Dear Jim,

3/9/85

My reading of the selection of FBI JFK assassination ticklers disclosed to Mark Allen 2/12/85 that came today was interrupted often, as will be my writing of this memo about them. I will not be able to organize it and still get it done but I think you will find reference to significant information. This includes the nature and content of FBI ticklers in political cases and the obvious, that the FBI lies to the courts with regularity about them, claiming that they are routinely destroyed after a short period of time. What you sent and I got today includes ticklers dated 1/64, now more than 21 years old and still existing. There is little doubt that whatever the FBI may say in the future, it will never destroy this and related ticklers because of the political need for them and their content and the impossibility of reconstituting them, even at the great cost this would entail, because no current or future FBI employees will have the requisite knowledge.

It is, I believe, significant than there is no content of any of these ticklers relating to the crime or its investigation or in any way a control over such info. This is to say that these are not normal criminal investigation ticklers. The underlying theme is cover the Bureau's ass when it is criticized and avoid what can lead to more criticism.

Of particular interest and value is Vol XII of the Lee Harvey Oswald tickler, which I'll address in more detail. I'd appreciate it if you would please, when you can, have two more copies of it made for me for filing in my critics subject file and for use in litigation, particularly if there is any remand in the field offices case. It also would be useful if I can ever undertake to do something about the abuse to which I've been subjected because this proof that Phillips lied under oath was in his very division and his section of that division at the time he lied under oath about both ticklers and critics. Lil does not have time for this now and it would be uncomfortable for me to undertake this slow copying with our machine. Let me know the cost, please.

Do not assume that the Oswald tickler is the case tickler for it isn't. It is probably the repository of the kind of information in the main Oswald file, and that permits extensive filing as tickler under other headings. One is in this batch, "PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF WARREN COMMISSION RECORDS."

Not one of these records was ever in central records and not one is a record copy. This is to say that the needs of the ticklers was in mind when the records were generated. Yet not one reflects a tickler copy in the copies indicated. Designation of the tickler copy to the appropriate tickler file folder(s) is holographic.

One of the interesting new disclosures is that LBJ wanted a book written to defend the official solution to the assassination, Hoover to sign it and that Ted Goble was assigned to the project before it was aborted. He is the TNG of the Marina tickler, Ted N. Goble, the supposed communist/Russian expert, the one described to you in feigned surprise by John Hartingh as the "liberal Harvard lawyer." You should remember him from 1996 and my refusal to look at another paper he processed until he was removed from the case. What a paranoid! The references to this book project are scattered, and it was finally wiped out with a lucid disclosure of how the FBI manipulates its friends in the press, in this case Sid Epstein of the old Wash Star. This, too, you may want to recall, is in our past. It ended up with the published press release a copy of which the FBI refused to give me for years and it finally told you to make a formal FOIA request (which stalled and built phony ststistics) to get a copy. (My interest was in the FBI response to what I had not yet published, of which the copy of the ms. I'd given the Times had disappeared.) I wanted the reproduction to be a facsimile, not the retyped Times or Star publication.)

While from internal references these tickler copies are not the complete business, they are complete enough to detail how the FBI used the Star, how anxious the Star and Epstein were to whore for the FBI, how the FBI pimped, some of the antecedents of the LBJ / Hoover book project, and how those purposes were accomplished by the Epstein/Star whoring. It is beyond question, from these incomplete records, that neither the Star nor Epstein went to the FBI with a story or even with a request for information. The FBI conceived the whole thing, DeLoach et al, "Crime Records," and asked Epstein to make the request. It even drafted for his signature the letter it wanted to receive from him and it was hand carried both ways. (by Wick)

Taking the FBI's word for anything can be dangerous but in their account the idea for the book was LBJ's, with Justice Fortas the intermediary.

There is great sensitivity about criticism and the critics, entirely out of proportion, it would seem to people outside the FBI, and there is a clear pattern in alleged refutation. An example is taking one of Lane's grosser fabrications and one of Leo Sauvage's inaccuracies, rebutting them, and passing them as a fair sample of all the criticism. (One reference to me acknowledges the accuracy of that one thing I'd said and passes it off as not the FBI's doing - which may or may not have been the truth.)

see elsewhere - Sauvage was accurate

There is a typical illustration about the FBI's lying to cover its own lying in XII, 8/15-12/28/66, Rosen to DeLoach 8/15/66. The FBI lies about its earlier lies, repeating that it had leaked nothing when the very people involved in these records personally did the earlier leaking, and what is close to a lie, that it did not follow Lane. Literally it didn't, but through others it did and acknowledges this in the same tickler. It had others tape all he said for the FBI and, in fact, this was disclosed before the time of this part of the tickler in the WC's list of basic information, which I got at the Archives, and then all hell broke loose. This illustrates the concern over the innocent disclosure of what could not be properly withheld then.

In III, Docs 6 and 11 are the original copies of abstracts. In 1996 we got carbons, and for all the ignorance about abstracts, there actually is a printed form for them. (One set filed chronologically, the other serially.) What may be significant about these is that they were not for such filing because no file-serial number appears in the blocks printed on for them. So, they were not intended for use as abstracts and may represent abstract cards used as tickler summaries.

The first record in XII refers to a matter I do not recall but may be in records I may not have read, the FBI's knowledge of a book intended to allege that Warren was involved in the death of a person whose name is withheld under b6 claim. It concludes disclosing files on Lane, denied by Phillips in 0322.

Next is the first of the records relating to the FBI's getting Sid Epstein and the Star to front for it in response (that isn't in any way response) to criticism. (Wick to DeLoach, 11/23/66.) It is followed by an earlier memo in which Hoover approves the letter Epstein is to write him. Meaning merely to sign the FBI's letter. Hoover also approved getting the prior approval of both DJ and Fortas, i.e., LBJ. The 11/23/66 "eh" memo on Director's memo form reports that Wick, personally, took the letter to Epstein to sign, was on his way 2:53. He had returned with the signed letter in the following 4:45 memo, Hoover's office form.

The 11/15/66 Rosen-DeLoach memo reveals that the FBI had an advance transcript of the unidentified TV program, undoubtedly Metromedia's "Minority Report." I see in it that Sauvage was not in error because in fact the FBI did leak the contents of its five-volume report before forwarding it to the Commission, (O'Leary loaned an advance copy of Sauvage's book to the FBI.)

As early as 10/19/66, Wick to DeLoach, there is clear concern that criticism be kept focused on the Commission and not the FBI and that nothing be done to attract

attention to the FBI, It began with Alex Rosen.

10/10/66 DeLoach to Tolson says that Fortas argued with LBJ against the book LBJ wanted Hoover to write. Apparently as a result LBJ would be satisfied with and appreciate a statement or article by Hoover.

At this point Doc 39 is witheld under b1, rather interesting and probably not valid.

79 has me saying that Hosty "did not stay" for the DPD Oswald interview. While my present recollection is not clear, I am pretty certain that Oswald grew angry and in Capt. Will Fritz's memo about this alleged that Hosty had "accosted" Marina. I think that Hosty was removed because of Oswald's antagonism. However, he could have been in the Fritz outer room and heard what transpired. My recollection of the Bookhout report referred to is that all he asked of Oswald and said in advance he would ask is personal background info. Next is the acknowledgement that the Walker house photo had in fact been mutilated. These few pages are hardly a representation of the content of three full TV hours. Nothing about the basic facts, only a few things that Hoover might considered embarrassed the FBI and him.

101 (or 104), Brennan to Sullivan, 10/3/66 has Dulles' allegedly impaired health "very much aggravated" by the critics. It also has Dulles' capabilities and memory impaired by the previous slight stroke, of two years earlier. It happens that I was then a friend of the Harper & Row man who took Dulles around promoting Dulles' book as of this very time. How impaired could be have been, how failed his memory if he dared go around promoting the book and subjected to questioning by strangers?

108 reflects the existence of an FBI analysis of Lane's book, relevant to Phillips lies in the field offices case. This indicates that the pre-serialization distribution copy sent to Rosen was copied for use for the tickler.