

Dear Paul,

2/2/78

In today's mail with your mailing that included your notes on the FBI's personal records on you were several helpful clippings from Mark Allen. Because some of what I'll be suggesting to you will possibly be helpful to him, a carbon to him. What I'll say about those clippings will help explain some of my present interests and problems to you.

As usual the FBI is playing games. With all of us. My main interest now relates to me and my FOIA cases.

Mark sent the States-Item p. 1 story bannered Criticism Bared in FBI files/  
Hoover on Garrison: 'fiasco.'

This story does not bear credit to AP or UPI. It also does not have the by-line of a staffer. Nor does it carry a Washington dateline. So the immediate question I have is how did the States-Item learn the very day of the release and in time for inclusion of the entire story how to find any records on Garrison. Or anybody else.

I am suggesting that the FBI did call this local-interest story (and all the documents referred to) to a reporter's attention.

The S-I story of 1/20/78 is credited to AP: "FBI probed Marina's sex life." The content of this story is documents that bear very heavily on the FBI's seriousness when it withholds records on grounds of privacy. (So if any of you come across any other such personal stuff and especially the citations to these records we may be able to use them very well in court. I have drafted an affidavit for JL in which this could be relevant if I could attach the documents.)

Here Jim phoned, I mentioned such things, and he believes that we may have some uses of the kind I've indicated, relating to compliance. He agrees that if they can release stuff on Marina's sex life they cannot withhold for us as they on privacy grounds. Except that nobody stops them. As a matter of their own practice they cannot.

I think the same kinds of uses are possible with PH's 1/25/78 memo, p. 1, graf beginning My correspondence on this" the 544 pamphlet. With the correspondence records for Jim, to show that they lie on this subject when while superficially there is no apparent reason to a subject expert there is a reason that can be perceived - they did not want any attention to that address. And I believe never did give that literature to the WC.

After extra space what you say about CIA, same principle. JL may ask affidavit, later.

P. 2, line 6, you are not going to ask Gink until you have all records. One approach. Another is to ask him and learn what they may never give you. As you will have seen I'm practicing the latter with respect to myself.

Your Gink was a numbered informer, not a source. He may still be informing on students and professors in political matters.

Here you do not reflect what I thought you knew: you will get from an FOIA request of HQ what is in HQ's central files only. Jim and I are girding for several battles on this. I have incorporated something on it in the draft of an affidavit I've prepared for JL. The central files do not include all of the HQ files. And as the SF LHM suggests I believe that WFO is used as a means of hiding in HQ files what the FBI wants in DC on political files.

You will have to make separate FOIA/PA (use both) requests of all field offices you think may have files on you. We have, re me, to all 59. Without exception all who have complied by sending any records have lied and are withholding, as I'll prove. I can also prove that some of those who denied having any records do in fact have records proofs in my possession. If I were you I'd do this and be sure to include SF, NO, Dallas, LA (cover your correspondence and other connections, perhaps other places for that reason) and WFO.

There are possible importances in the copies of some of the documents on you. As you know Jim and I will be seeking some kind of redress and in this way also these can be helpful.

The Serial is not visible on the Branigan 10/2/68, the one with Hoover's note on you as "smear artist." The file 62-82555 is typed on. No other visible file indication. This means they have a name index that includes critics to the HQ central files. It is not absolutely certain but I'd guess from the mark in the upper right that you got a copy of the Sullivan copy. This raises a question to which Jim and I have never gotten any satisfactory answer, what happened to the other five copies?

I think it is possible that a file on you may be indicated in other copies and that is the reason they have given you this one, to hide the identification of another one. When this kind of chickenshit got to Hoover's personal attention it seems entirely improbable that if and when the founding father wanted records on us they had to hold him up while they wandered through 490-600 or more Sections to remove a page here and a page there.

Now on Hoover's note I have several interests. First of all, is there any basis in any record of which you know for him to know other than these records show about you? If you know of no other records, is there anything you had done that would justify the epithet "Smear artist?"

I will be wanting to be able to show that the FBI was out to hurt those of us who asked questions about the JFK assassination, the hurt perhaps varying in degree. So after you have all the records or what they represent as all I'd appreciate a set and your personal comment on whether or not ~~it was justified~~ what is said that is not nice is in any way justified. I will want to be able to do this to the degree possible with all "critics."

10/31/69, from 62-109060, the numbers at the bottom do not indicate an informant number, as I took it you said. The code for filing "1" = "training schools. Within those files 137 is a separate breakdown, of which 5238A is the Serial number of a record or perhaps outside my knowledge of a sub of a sub-file.

6/30/70, Serial 6945 again indicates they have files all collected and on hand because Goble could immediately cite the Hooverian scripture about "smear artists." Too much work any other way.

I'm starting a file Hoch- FBI/ Personal Files. I'll do this with all the others as I come across records. I think they made a serious mistake in this and want to do what I can to assure them full benefit of their viciousness.

While I was writing this Lardner phoned to read a couple of excerpts from some on me he'd come across. He got a kick out of knowing the truth.

I'll be making copies of the records on me available when I have them all or what I can reasonably hope is most. But on this I'm going to have to depend largely on others because I can't take time to search for them now. When I have them I can attach comment.

This kind of operation on the critics can do more to raise doubts about the FBI's work than the critics can. Especially considering what is true of some.

Best,