

11/30/77

Dear George, *Larkin*

My wife stayed up last night and copied the rules transcripts for you. Because I expect to see Paul Valentine Sunday I'll not mail them but instead will give them to him for you. This will save what for me are considerable mailing costs and you will not have time to read them now anyway with all those FBI pages stacked ahead of you.

On the FBI records, if there is any outline or guide to them of any kind I'd appreciate a copy. If this is verbal, after your time pressures are over will be plenty of time for me. My interest in them, aside ~~from~~ from what help I can be now, is for the future. I do believe, from what the bitter-ended Gemberling said when the story first broke in Dallas, that there are some records that lead to other than the official conclusions. This may well be along the line of what I've been giving away recently, about Oswald.

When it has cooled as a story I'd like to be able to borrow these records to make copies. My wife gets busy about the first of the year. This last until mid-April. By then I'd expect the papers not to be pawing with hot little hands for stories. By then also there may have been a decision on my request for copies with a waiver of fees and charges. But if not I'd guarantee their safe return.

How true I cannot say but the AIB people are reported to have told a reporter named something like Walters (Star?) to be alert for dynamite in the FBI releases relating to the ammo used in the crime. In the version that has reached me it is said to have been a special type made for the CIA. Be careful. I've heard the story before but do not now recall all the details. Of course I'm very interested in the subject. My efforts to track the ammo matter down is a continuing one after a dozen years. I've been to the Supreme Court on it and am now before the appeals court for the fourth time. But I have no reason to believe this story.

Whispers have also been reaching me that the CIA is trying to turn the Assassins committee toward the FBI and vice versa.

These are not only cautions - they are the kinds of things that lead me to believe that the FBI may have made notes in the course of reviewing these records from which they can retrieve any of them and from which they may have an aid prepared for the press. But not for others on their informal "Enemies" lists. Like me. And without something of this nature I'll not be able to go over many records if I see them. I'll probably be able to react but not definitively not knowing what else the Commission did not get. (A good question to the FBI is why it did not get these records. If they say the content was conveyed I can assure you that often worked backward and sometimes not at all.)

The consolidation of various reports in the "OO" or "Office of Origin" was in Dallas by a recently-retired agent named Robert P. Gemberling. I do not expect any beating by Gemberling, who the Dallas papers have as the one who prepared these records for release. I can tell you that if the testimony we adduced in an FOIA case is truthful as of September 1976 all the records had been reviewed in HQ three times under FOIA requests - without any of my dozens being responded to. However, inside the FBI Gemberling would be regarded as a subject expect.

It surprises me that I have had no inquiry from anyone asking for an opinion of this very atypical FBI behavior - the apparent spontaneous release of all its JFK assassination files. After the way they've been stonewalling me and others, in and out of court? I don't know the explanation. I can make some guesses. One is that they believed that with my King suit against them grinding to an end, and having ground them some during its course, they anticipated I'd have them in court again on my unanswered JFK requests. It would have been true. Jim and I planned a very large suit under FOIA. The result is beyond question - they are unloading almost all in one documentary repast beyond human digestion. They and

the CIA have learned that the papers will have a one-day sensation, as with mind-bending, and their world then goes on much as before. With each disclosure reporters, editors and the people become inured. There are virtually none who have or can take the time to go over such a volume of paper and there is little interest if the few of us who have taken this kind of time discover anything of significance. You may find this hard to believe but I have many such experiences. An example is my inability to interest anyone in my fairly early discovery of the CIA's mind-toying. I found evidence of it in once-secret Warren Commission files, of all places, and associated with Helms. I got \$300 from the National Enquirer for the lead on it and then never would go farther. Not even when years later, when the story broke with the Rockefeller Commission, I came up with one who had been part of that program and even at a time earlier than admitted.

My hunch is that whatever explanation is offered, if one is, part of the reason for this 80,000-page plus release is obfuscation and exculpation. Much is hidden forever in that imposing mass. And the FBI can always claim, well, we let it all hang out.

My tactics in the King case can have encouraged this. I've let only one paper out after the first release to me of a couple of dozen pages sworn to as full compliance. I held a press conference and gave copies of all I first got away. There was no real interest and none in any follow-up. The one paper is recent, to Les, on the FBI's seeking of permission to bug the Ray family. (I believe it was window-dressing, that they had already done a fruitless black-bag job.) I had a purpose in letting this one out. I also had a purpose, especially after I perceived the lack of interest, in giving nothing more away when in the end I'm giving it all away. That was not to alert those processing the papers to what they might want to hide under a spurious claim to exemption. They have been using non-subject experts to process the papers. So the analysts do not know the facts of the cases. They catch FBI traditional dirty tricks but the subtleties are lost upon them. This has led to much worthwhile information if not to any major story. And the FBI is happy not to have been pestered with stories. It is already claiming look, we've given you all. And right now I'm going about proving it hasn't.

I don't think any part of the press will really go over all these coming records. Or that all the hidden secrets are in them. Aside from the back channels there never was a real investigation of the JFK assassination. I'll be surprised if you do not find most of what you go over to be basically irrelevant. Impressive mass but not nitty gritty. There may be some that could not be avoided but I think no secrets, no great earth-shakers from the FBI's derring do. There may well be significant material on aspects, like background on LHO. One of my requests is for every record on him. There are pictures they are still withholding from me. I have a copy of one that is of possible significance but nobody will pay any attention to it. They have at least two amateur movies of Oswald being arrested they never gave the Warren Commission - and have been withholding from me since 1968. There can be much on some elements never pursued by the Commission. Like the great number of reportings of Oswalds that could not have been the real LHO. Some are not human error or confabulation of publicity-seeking. I have a chapter in my first book titled The False Oswald. And so on.

I don't know if this is helpful to you. I suggest you not forget the first rule of the game as these types play it: cover the ass. It requires the reading of thousands of pages before one learns the special meanings they impart to ordinary words. Without semantics there could not have been the FBI we've come to know.

Best of luck as you rush in reading,