

April 6, 1971

Hon. Hale Boggs
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Boggs,

Congratulations on your courageous speech yesterday demanding the departure of J. Edgar Hoover. Even the FBI will be better off for it.

My purpose in writing, however, is not merely to express approval of this one speech. It is to inform you of what I believe you may not know, that you have in other ways been victimized by Mr. Hoover, during your membership on the Warren Commission. I have conducted and am, with serious official interference, still conducting, an investigation of that investigation. I have read those executive sessions not still suppressed, and I know the feelings of the Members of some of the issues, especially one I will address directly.

The most significant evidence was withheld from you, and by the FBI. I am preparing to sue for some under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), have won one such suit (incredibly, with a summary judgement), and I think it is quite accurate that not one single communication from the Department, which responds for the Bureau under the FOI, has not lied, blatantly, violated the law, or just been plain deceptive. I think there are now two cases of official perjury, and if you are a lawyer, I will put you in a position to judge for yourself.

Some of these things relate to New Orleans. For example, you had no pictures of Oswald being arrested. This is not because the FBI did not have them. They had at the very least two motion pictures, taken by amateurs, both of which they withheld from you. There is reason to believe there may have been an official also taking pictures. I have obtained from the owner what remains of the pictures in one case. Both have informed me (and in each case with a corroborating witness) that the original pictures were edited by the FBI and the edited version rather than the original returned. You got neither. Bearing on this, there is absolutely no doubt that the WDSU-TV pictures were likewise edited, and that the still pictures made from it were, except for I think 3 of 17, withheld from you and are not now in the Archives. I have uncontestable proof of this in FBI reports in my possession, I have a copy of the WDSU film made available to me by Ed Planer, and I have several witnesses describing still pictures from this film shown them but not you. The Secret Service copy, which I was finally able to force into the National Archives, still has a wrapper saying it shows Oswald and two other men distributing handbills outside the old IEM, but the remaining film shows but one. I interviewed that one, on tape, with his permission, and he describes the second man with him and Oswald. Jesse Gore also told me of seeing this third picketer. With the serious question, was Oswald alone, need I emphasize what this evidence could have meant to your Commission, and that you should have evaluated it, no others for you?

Your report deals with another aspect of this picketing saying that Oswald, using the name Oswald, had the handbills printed by the Jones Printing Company. The Report uses the exact wording of the report supplied your Commission by the FBI in Washington. However, it is diametrically opposite the raw reports (and I have and can show you all of these) of the agents in the field, who said that the only people who knew said it was not Oswald. I interviewed both, again on tape and again with permission, and they leave no doubt that

not only what is not possible is that Oswald got these handbills, but independently, when each of the two people was given a stack of miscellaneous pictures, totally perhaps 100, each selected the same pictures of one man as the one to whom they had delivered the handbills. Nor is this the entire story, but it gives you one aspect of what was done to you and your Commission, how you were boxed in, added to the victims, so to speak. And this is only part of what was withheld from you relating to New Orleans. There is a considerable story on David Ferrie you were not given, and what was made available was couched in such language that your staff, if it had the desire (and I doubt Wesley Liebeler did) would not likely have detected it,

This is not true of New Orleans evidence alone. I can show you what I have obtained (and completely properly) that was withheld from you of an even more basic nature. It apparently was decided that letting me have it without going to court would attract less attention to it than letting me sue for it.

Let me give you a couple of other examples of what the FBI did to you, from only those things for which I am now suing or preparing to sue. You do not have a single meaningful of the late President's garments. They were carefully arranged to show nothing but gore, to hide the evidence they bear. I have obtained some that prove this beyond doubt, even to the layman, and I have a reading from an accredited criminalist. I am suing for others, those not taken for you. You realize these garments are all in your evidence, and all I seek is pictures of the damage, no more. They will flood me with gore, with all the undignified pictures capable of none but sensational use, but pictures of as small an area as 1/2 inch of the garments, showing only the damage, which is all that I think I need for my continuing study, that I am denied for a series of spurious reasons. These range from the frivolous claim that pictures not showing the blood are for sensational and undignified purposes to the quite false claim that the alleged GSA-family contract precludes it (which is the opposite, it requires it).

Are you aware that you were never given the spectrographic analyses? I also have been denied them, from the time of my first request in May of 1966. It is not and cannot be covered by any of the exemptions of 5 U.S.C. 552. Can you think of one good reason why you should not have had it? The reason actually made in court - and I can supply you with the transcript - that that the Attorney General had determined that the "national interest" required it to be suppressed. If you are familiar with the legislative history of this law, and particularly with the House Report, nothing is more certain than that congress intended eliminating that indefiniteness, that traditional cloak for suppression. I can supply you with this report, too. Even then, no such statement from Mr. Mitchell was produced in court, and with the case under appeal, he has not denied making this "determination", of which proof does not exist.

I do not seek publicity for any of this. Quite the contrary. I have invested an enormous labor, and I desire to complete my own research and writing before anything else. However, on a basis of mutual confidence - meaning you will make no public use of what I do not now want used and I will make no unauthorized reference to any consultation or meeting we may have - everything I have is available to you. In strictest confidence, I tell you that Senator Russell was most seriously disturbed when I handed him proof of alterations made in your official records. I will show you this also, should you desire, for it is one of the ways in which, historically, the Members were made into victims.

For more current evidence of the performance of the FBI under Mr. Hoover, I refer you to my current book, reviewed in the coming issue of the Saturday Review and of which I enclose a pre-publication, trade-press review. The agents are neither this incompetent nor this dishonest...When, as you do, you talk of this in the context of the Bill of Rights, you could not be more right and, I hope, with me, more concerned.

Sincerely,