

31 December 1968

Mr. Paul Hoch
2537 Regent St. (Apt.202)
Berkeley 94704

Dear Paul,

I have read your analysis of the affair of 544 Camp Street with great interest. It seems to me that you have established that, at the very least, Quigley and the FBI were negligent in overlooking an important lead requiring investigation, and that the FBI subsequently tried to cover up and conceal that negligence. Another possibility is that 544 Camp Street was not investigated because the FBI already knew all about Oswald's link with that address, in the course of his functions on behalf of the FBI itself or another political police agency seeking to elicit pro-Castro sentiment on the part of local people.

The correct understanding of these events depends to a large extent on the credibility of the generally accepted assertion that Oswald "was interviewed at his own request" by Quigley. It was suggested to me quite some time ago that such a request was standard operating procedure, by which an undercover FBI informer would trigger the local FBI office to his identity, by giving grossly false personal data (e.g., the misrepresentation by Oswald of his wife's name and the place of their marriage, as I recall, to Quigley) and thus make it possible to be extricated from local custody without blowing his cover. I have some doubts about the validity of this explanation, since it would be far simpler just to tell the FBI interviewer (presuming the interview was private) that one is a member of the club.

Until quite recently, I have had serious difficulty in accepting the assertion that Oswald requested an interview with an FBI agent while in custody of the New Orleans police in August 1963. I have detailed my reasons for questioning this in a paper I wrote a few months ago, when I gave up hope that, as I had urged several times, an attempt would be made in New Orleans to obtain further clarification of Oswald's supposed request. I will try to find a copy of that paper and send it to you under separate cover. Shortly after I wrote up my doubts about Oswald's alleged request, my suggestion was finally acted upon. Lt. Martello (now Captain), asked about this point, now said categorically that Oswald had indeed requested that an FBI agent be summoned and he expressed surprise that this was in no way attested to explicitly in his Warren Commission testimony. Although Martello's corroboration shifts the balance in favor of the truthfulness of the official version of how Quigley came to interview Oswald, I am not yet absolutely and finally convinced. I will be interested to know how you evaluate the questions I have raised in the paper, when you have received it separately, and how Quigley's failure to investigate 544 Camp Street may relate to the validity, or the non-validity, of Oswald's asserted request to see an FBI agent.

On a different subject, I note with interest the dismissal of Boxley and the stream of charges and counter-charges involving others close to Garrison. Such disarray and hysteria will further discredit and handicap legitimate investigation and criticism, as you will perhaps agree. Let me close with all good wishes for the New Year,

Sincerely yours,