

July 25, 1978

Dear Harold,

Thanks for your letters of 7/14, 7/15, and 7/20. I don't have much to report; everyone here is recovering from a cold.

The Dallas documents are interesting. Enclosed is my listing. As we agreed, I'm keeping ~~xxx~~ this all totally confidential for ~~mw~~ now.

I don't think I have much to contribute in the way of analysis of these documents. I'm surprised that some of them (#2, #15) aren't in the HQ files; maybe they are. In #18, re Jim Bishop, the file ~~xxx~~ category 80 indicates ~~WRxxxx~~ "Public Relations matters." In #19, the name of the author, a SA, is deleted, but apparently his initials (FVC) are not.

Also enclosed: a list of Dallas and N.O. file numbers which might be relevant. Plus, a couple of clippings (one about a FOIA suit against the SS, presumably by a Weberman crony, which I hadn't heard of), and pp. 26-27 of my "Epstein" notes.

I don't recall whether I mentioned this before, but I don't think it would be worth going to the effort of copying a lot of the inventory worksheets for me now - at least until I've seen a few of them, and can tell if they are all ~~mw~~ worth getting. Hopefully I'll be able to see you in September, if I do make it there for the hearings, and we can work some further arrangements out then.

You asked if I have made a FOIA-PA request for records on me. Yes, but they managed to interpret it very narrowly, sending me only the two items which ~~xxx~~ contained background info on me. I've written back, asking for at least citations to all serials indexed to me, but I haven't heard yet.

You sent me a classified ad from "Seven Days" for a JFK documentary on the tramps, Hunt & Sturgis, etc., which originated in S.F. This is almost certainly from Paul Kangas, whom I have met a couple of times. He is quite sincere, and a rather nice guy, but the Hunt-Sturgis stuff is, of course, loony. (The differences between the tramp photos and the Hunt-Sturgis photos are accounted for by retouching. With that approach, you can't lose!) I've stayed away from him as much as possible. He represents an offshoot of an ~~xxx~~ offshoot of the Weberman people.

If you want a summary on "D" for use in court, I ~~xxx~~ think what's in the WR is as good as anything I could provide. (If necessary, supplemented by pp. 28-30 and 41-43 of the Schweiker Report.)

You asked if I knew of a 4-volume Gemberling report of 5/16/64, ~~1155~~ 1266 pp. This sounds ~~xxx~~ like CD 1107, dated 5/15, which goes through p. 1266*.

The name Mark Allen gave you re Mexico CIA, Tarrascoft, rings no bells with me.

The 130 pp. of pre-ass'n documents I allegedly got are in fact 64 pre-ass'n pages (18 new, the rest published or released long ago), ~~plus~~ plus some post-ass'n stuff, as described in the list I sent you earlier (PLH FBI documents #490-526). The JD's cover letter made no reference to a specific request of mine (in fact, I hadn't formally requested the post-ass'n stuff). It doesn't even describe the records sent, but ~~xx~~ if you still think you can use it, I'll send a copy.

I think if Guinn's NAA work had been able to ~~disprove~~ disprove the single bullet theory, we would have ~~xx~~ heard about it by now. I'm a bit concerned that the HSC didn't give him the mandate, or the material, to do proper control studies - for which you need ~~quite~~ quite a few bullets from the same lots as "Oswald's."

~~XXXXXX~~ [Re those 132 pp. from the FBI: on 5/17, McCreight wrote, saying "Reference is made to your ~~FOIPA~~ FOIPA requests for information pertaining to LHO in the investigative files maintained at FBIHQ. The records which you requested have been processed, and the documents are available for release."... Send \$13.20. [Obviously, it's only part of what I requested!] The cover note with the documents themselves said "The enclosed documents are copies from the files maintained at FBIHQ... captioned (1) LHO, (2) Funds Transmitted to Residents of Russia and (3) FPCC."]

Best regards,

Paul
PLH