

January 22, 1978

Dear Jim et al (& Mary, Sylvia),

Under separate cover, I've already sent: [and am enclosing for MEF, SM]

- (1) My transcripts of radio & TV coverage of the second release (9 pp.)
- (2) A copy of the New Times article (7/11/75) on Hudkins, which covers not only the LHO-FBI story, but his early version of the Castro-retaliation theory. It might be worth rereading this with Epstein's forthcoming opus in mind.
- (3) [For AIB, MEF only] A story from the Oakland Tribune (1/18/78) about Priscilla. She certainly does sound odd. I wonder if the personal interest in JFK which she attributes to Marina is in part a projection of her own (frustrated?) interest in JFK back in 1953?
- (4) An ad for last week's "Welcome Back Kotter;" Epstein's "'hot' term paper" is obviously his ~~of~~ forthcoming book, and "Angie" is clearly Angleton!
- (5) [AIB only] Art Hoppe's column on Dick Noxious, our punk President (ret.)
- (6) [AIB only] A copy of the affidavit I sent Lesar, at his request, for use ~~xxx~~ in their attempt to get a free set of the documents - ~~wix~~ which I gather was successful.
- (7) An exchange of letters ~~xx~~ with Larry Haapanen re LHO in NO. [AIB only; was sent to MEF & SM earlier.]
- (8) A list of local newspaper stories about the second release.

Jim, I'm sending the CIA's Document X Disposition Index under separate cover. The cost was \$9.63 plus postage.

Mary and Sylvia: you should have received the latest batch of AIB-selected documents (#165-247), along with their list, which I sent on 1/18.

Mary, thanks for your letter of the 10th, with the index cards. I think your handwritten version of this information would be fine for me; I'm sure it is quite readable. I don't maintain name indexes myself.

Sylvia, thanks for the copies of Penn's TCI, which I am returning under separate cover. There are a number of rather useful pieces - particularly Gary Mack's analysis of the DPD tapes (Vol. 2, #1); the Frankel NYT story of 11/23-4/63 (in Vol. 2, #3); Shaw & Harris on Souetre (Vol. 2, #4), and the article about the origins of the FPCC (#5, p. 8); plus, of course, some things I already had heard about, namely Pat Lambert's article on SS 491, Mary's index, and your letter on Bethell.

Sylvia, thanks for your letter of the 13th. I do remember your 1968 piece on Oswald's arrest and the story that he had asked to see the FBI, and I found it quite convincing. I'm not sure we didn't already know that Lt. Gaillot had called the FBI on 8/9/63; that didn't strike me as new. In any case, this is one of the questions the N.O. field office files might shed some light on. (As I think I mentioned to Jim, the FBI tells me that these field office files (pre-assassination) are being processed in response to my request. Incidentally, this suggests that they have never been pulled together, either for an internal FBI investigation, the Edwards Committee, the Schweiker Committee, or the House Committee!!) By the way, Mark Allen has sent me a few pages from the FBI's Cuban Cointelpro file. Nothing really exciting - specifically, nothing about New Orleans - but Mark says that the file skips from 1961 to 1965, which he (and I) find very suspicious. I think he will be pursuing this.

Probably because both I and the press had been around once before on this, I found less to get worked up about in the coverage of this second release. The big exception, of course, is NBC's treatment of Lonnie Hudkins and the LHO-FBI story. Really shameless! Ordinarily I'm quite willing to make excuses for our harried media friends, but I think that showing Hudkins' story on the screen and then indicating that it ~~wasxxx~~ was just other reporters who ran away with the story is inexcusable. O'Toole and Rosenbaum did a number of Hudkins a few years ~~agan~~ ago, pretty convincingly. And whose side is Seth Kantor on anyhow? It's even hard to believe that Gemberling hadn't heard the Hudkins "hoax" story before last week. And really, why does NCB insist on saying there is nothing to refute the Warren Report, etc.? Is it just that the press don't like being told things by outsiders that they should have discovered themselves?

As before, I found Jim McManus' coverage outstanding, ~~xxx~~ by comparison. Again, there were interesting small changes between his three appearances; I can't tell which came first, but someone was ~~xxx~~ at least aware of some of the subtleties, and the text was edited to get things right (or, maybe, wrong). For example, on the 1/19 Morning News, he avoided saying that the items he mentioned were new, or that all the evidence supported the WC.

By the way, I haven't heard from Jane Bartels about the documents she sent me a few weeks ago; of course, I would like to distribute them as ~~x~~ soon as I can. (There are a couple of *** items which the AIB may not have picked up already.) I'll keep trying to get an answer.

I think the story of Ford leaking the WC transcripts to the FBI didn't get as much play as it deserved (at least out here). Did anyone ask Ford about this? I should check what he said in his book about how well the FBI and the WC got along. (Also, my essay in the anthology, p. 135, might be a useful reference; also, of course, my manuscript, which goes into the 'old' Hudkins story in detail.)

An important character in the Hudkins story is Joe Goulden, who wasn't mentioned on NBC. He had the LHO-FBI story first, and he certainly didn't make it up to see if his phone was tapped. Is he in Washington? Has anyone ever talked to him?

Overall, perhaps the tone of this batch's coverage wasn't so bad, because there wasn't the incorrect focus on something like the Cuban angle. I suppose that to the general public - which has not known for years that Warren didn't want to head the Commission - the net impact of the coverage was to discredit the FBI-Commission investigation. But it sure does make the press look bad!

As before, UPI was the worst offender, in terms of 'discovering' things that were old. One UPI story I ~~xxxxxx~~ have is bylined "Mike Feinsilber, UPI senior editor," so he may be the one responsible for all this.

If any of you have local clippings of special interest, I would be glad to add them to ~~f~~ my file and circulate them on request.

I thought Carl handled himself very well in a potentially impossible situation. (Is the figure of 10,000 pages still withheld an FBI estimate, or what? Does this refer to the pre-assassination files? My guess is that most of the deletions are of relatively uninteresting material from other agencies, but I think it is certainly worthwhile to go after the ones which are clearly special - e.g., the deletion on an unidentified topic in AIB #242 (Ser. 62-242).) The point he mentioned, about the possibility of an internal FBI ~~xxx~~ coverup to keep things from Hoover, should certainly be kept in mind; that mechanism probably operated in the case of the note to Hosty, and may ~~xxx~~ explain such things as the suppressed Hosty notebook entry, the missing N.O. ~~xxx~~ affidavits, etc., as well as the ~~Rxy~~ Ruby-PCI story.

Jim I can answer a couple of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ questions in your list of AIB documents #165-247, offhand. We do have more on Donald Wayne House as a suspect, including an Enquirer piece a while back, I think. [That reminds me - the Lane stuff in Larry Flynt's L.A. Free Press isn't out yet, at least up here.] Re serial 67 - check Sylvia's book, and Kantor's notebook, about info from North Carolina about the origin of the rifle. (I gather that a lot of gun buffs immediately recognized the gun and knew where it could be obtained.) I've sent the stuff on the copying of the Z film to Lifton, who's interested. Serial ~~187xx~~ 99 (#187) - the guy ~~xxx~~ cornered by police was presumably the 'wrong' suspect in the ~~xx~~ church basement, or whatever it was - this was in the DPD tapes; Mary can fill us in. Sounds ~~kk~~ like ~~xxxx~~ they had their man even before they got the right one! (This really smells!!!) #198 (Ser. 182) - I think we have ~~xxxx~~ more on this from the CIA file.

#219 (Ser. 264) - a ~~x~~ good question - who are these guys? #247 (Ser. 451) - recall the work I and Newcomb did (independently) on the Kleins ads, etc. - the coupon torn from the magazine N.O. sent up was not the one he used, but was found in his effects!

I feel very harried - and I'm just out here; you must be even more pressed - and will just try to get this into today's mail, and write again later. Thanks for having kept me informed (esp. on JEH's comment on me!) P.S.: no Gale memo (or info on it from the FBI) yet.

Best, to all,