

25 Jan 78

These documents were ~~xx~~ spotted by the AIB in the second FBI release. I have asked for my personal file, which should include this and (I would now guess) quite a bit more. I'll hold off on a systematic analysis until I get either the whole file, or some more sensational items.

I have had a lot of correspondence with the FBI, going back to 1965. I'm a little surprised that my FOIA requests ~~xx~~ got this much attention (even reaching JEH himself) within the Bureau. This could, of course, explain the stalling I got.

Memo of 10/6/69, re my request for the Quigley 544 Camp pamphlet. My 544 Camp file has all this correspondence; long and ~~xxxxxx~~ unsatisfactory. The FBI/JD either didn't understand, or pretended not to understand, that I had good reason for wanting to know (a) if Quigley had in fact kept and ~~xx~~ filed the Lamont pamphlet Oswald 'made available' to him; (b) if that particular copy had 544 Camp on it. The point was, if it ~~xx~~ did (which turned out to be ~~xxxx~~ the case) that the NO FBI's failure to check out that address was very conspicuous.

This memo is by T. N. Goble (for Branigan) to Sullivan; ~~xxxx~~ that name is not familiar.

Interesting that the pamphlet stayed in the NO files - i.e., never got to Washington. Among other things, that means that nobody at HQ was ~~xxxx~~ alerted to the possible significance of the non-response to the 544 Camp address.

The first sentence under 'observations' on p. 2 is a misrepresentation of my letter. Being unduly polite, ~~xxxx~~ I said that "In view of the persistent allegations that there was some sort of special and hidden relationship between LHO and the FBI, I feel that it would be in the public interest, and in the interest of your department, not to withhold" anything that might be relevant. That's hardly the same as just writing of "some sort of special ... relationship." My letter (available on request) did explain the significance of the FBI knowing about 544 Camp; apparently that didn't prompt the FBI to investigate!

My correspondence on this particular pamphlet ~~x~~ goes back to 2/19/68. I made it clear that I knew about other copies of the pamphlet, including the published one. I was told, respectively, that the pamphlet is published, that all copied in the FBI files had been turned over to the Archives, that the Quigley pamphlet was identical to the others; that it had the 544 Camp stamp - actually, that it is identical to the copies which have that stamp (this was 11/8/68); that it did itself have the stamp and that I should direct future requests to the Archives; then they sent a copy of CE 3120, and said it was the same; and then finally, as reflected in this memo, I got the pamphlet. This correspondence must have ~~driven~~ driven them up the wall! I guess they were going to a lot of trouble simply to avoid actually giving me ~~xx~~ something from the FBI's files.

~~x~~ Presumably, when my personal file is processed, there will be more on this. ~~M~~ There's no real point in looking for more now.

Since the action taken in 10/69 was to get a copy of the pamphlet from NO for the Department, I guess that the Department's letters to me had been based on info from the FBI, rather than from their own inspection of the pamphlet.

I'm looking forward to more comments by Hoover on my other letters.

Airtel and LHM from SF, 10/31/69: illegible, ~~xxx~~ but not all that interesting. This was apparently prompted by ~~xxxxxxx~~ an informant's submission of two pages from CD 49, pp. 22-3, entitled "Review of Government agency records," which relate to CIA and HEW. The CIA said (falsely) that they had ~~xxxxxx~~ CIA-generated material in the Oswald file. This page was never classified, but I guess I can believe that the informant gave it to the FBI "because the possibility existed that it is a confidential government document which Hoch is not entitled to have in his possession." (P. 2 of the LHM)

The source's name is deleted in the text, but not in the filing notation at the bottom of p. 1. (137 identified an informant.) This man is the owner of a copying service where I did a lot of work; he was always friendly enough to me. He is ~~x~~ foreign-born, and could easily have been of interest to the FBI in connection with his political activities, or those of his compatriots. It could easily be that

we discussed my work, and I gave him copies ~~for~~ of some documents for his own information. It is possible that, after he gave the FBI the pages from CD 49, they asked him about other stuff I was working on. (I did write Nader one, as alleged, but I ~~think~~ doubt that I would have described my FOIA requests as successful; generally, they weren't.

Anyhow, I'm certainly not going to ask the informant about all this until I see the rest of my file, and see if he was passing on stuff regularly. The one aspect of this which most interests me is the possibility that the FBI made a habit of having sources in copy places and print shops - that would actually have been a good way of keeping track of a lot of Berkeley political activities.

11/6/69, Goble for Branigan to Sullivan: The second graf refers to earlier contacts with the FBI. On 2/4/65, I wrote a toadying letter (referring to the FBI's excellent investigative report) asking about getting CD 1. Hoover's reply (2/10X) thanked me for my kind comments and said that "it is not expected" that CD 1 will be made public; it was up to the WC ~~to~~ to decide what to release. (I think this letter is reproduced in one of Weisberg's books)

On June 21, 1966, I dropped in on the FBI's office (presumably set up to take care of such walk-in inquiries) and talked to Mr. Thomas Coll. It was not quite correct for Goble to ~~say~~ say I was referred to data furnished to the WC. I asked if there had been good FBI-SS liaison, which Hoover did confirm in his letter of 6/28/66; what I was interested in, and what Coll told me, was that the FBI probably got the autopsy report shortly after the SS did, and that he was ~~sure~~ confident that CD 1 was based on a report (written or oral) of the autopsy. Of course, at this point I'm sure Coll didn't ~~know~~ know what he was talking about. I would like to see his memo of this conversation, of there was one.

I did ask if the X Sibert & O'Neill report was in CD 5, 7, or 49~~x~~, which could not yet be examined at the Archives. The FBI didn't say, but Mike Simmons found it for me shortly thereafter. (This early correspondence with the FBI is files under "WC people and files.")

Actually, I'm impressed that the Archives was able to identify the suspicious document I had as part ~~f~~ of CD 49. (Maybe that was written on it - probably was!)

This memo is a response to the LHM from SF; nothing special about it.

Teletypes of 12/12 and 12/14/69, NO to HQ, listing the exhibit items in the NO FPCC 1A envelope. Nothing sensational there; ~~they~~ they had been denied to me and had never ~~be~~ even been described. I don't think we knew that Core gave the FBI a Lamont pamphlet; did it have 544 Camp on it too? The other items indicate pretty good coverage of correspondence to the FPCC in N.O. - 2 letters and a membership form. I think the ~~name~~ name on item 2, Henry Heller, is familiar.

The first teletype describes the items; the second explains where they came from.

[Before I forget - one additional question on the ~~info~~ info from SF - why was there a LHM? Isn't that done when they plan to disseminate info to other agencies? If so, who?]

These teletypes are in response to my request of 7/8/68, lost ~~by~~ by the JD and resubmitted 12/1/69, for NO FPCC 1A items 1-4. I was told the pre-handbill items don't relate to LHO, which is accurate; the next item does, ~~however~~ however. (The Core copy of the Lamont pamphlet.) This request was then dropped in favor of the more general one ~~is~~ covered by the next item.

6/30/70, again Goble for Branigan to Sullivan, with an OK by ? (JEH?). Re my request of 6/8/70, for (a) some enclosures ~~which~~ to CE 3146 (Odio) which couldn't be found at the Archives; I think I eventually got all of them (2b); Thomas Vallee docs (which Skolnick was after); obtained on appeal (12/16/70); (c) the most interesting, any NO FPCC stuff on ~~the~~ LHO; never obtained. The Vallee stuff could legitimately have been withheld, mostly. The problem with the NO files is that I don't trust any claim that the substance was already available.

I've got a pretty thick JD correspondence file; some things I got, other I didn't. Thru 1971, requests related to Quiroga; the mags from Alba's in NO, Ed Butler (original interview not found), withheld published CE's, pre-ass files, LHO corr. w/ Worker, McDermid. 10/5/71-I sent Mitchell a funny Doonesbury clip. [END]