, confronting the Commission with a real crisis of not ignoring it and not altering either the number of pages or the numbering of the footnotes or requiring any major changes in the index, all already set in type and in page forms for printing.

I recall no record from any source referring to any earlier investigation of the men or the Odio report and only some of those reflecting the effort to destroy Odio's credibility.

Field offices involved: Dallas (all areas), Los Angeles and Miami (all men) and ~~San Antonio, Albuquerque, Phoenix, and~~ Albuquerque or Phoenix on Seymour alone. (The men were anti-Castro mercenaries. Hall and Howard lived in L.A. area.

"Our files" was used in memo ~~we~~ can hardly refer to all FBI files or the summary of them is entirely inadequate. This makes me believe RHL referred to his own tickler or the Division's files.

Paragraph 4 refers to the FBI's "extensive investigation." Of Odio in an effort to break her down this is true but not reported fully and underlying records not provided. (Historically important and of interest to me as another indication of someone other than Oswald being represented as Oswald prior to the assassination. Or, possible conspiracy indication.)

In "Our inquiries in this matter were continuing as of 9-24-64 when the Warren Commission submitted its report ... to the President..." the FBI is actually admitting while not saying it that it had not conducted the required investigation before then.

Cross filings none of which is completely legible include one in a 94 file, which is natural for a publication but the FBI appears to be determined to pretend otherwise to avoid opening a DeLoach's box of family jewels.

Instead of lying to a general sheet, as it did to the private citizen, the FBI merely suggested that all was in the Archives and referred the Inquirer there.

It is possible that the information not provided is withheld by tricky filings, as in some files in the field offices. For different reasons there should be files on these people and the men should also be in files relating to their prior and in Hall's case subsequent activities, esp. re Garrison and NSUA. Prior activities include violation of the neutrality act, anti-Castro activities, including operating a trading company (at least on) on Lake Key, near Panama, Fla., and arrests in Dallas and Florida. Also, there was a survey of one of their associations, perhaps too, if the drowning of a ski-diver was not a real drowning, which is the rumor. Hall also had been a Castro prisoner and should be included in other FBI files relating to Santo Trafficante, with whom he was jailed in Cuba and with whom he allegedly had a subsequent relationship. (He told me of this later, the second time with a reporter present, along with his lawyer.)

The political activities of these men included activities ranging within the United States and up to the right of the Sahara, with whom they had an association.

Whether or not there is any connection with the actual crime all these people have received considerable historical importance if only as a result of the FBI's failure to conduct a full and prompt investigation and as a result of its bludge and the actual content of its late reporting.

(Gale's)

Personal details should be involved. However, I know of none that are not within the public domain. The FBI put its special representation of her/psychiatric treatment into the public domain while not disclosing what was public knowledge of her personal life and politically and ideologically prominent boy friend. (Ferre, brother of then governor of Puerto Rico.)

Gale is remarried, has children, and I have no int event in the disclosure of the personal details to others, for they also do not interest me, even though under FBI precedent they cannot be withheld. However, I do want all records, completely, except for such FO withholdings, to which I agree in advance regardless of precedent. All is relevant, however or wherever filed, to full JMK disclosure. This includes the Inquirer and other 94 and similar files none of which can be expected to include what the FBI does not want out, its successful control over what could be known and media manipulations.