

Chapter 8. *Who Helped "Wife" That "Dirty Rumor" Out?*

In fairness to all the reporters, and to my friend Lonnie Hudkins in particular, they were all thoroughly professional. They did everything they could honorably do to be helpful. The one thing, with a single ^{disputed} exception, they all refused to do was give the name of their source or sources. Lonnie is once quoted as giving ~~Alexander~~ ^{he denies it} as his source.

Moreover, he continued to be cooperative. He volunteered. Lonnie's volunteering information he believed could be helpful to the FBI is illustrated by this ^{to The FBI (when most were not were given)} March 3, 1967 "airtel" (a letter sent by air ^{has} this FBI fancy name) from the Baltimore to the Dallas FBI office. It is headed, "Re: Press Inquiry at Dallas, Texas." It is not in response to any request from Dallas:

On 3/13/67, ~~LONNIE HUDKINS~~, true name ~~ALONZO JEDDT HUDKINS, III~~, 12 Woodland Court, Apartment 204, Laurel, Maryland, reporter and rewrite man for "The News American", Baltimore newspaper, South and Lombard Streets, Baltimore, Maryland, advised SA J. STANLEY ROTZ by telephone that he had recently been contacted by representatives of Newsweek magazine, CBS and NBC, to determine whether he had any additional unpublished information or was interested in joining them in securing such information in the Dallas, Texas, area relating to the assassination of President KENNEDY. HUDKINS was known to these news media through his having been employed as a reporter for the Houston "Post" at the time of the assassination in 1963, his coverage of events at Dallas at that time, and his publication with two other reporters of an article relating to the assassination. In this latter connection, Mr. HUDKINS advised he had been thoroughly interviewed several times by FBI Agents at Dallas and had furnished all information in his possession to the FBI. He said that although many people are currently attempting to write books concerning the assassination, he himself has no such intention.

Mr. HUDKINS said he advised the above mentioned news media that he himself had no further information or interest in developing information concerning the assassination, and that

1-65
BA 09-30

he would not accept any employment related to it. HUDKINS thought the FBI should be alerted to the foregoing indication that Newsweek magazine, CBS, NBC, and also Life magazine, are apparently making inquiries to determine whether or not persons other than LEE HARVEY OSWALD were involved in the assassination.

~~Hugh G. Answorth~~

Mr. HUDKINS understood that Newsweek had hired a reporter named HUGH ANSWORTH, who had been covering the Dallas scene at the time President KENNEDY was shot, who was present at the theater when OSWALD was arrested, and also present when JACK RUBY shot OSWALD.

HUDKINS understood that CBS was checking out one idea that there were two simultaneous, unrelated plots to assassinate President KENNEDY. This included the possibility that a group of "right wingers" may have been coincidentally shooting at President KENNEDY at the same time OSWALD shot him.

The foregoing is being submitted to alert both Dallas and New Orleans since it is not known whether or not the action of the news media may have been motivated by recent publicity in this matter from the New Orleans area.

(62-104060-4770)

Lonnie was right. ~~The official~~ Interest had not died. It has not died since then, it will not and it should not.

Not long after he tipped the Baltimore FBI office off on what was pending we became friends. He and his wife Mary and from time to time their son Lon, Jr., the fourth Hudkins with that name, visited us ~~with us~~ ^{until they left the area, when Lonnie went to work for a different paper,} from time to time.

On their first or one of their first visits Lonnie told me ~~what~~ how that number, either ~~S-172~~ S-172 or S-179, became part of our history.

~~He~~ He and Hugh Aunsworth, then with the Dallas Times-Herald, were interested in this Oswald infirmer story, as was Bill Alexander, who was their friend. They believe the FBI was tapping their phones so they arranged a conference-call in which the three of them would discuss the number. Lonnie made ^{up} the number S-172 up. One of the others ^{said he} (thought it was S-179). ~~That it was an FBI number and that it had paid Oswald \$200 a month~~ They finally decided that, as Lonnie insisted, it was S-172 and then their conversation ended. Lonnie told me that within a half-hour an FBI agent was at his desk questioning him about it.

Later Lonnie also denied that he had identified ~~Alan Sweatt~~ as his source.

We now skip ahead to 1975. Lonnie heard ^{on ABC-TV} the comedian Dick Gregory on a talk show making a big thing of that S-172 number proving that Oswald had worked for the FBI. So Lonnie wrote his first story about that business since the time of the assassination investigation. It appeared in the News-American for which he worked, on March 10, 1975. In it he ^{wrote} ~~gave~~ essentially what I remembered his having told me.

Jumping ahead again, ^{three months,} to June 5, 1975, on that day the Dallas assassination case agent, Robert P. Gemberling, wrote a memo to his SAC, Shanklin that begins, "On 5/30/75 SAC WILLIAM A. BRANIGAN at FBI HQ telephonically advised ~~xxxx~~ SAC J. GORDON SHANKLIN as follows. ^{before he wrote his memo} In those six days Gemberling got mixed up a bit. Here is the rest of the text of his memo:

107

An article has been printed in the "Washington Star" that back in 1963, BILL ALEXANDER, Assistant Dallas County District Attorney was convinced that the FBI was taping his telephone though Agents denied this to his face. In order to find out, ALEXANDER supposedly arranged with two journalist friends to spring a story so wild it would bring the FBI running if, indeed, they were listening in to telephone conversations. The three men arranged a conference call from ALEXANDER to the newspaper offices of "The Dallas Morning News" and "The Houston Post". According to Mr. BRANIGAN, this article reflected that as the conversation wandered on, ALEXANDER asked the two journalists "Do you remember what OSWALD'S payroll number was?" The man at "The Houston Post" said, "I think it was S-172." But ALEXANDER said, "No, I think it was S-179." The article indicates that sure enough, within one half hour, FBI Agents had shown up at all three men's desks, flashing their identification and asking what they knew about a Government payroll number for LEE HARVEY OSWALD. The number, of course, had been picked out of the air to produce just the reaction it did.

Mr. BRANIGAN reflected that we do a file review and make available to him pertinent information relating to the allegations made about OSWALD being an informant of the FBI.

Gemberling then wrote ~~that~~ on June 2¹/₆ he cited three and only three ^{to Branigan} sources after this check. As we have seen, Dallas sent more than three reports to HQ. ^{In May.} in March
The story had not just appeared in the Star, Lonnie wrote it for the paper he worked on in Baltimore, the News American.

The file number in Dalls^a, where only this file copy was made, ^{and kept,} in the ^{main} JFK assassination file, is 89-43-9532. Inexplicably, attached to my copy is not any Washington Star or ^{Baltimore} New American story by but an undated story from the Dallas Morning News that reached ~~its~~ ^{The Dallas FBI} file clerk for numbering and filing on July 2. ~~It~~ ^{is} written in the proper space on the stamp affixed on filing is Gemberling's name.

That is an ^N entirely different story. ^a It is from the AP in Washington, without any date there, either, and it is about that ^a January 22, 1964 transcript. In the story the AP says that ¹ I obtained the transcript under FOIA and "A copy ¹ was of the ¹ transcript was obtained by the Associated Press."

That should not have been difficult for the AP because that April, without any dating I cannot say how many months ¹ earlier, I have given copies away wholesale. The afternoon before I was to speak at a conference at the New York ¹ University Law School that night

I had a press conference at the Hotel Taft and gave all those present copies of that transcript. I have no doubt that among the 20 or 30 reporters present was one from the AP.

What had Gemberling, then close to retirement, so confused I do not know but he even had Branigan as the SAC at headquarters! Good thing no copy was sent there! (Headquarters has no SAC. Only the director is at the top there.)

So, I in addition to the Commission's determination not to get to the bottom of that "dirty rumor" and to ["]wipe it out ["] to the degree possible for it, there was lying in what people told the FBI, mistakes by the FBI in its reporting and in general the confusion that was helpful to the Commission's wrongful purposes and has persisted ever since then.

The Commission did ^{take a little} ~~that~~ testimony on this- in e secret, as it took all his testimony. When it was published in Volume 5 of the Commission's 26 volumes of testimony and appendix, is ^{but a tiny} ~~a~~ fraction of the 10,000,000 words all made available at the same time. That was an ideal formula for seeing to it that there could not be any real reporting of 10,000,000 word.

The first witness in that volume was Alan Belmont, assistant to the director of the FBI. Among the matters ^{on May 6} about which he was asked (is this by Commission Counsel Samuel Stern: "You have already answered ^{d/} this, Mr. Belmont, but just so that the records is completely clear on this point, was Lee Harvey Oswald ever an agent of the FBI?"

To this Belmont replied, "Lee Oswald was never an agent of the FBI." (page 15)

~~No~~ ~~verse~~ ~~s~~ version of that "dirty rumor" had Oswald as an FBI "agent." Only something like an informant. But that took ^{care of the Belmont part} ~~care~~ of the Belmont part.

Belmont testified May 6. Hoover, followed by ^{at Director John C. his deputy, Richard} McCone and Helms, testified the ~~same~~ morning of May 14. (pages 97ff) Henry Wades's testimony of June 8 begins on page 521 of that same volume.

Waggoner Carr ^{Wade} was there, too. He was present when Wade testified and he testified ^{after} himself. His may well have been the ^{briefest} ~~shortest~~ of all the Commission's testimony. It ^{and W's analysis} takes ^{this} up less than two pages (258-60) of which Rankin's prepared questions ~~takes~~

not quite one page and most of the rest is of orchids all round. *A merit allie if leaf base fest.*

Carr was not asked a single question about that "dirty rumor."

"8 or 9 o'clock at night" the day of the assassination. All he was asked about is a phone call from the "White House" *(He did not mean that literally because Johnson had not yet moved in and the Kennedys were at the hospital where the autopsy was being performed.)* That call was about "A rumor had been heard that there was going to be an allegation in the indictment against Oswald connecting the assassination with an international conspiracy, and the inquiry was made whether I had any knowledge of it, and I told him I had no knowledge of it." (As of the time of that call, Oswald had not been charged with anything.)

Wade's testimony was much longer. (page 213-54) Rankin began by telling him, *(We are going to ask you generally about the time of Mr. Oswald's, Lee Harvey Oswald's ^{arrest,} address,* what you had to do in connection with the entire matter, and the press being there, and various things in regard to Mr. (Sergeant Patrick) Dean and other matters. Rankin got around to that "dirty rumor" toward the bottom of page 242. At the outset of ~~about~~ ^{less than} a page devoted to this Wade volunteered that "Alexander is not a great lover of the FBI." The questioning was superficial. It did not begin to include what the Commission by then had from the agencies.

But speaking of Alexander, Wade gave the Commission a broad hint, practically an invitation: "I think he would like to talk a little about it but I don't think he knows anything of his own knowledge." The Commission did not call Alexander "to talk a little about it." Or about anything else. *He was not a witness.*

What Rankin asks and says is not exactly as at those executive sessions and he has Goulden ^{getting} his story "from the Hudkins report that had been picked up."

Goulden's story appeared December 7. Hudkins' was published January 11, more than three weeks later. That would have been more like ESP than a "pickup".

The transcript reports that of the Commission, Warren, Cooper and Dulles were present. Of the staff, Rankin, his assistant, Norman Redlich and Dr. Alfred Goldberg, historian. Diligent questioning ^wasn't! And as Rankin et al knew, those very, very few, the mis-
scale percentage of Americans ^{could} ~~who~~ who see the transcript would have no way of knowing of those executive sessions and what happened at them or what the reports of the various

It would be in the official record for him to cite. He knew very well that there would be criticism because he saw to it that there would be criticism not only by not having his FBI do any real investigation ^{of the crime itself} but because he had agreed with Katzenbach as soon as Oswald was dead and thus there would be no trial to find Oswald the lone assassin. I begin NEVER AGAIN! with the documentation of this de facto conspiracy not to investigate the crime in which they had other co-conspirators. So in advance, knowing that as of the time he spoke these words all was ~~and~~ ^{for some time} would be secret, he characterized all those who refused to agree with ~~the~~ ^{those} "findings" he had fixed upon the Commission before it even got started as "extremists". As he used the word ^(and it was taken that way) he usually meant of the left.

For the head of the FBI, the man who then and there testified that all the FBI sent to the Commission passed through his hands, to say that any criticism of it is "without any foundation" is to lie.

To comprehend the magnitude of this lie all one ¹ need do is recall that in his supposedly definitive five-volume report in which he supposedly solved the ^{murder} crime he does not include all the known shooting and does not even give the cause of death. Before that report was written the FBI had declined copies of the autopsy and access to all the autopsy film, pictures and X-rays. The FBI did not want them because they, ~~might~~ supposedly basic fact of the crime, could interfere with the conclusions Hoover ~~alone~~ reached before the autopsy was ^{4/1} begun. Hoover did not want any fact of the crime to in any way interfere with or raise any questions about his "solution" he reached before the actual evidence was available, to the degree any of it was available that early.

This is to say, and I do say, that there is no ^{innocence} innocence in this, that ~~none~~ is possible. Hoover lied knowing he was lying. I It was not an accidental lie. It was a lie intended to protect his reputation as the greatest investigator of them all and of his FBI as the greatest investigative agent of them all when they had not prevented the crime and hadn't the slightest idea of who and what were behind it.

His "solution" which was ^{his FBI's} ~~its~~ "solution" is what the Commission would "find" so in advance he characterized all those who would disagree with it as "extremists" who would disagree "without any foundation at all."

agencies hold. These brief few and superficial questions give the impression that there was nothing to be "wiped out" at all.

Hoover's ^A testimony was different. As published it was the work of a committee.

The records disclosed, of which ^{and filed by} I made duplicate copies of all relating to his testimony, reveal that a number of ^{crew of special} special agents were assigned to go over copies of it and clean it up- correct errors, ^{read his} manufacture ^{of} his language, make it comprehensible where

it was too heavy and he rambled, and ^{d/} they even added paragraphs he had not spoken. ^{All of this} required a special crew of special agents.

Each and every change, including additions, was attributed to the court's reporter's ^{deficiencies and} alleged errors and mistakes. After all, the founding director never erred! No matter how often he did.

^{Hoover's} For his testimony five members were present: Warren, Cooper, Boggs, Ford and Dulles.

Of the staff only Rankin and his assistant Redlich are noted as present, along with Carr and ^{w/} two observers from the American Bar Association,

It began at 9:15 a.m. As Hoover ^h rambled on, some of his answers to simple questions took more than a ¹⁷ printed page for his responses.

The Commission did, of course, have much about which to ask him. And there really was much for him to say and for them to hear. He was the director of the FBI and it did almost all the Commission's investigating - such as it was and of what it was.

In ⁵ answer to Ford's question, "Is the Federal Bureau of ² investigation continuing to investigate all possible ramifications of this assassination?" after a third of a printed page that boils down to "yes" Hoover added, skilled propagandist of the right and self-protector par excellence,

speech incident

"I, personally, feel that any finding of the Commission will not be accepted by everybody, because there are bound to be some extremists who have very pronounced views, without any foundation for them, who will disagree violently with whatever findings the Commission makes." (page 99)

This was not responsive to Ford's question but it was what Hoover wanted believed ^{170A} he got it in. ^{here}

Of the man he knew had threatened the extreme violence of bombing the destruction

and the threat itself / Men was keeping secret - it remained secret for a dozen years -

of whose threat ~~of~~ which the FBI had kept secret and the destruction of which was approved by Hoover as soon as ~~he had been killed~~ ^{Oswald was} Hoover responded to this question from Boggs getting more self defense in:

Representative Boggs. You didn't find any indication of why anyone should even suspect that Oswald would do this, did you?

Mr. Hoover. We ~~didn't~~ found no indication at all that Oswald was addicted to violence. ..."(pages 103-4) Not counting that threat to bomb or wife-beating alleged in the FBI reports, maybe there was no ^{any} ^{such} indication."

As he rambled on in non-response to this question Hoover testified, "The first evidence we had of him in our files was a statement to the press in Moscow."

That does not count ~~his~~ ^{their} interceptions of his letters when he was 16 to leftist ~~groups~~ groups whose mail the FBI was able to get. ^{and gave to the Commission.}

When Boggs asked Hoover to "speculate on what may have motived the man?" Hoover got his political licks in: "...this man was no doubt a dedicated Communist" and a's such "he sympathized thoroughly with the Communist cause." (page 104)

The FBI's own files overflow with Oswald's secret denunciations of Russian and American Communists and ~~in~~ more than two months earlier it had evidence that Oswald was anti-Communist even in the USSR.

Of course Hoover was never questions! Who could dare and hope to survive politically? But here he says that Oswald killed JFK because "he sympathized so thoroughly with the Communist cause," giving no reason to believe that the Communists preferred Johnson to Kennedy), ^{and that is what he himself} ~~and that means there was a Communist conspiracy,~~ ^{which Hoover said} there had not been.

Asked if he believed there should be a law making killing the President a federal crime above the middle of page 115, after saying he was strongly in favor of that, which is all the ^{answer} ~~question~~ required, before Hoover ^{wound} ~~went~~ down toward the bottom of page 116 he managed to volunteer what I believed from the first, that, "...Because of the publicity (through leaks and the like) you had to face the charge that the prejudice of the community would require a change of venue. With the publicity ^{city} I do not know where you could

change the venue to...." In short, the chances were that under existing law and decisions if ~~the~~ Oswald had not been killed it might have been impossible to try him.

At this point Hoover launches into the Hudkins story, unmasked, and in notime flat he is back to the change of venue and then to "A small thing can make a man break and come forward with a full confession". This leads him, without his being interrupted, to say that "Generally, we try to arraign a prisoner within an hour." This was his springboard, invisible but actual, for ~~his~~ ^{his} "For years we have had a rule against the third degree." "which is a perfectly natural basis for then saying, "any allegations are made unfairly against police officers that have used third degree methods and we have been able to prove they haven't." ^{in the words,} "Particularly complaints by blacks ~~or what~~ he preferred "where civil rights matters are involved."

after a two printed pages of non-response

When Hoover stopped to take a breath Rankin tried to get back to the protection of ~~the~~ president ~~saying~~, "Mr. Hoover, to remind you of my question..."

As Linda Ellerbe used to say, "and so it goes" when Hoover is ~~testifying~~ ^{speaking} as testimony.

But before he could get ^{my} comfortable on his launching pad ~~the~~ Rankin was careful to get Hoover's ^{ed} want/denial of any FBI-Oswald connection on the record. After Rankin said that Hoover had "furnished us a considerable amount of information", entirely undescribed and consisting almost entirely of what I quote above, "about whether or not Lee Harvey Oswald was ever an agent ^{or} acting for the Bureau in any ~~way~~ capacity..." Hoover responded, "They (those records quoted above) are correct. I can most emphatically say that at no time was he ever an employee of the Bureau in any capacity, either as an agent or as a special employee or as an informant." (page 98)

The FBI could have produced sworn statements from those who have access to the records of informers in the New Orleans and Dallas offices or of those at FBIHQ where approval for use of informants is required and filed and by those statements have established that a proper search of the records where all such information is preserved reveals that there was never any kind of FBI-Oswald connection. But that is the usual, the normal, the court-approved way so ~~why~~ why do that when the great man can bluster, instead?

Pontifical and lecture

CIA Director ⁶ John A. McCone and his deputy director Richard Helms followed. (pages 120ff) The first question Rankin asked McCone is "Are you familiar with the records and how they are kept...as to whether an amn is acting as an informer, agent, employee or in any other capacity for that Agency (the CIA)?"

McCone said he ^{is} was "generally familiar ^{with} them but "I am not familiar with all the records because they are very extensive." But, "I have determined to my satisfaction that he had no such connection." McCone then explained ^{of} that what he did was to prepare himself to give hearsay testimony, without any affidavits from those who had the requisite first-person knowledge ^{and} who were available for attestation. (page 120) He then, on the next page, said that such information does ^{not} generally pass through ~~his~~ ^{my} hands.

And thus it was proven that the CIA and ^U Oswald never had any connection with each other. Not the way the law would have it but the way that satisfied the former solicitor general of the United States and its sitting Chief Justice.

McCone was asked, "Can you tell the Commission as to whether or not you have supplied us all the information the Agency has, at least in substance, in regard to Lee Harvey Oswald?" Helms responded, "Yes, we have." (page 122p) If this were true there would have been some ¹⁸ linear feet of CIA Oswald records in its 201 or Personality Profile file ^{alone} that they did not have at the Archives when they supposed it had all the Commission's records and I was going through them. This is the extent of ^{The CIA's one Oswald} ~~the~~ file as it was transferred to the Archives under the 1992 law.

According to what ^{John} Newman told me he found in that file, McCone did not tell the truth in ^{assuring} Ford that the CIA had had no ^{personal} contact with Oswald" after he returned from the USSR. ^{But} in fact, despite the unlikely CIA earlier denials, he was interviewed by it after he was back. (page 123)

Or, when it ^{came} to "wiping out" what he referred to as a "dirty rumor" J. Lee Rankin was the man the Commission needed.
 - by seeing to it that ^{only} ~~only~~ would not be -
 He wiped it out by contriving not to have a competent first person statement, which

This

what the courts require, and with the full knowledge from the best of ~~the~~ possible experts, his Commissioner Allen Dulles who had headed the CIA into some of its most spectacular failures, ~~or~~ over a period of quite a few years, that they all lie their heads off and ~~commit~~ commit perjury, as they should!

Remember that quotation from page 62 of "Whitewash IV", which is page 153 of the *Verbatim* stenographic ^{transcript} of the ~~verbatim~~ of that January 27 session? There, asked by *Boqys* if ~~Boqys~~ is a CIA man would tell the truth Dulles replied ~~he wouldn't tell.~~ "When Warren, then asked "Wouldn't tell it under oath?" Dulles replied, "I wouldn't think he would tell it under oath, no." Asked "Why?" by Warren, Dulles told him, "He ought not tell it under oath."

And thus it was that the CIA, too, helped Rankin "wipe out" that "dirty rumor" of his that led to the calling of those TOP SECRET executive sessions when perpetual secrecy was expected and expectable, before there was any Freedom of Information Act and without one ^{who} to those who avoided ^{truth was a} the most direct and unquestionable answers is a devil loving scripture.

And those who ^{with official lies, who want the truth?} do not agree. According to that other outstanding authority on such matters, J. Edgar Hoover, we are "extremists who have very pronounced views, without any foundation for them."

It really has gotten to the point since John Kennedy was killed that those of us who believe in our system and in the ~~pro~~ ^{of} procedures and requirements ~~of~~ of the courts are "extremists" to those who are the authentic extremists and neither abide by not live and work within basic American belief and law ~~when~~ ^{they} they have what to ~~them~~ ^{them} are important political objectives.

Edna Hoover

How Rankin was in a position to see to it that this "dirty rumor" was not investigated, which can also be interpreted to mean how he was able to protect the FBI, is a story about the incredible influence, ~~and~~ really control Hoover was able to assert ~~on~~ on much of the government, including the most conservative at the Congress. Of the many possible sources I believe two little-known FBI records suffice to make it clear that Rankin owed his prestigious job as Commission General counsel to of all people- J. Edgar Hoover!

I have referred previously to the FBI's damage-control tickler that is so illuminating and informative and is so explicit in details, ^{including} various means by which Hoover did assert control, including by blackmail, *in the Commission,*

That tickler is divided into three main topics. The third is "Bureau Relations with Warren Commission". It had five numbered parts under "A. Formation of Warren Commission." *(Walter Jenkins was one of President Johnson long-time assistants)*
 The first is "Hoover opposition: memo and Jenkins memo." The second is "Katzenbach testimony and Sullivan statement." *"(Hoover did have an adversary relationship with the Commission. He lost to Warren.)"*
 The third is "Early memos - adversary relationship."
 The fourth is "Hoover blocking Warren's choice for general counsel." The fifth is one of the indications of blackmail, "Preparations of dossiers on staff and members." With regard to this fifth item, there is also, under, of all improbable and entirely inappropriate headings, "Assistance to Warren Commission," which is Part ^{C.} under this same third major breakdown, its first item, "Preparations of dossiers on WC staff after the report was out." That, in the FBI's concept, was part of its "Assistance to Warren Commission"!!!

"Hoover's blocking Warren's choice for general counsel" is how that job was available for Rankin. Traditionally, the chairmen of all bodies have the right to select their own preference for all such positions. Warren knew and liked Olney, who was reportedly Warren's protege. Olney was a widely respected Department of Justice ^{4/} ~~was~~ assistant attorney general. He did not approve of all the FBI did, which, naturally, made him an enemy to Hoover and those cloned on him. He was also a liberal, and that, to the Hoovers and the like-minded in the Congress, made him ^{only} little less than a Communist.

As I say above, Cartha DeLoach handled Hoover's lobbying and polite blackmail. *He could and he did also bully, as he reports doing in a part of what follows that I do not quote.*

At the height of the brouhaha over the report that Oswald had worked in some capacity for the FBI there was much interest in this ~~on the Hill~~ at the Congress. Three of the most far to the right of the conservative senators were interested and concerned. *DeLoach wrote*
 (In a February 7, 1964) memo for Hoover, naturally not addressed to him *It was* but to "Mr. Mohr," John P. Mohr ~~whose~~ title was assistant to the director. In four single-spaced pages with narrow side margins DeLoach reports on more than what is relevant to Hoover's keeping Olney far from getting the position Warren wanted him in. Another way of putting this is how Hoover controlled our history and what it would record while covering his own ass. By the time DeLoach is toward the ~~xxx~~ end of his report on his very successful lobbying he has spoken to Senator James Eastland, Senator Richard Russell, *and to* Jay Sourwine of Eastland's committee staff, Senator Warren Hruska and Senator Everett Dirksen, the latter at Sibley Hospital, *Hruska* accompanied DeLoach to the hospital. Before going there, however, DeLoach phoned Hoover to get his permission. Here is DeLoach's own account to Hoover in which, wisely, he omits Hoover's name as that of the one behind that successful operation:

(From . . .) Senator Dirksen asked me if we were satisfied with Rankin. I told him that Rankin had been appointed as an alternative. I then briefed Senators Dirksen and Hruska on the fact that Chief Justice Warren had first wanted his protege Warren Olney to serve as Executive Secretary of the Presidential Commission, however, in view of Olney's miserable personality and inefficiency it had been necessary for a number of sources to confidentially brief members of the Presidential Commission; other than Warren, as to Olney's background. I told Senators Dirksen and Hruska that as a result of this action the Commission members had overridden Warren concerning the appointment of Olney and that Rankin had been elected as an alternative. Dirksen stated he knew Olney and definitely recognized him as an inefficient incompetent.

Nicholas Katzenbach, who engineered not a few disasters when *105-82558-2480* he was Robert Kennedy's top assistant, the deputy attorney general, made all of this possible by his blabbing ~~e~~ to Alan Belmont, then so high in the FBI only Hoover's oldest and dearest friend. Clyde Tolson, *(FBI)* was between them. On December 3, which was almost a week before the Commission had that five-volume FBI report, after working hours, at 6:10 p.m., according to Belmont's memo to Tolson, Katzenbach called him

111
to run off at the mouth about a Commission meeting Warren had called for the next morning. In the course of this Katzenbach sealed Olney's doom:

Katzenbach said that he had been talking to Chief Justice Warren, and Warren had indicated to him that the chief counsel for the President's commission will be Warren Olney. Katzenbach thought that this would be most undesirable. Katzenbach said that, as we probably know, Chief Justice Warren thinks that Olney can do no wrong, and he (the Chief Justice) had made the point that Olney is conversant with the FBI's procedures and thus would be operating in a familiar field. Katzenbach said if we have any ideas as to how Olney can be blocked as chief counsel, he would like to have them. I told him that, as far as I was concerned, Olney was an undesirable choice, and if we had any thoughts we would get them to him. (62-109090-1716)

Hoover wrote "Horrible" after the sentence reporting that Olney was Warren's choice.

Before Hoover could get his knives flashing inside the Commission, Katzenbach also told Belmont, who promptly bucked it to Hoover, that "Mr. Katzenbach said that if Warren Olney is appointed as counsel for the Presidential commission, Katzenbach is going to try to get an attorney from the Criminal Division in with the Commission, so he will know what is going on." (Olney did not get the position but Katzenbach got his man, Howard P. Willens, in that spot anyway. Willens was the kind of authority on the staff.)

As Hoover later boasted to Appeals Court Judge Edward A. Tamm, formerly a high Hoover assistant, Russell De Dulles and Ford "vigorously opposed" Olney and "threatened to resign if Olney were appointed." Hoover adds, piously, that "although they blame me for the attack on Olney although I did not raise a finger to it and it was done without my knowledge." (62-109090-176, with copies designed for four other files.)

The executive session transcript for December 5 confirms Hoover's identification of those who did his dirty work and put his knife in Olney's back. McCloy expressed reluctance about Olney then.

In its notice of Olney's death, the conservative Washington Star of December 23, 1978 reported that he was also the director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and that as an assistant attorney general he had successfully prosecuted a number of members of Congress and Internal Revenue collectors and his handling of a number of politically sensitive cases. Olney was known for his zeal in civil rights... This alone marked

political
 him lousy to Hoover and his Commission)like minded.)

It was those who opposed ^Uney who seelected Rankin.

And as this among countless similar matters depict, for Hoover truth ^{was} whatever ~~no matter how untrue he knew it was~~ at any time seemed to serve whatever purpose he may have had in mind. For Hoover truth bore no relationship to fact or reality.

Rankin, if he had no other source, had copies of the executive session transcripts.

H He undoubtedly read those ^{few} that preceded his appointment.

He knew he owed his prestigious ^{to} position Hoover.

Who throughout his career was never the man for whom Diogenese was looking.

Diogenes