

Paul L. Hoch
10 June 1978

By letter of May 17, the FBI notified me that 132 pages from FBI HQ files which I requested were available for release. Contrary to my assumption, only 64 pages were pre-assassination documents (and only 18 of those pages were new to me). There were also 52 pages from the post-assassination part of Sections 1-3 of the LHO file, which were withheld from the pre-release copy given to me. (They were, however, in the FBI's December public release, and the ALB had sent me essentially all of them.) The remaining 16 pages of the 132 are referral slips for withheld documents.

Please refer to the listing of these items for individual descriptions. I gave all pre-assassination records a high rating (about one * extra), just for being pre-assassination. There doesn't seem to be anything sensational here; there are new details relating to old leads, which hopefully have already been checked out by the House Committee.

Missing "Funds Transmitted" documents? The only document provided from the file "Funds Transmitted to Residents of Russia" was the Fain report [CE 821], with its two (new) cover pages. The FBI has confirmed that the Washington and NY field offices found no references to Oswald in this file which had not previously been sent to or from FBI HQ. However, the cover page of the Fain report (#493) refers to a NY letter to Dallas, 3/9/60, and a New York letter to the Bureau, 2/26/60.

This raises two questions: first, why didn't we know about (and have) these documents before now? The FBI didn't give me any indication that the 2/26/60 letter is in the HQ Funds file. (Even if it is withheld in full - which is unlikely since the FBI consistently releases items with the substance deleted but with identifying information visible - there should have been some sort of referral slip.) The NY letter to Dallas should have turned up in the material from the NY Funds file.

I understand that this information is "sensitive" - it probably comes either from confidential sources in a bank, or from the CIA mail intercept operation in New York. The second question raised, of course, is: what is in these documents? My guess would be that their contents will not be sensational. In any case, this indication that Oswald documents have become irretrievable should be pursued.

Item #493 has an undated notation "1 cc to go in 105-82555." This apparently was not done, or later suppressed.

A few lines are withheld, but only as "confidential," which implies that the source was not all that sensitive.

Offhand, I can't tell if there is anything new and interesting in the details about the FBI's contacts with the Oswald family. I'll ask Peter Scott to comment.

The FBI said that the Bureau learned on 25 January 1960 that the funds had been sent. That early date is not reflected in the Fain report. Clearly there are other documents on this matter, which should be tracked down.

FBI concern about the FPCC in New Orleans: The 3 new pages from the FPCC file (#490-1) provide some additional details about this subject, which has interested me (and many other people for years). #490 specifies that New Orleans (specifically, DeBrueys) was reopening the FPCC case in late August 1963 "for the purpose of determining the identities of members of the New Orleans chapter of subject organization, as well as the nature of the activities of this chapter." Which, of course, makes it even more peculiar that there was no evident interest in 544 Camp Street.

I have pretty much run out of steam when it comes to trying to analyze such matters on the basis of a sanitized fragment of the documentary record. I gave a 15-page memo with questions for DeBrueys, and comments, to the Schweiker Committee. I have no idea what they got from his testimony (if anything). I've also given that material to the House Committee. Incidentally, items #490-2 were copied for review by the HSC on 28 June 1977 (which is rather late in the game); #491-2 were given to the Senate Committee on 21 Nov 75. The material from the Funds file does not show any such dissemination. Since FBI HQ wrote the 4 major field offices to get the pre-assassination files for me on 17 October 1977, it may be that the

HSC is not that far ahead of me in studying this rather basic material, despite their much greater ability to demand access. A distressing prospect.

In #490, the deleted source is Jesse Core. Also, as far as I know, this item was never given to the Warren Commission.

In #491, I would of course like to see the deleted names. I am curious about NO T-3, who provided the "Carte Blanche" transcript (Oswald, Butler, etc.) on 12 September 1963, according to p. 12. Hoover told the Commission that NO T-3 in this report was Mrs. Jeanne Rodgers of WDSU, but that the date should have been 22 August 1963. Why would Kaack use her name and DeBruens protect it? Since Hoover's explanation has been published (CE 833, #15), the description of NO T-3 in Item #491 should not be withheld.

Note the extensive dissemination of the DeBruens report: State, CIA, G2 [Army], ONI, OSI [Air Force], RAO [Justice?], and even NSIA, plus I&NS in New Orleans. The most interesting of these is G2. Some of the other Oswald items also went to the Army (e.g., Hosty's report of 9/10/63, Serial 36); certainly the HSC should have put together a comprehensive list of who got what, and should have tried to find out what happened to the Army file(s). [Refer to my memo of 8 Oct 77, on the new evidence that the Army was the first to tell the FBI about the Hidell alias.]

Additional FBI files to be reviewed: My letter of 28 Oct 77 to the FBI included a rather detailed list of the files apparently covered by my request for all pre-assassination records on Oswald. A number of these files have not yet been processed, it seems.

The FBI asked Dallas, New Orleans, NY, and WFO for the LHO, FPCC, and Fumas files; they have been processed for the latter two cities, but not for Dallas and New Orleans - which are of course bigger, and probably more interesting.

Processing of HQ files on LHO, FPCC, and Fumas appears to be completed.

As far as I know, no work has been done on:

- (1) HQ Files on Marina ("SOBIR") at HQ, Dallas, and New Orleans. Probably consists mainly of duplicates, but I do want to see what initiated these cases.
- (2) Any files from the Paris and Mexico City Legat offices. These could be important.
- (3) Files from Newark and Little Rock on LHO. (Probably trivial.)
- (4) As specified in my letter, there may be additional material in various other files. In order of decreasing probable importance, these are Hoover's personal files, the COINTELPRO files, and files on Lee "Henry" Oswald, Webster, other defectors, another Lee Oswald (?) [stolen car case?] and a FPCC item not naming Oswald but probably one of his pamphlets.

I am planning to ask the FBI to pursue this additional material.

New pre-assassination material from the main LHO HQ file:

In the communications with Paris (#495-498) everything of substance is deleted, except a letter, apparently from Schweitzer College to some local police reporting that Oswald hadn't turned up. According to CE 834, #500 says that the Legat had informed one of his sources as to Oswald's present status, but the substance is entirely deleted.

In #501 (Item 57 of CE 834), the first section, in which Hosty reports having learned from INS that had reported Oswald's Soviet Embassy contact, is deleted. I have wondered if Hosty had complained about not having heard this directly - he doesn't in the available part of this document.

The referenced document is an airtel from New Orleans to Dallas, 10/2/63, which I don't think we have; it should be in the files still being processed.

Item #502 reveals that HQ sent quite a bit of background info to Mexico.

The cover pages for the Kaack report (#503) confirm that Kaack knew about the CIA material on Oswald in Mexico - presumably including the Kostikov contact, although exactly what Kaack knew is deleted. Of course, it is good to have the leads Kaack set out. There are references to relevant items in the NO LHO file, which we don't yet have.

I haven't done any notes on #463-489, which are sort of interesting, but pretty much self-explanatory. Refer to the detailed listing, and ask for copies of any desired items.