65

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg JFK assassination appeals 3/30/79
1) "Privacy" vis historical cases for newspaper editors who write page-1 articles
2) Oswald's visit to the FBI and alleged threats against it and an SA

Previously I have written to ask where the records relating to the above-captioned subject ~~material~~ are. From the "previously processed" notations in the Dallas files and the absence of any index or guide it was impossible to locate any such records.

By accident I have located some but not all in the voluminous ~~xxxxx~~ records, not in consecutive serials. As of now I have not located the FBI's own final report or all the materials it gathered for its internal investigation. I have found many of what the FBI regards as affidavits ~~and~~ I have references to the results of investigations of the matter that are not included in the statements.

(93) I attach page one only of 62-109060-7226X. It typifies all that is wrong, wasteful and entirely unjustifiable in the FBI's attitude and processing of these records which are so embarrassing to it.

Make any kind of bet you want: the withheld information is the name Johnson and the newspaper The Dallas Times-Herald. Now this is not an educated guess from a subject expert. It is because all is public domain. This clearly is in the FBI files. It is in many if not most of the statements. It is in, very prominently in, the 8/31/75 issue of that paper, which made a big front-page splash. The extensive attention includes Johnson's taking the entire matter up with FBIHQ, in a separate box as I recall. (I have since found this story in FBI file

But were none of this true, how can these withholdings possibly be justified? And what need could have been served? Given the subject matter, carefully obscured in this self-serving FBI cover-the-ass paper, how could the withholding be justified under any conditions? Is there anything that better fits the description of the Congress of what can not be withheld? Of course, this is an historical case. So you and through you the Department and perhaps in time the courts will have this view of the FBI's performance in historical case maximum disclosure.

There also was a public House hearing and televised on the matter, about 11/75. This also is long before the processing of the records. In fact, one of the records I have found is the transcript of Adams' testimony, so the processors did not have to have any other knowledge to know this was all public domain. However, the FBI statements I've read to now include no specific references to the extensive press attention. Radio, TV, the Dallas papers, Time magazine, the wire services - all in the statements taken from various FBI people. All also read by those who perpetrated these withholdings.

If by chance claim to 7D was made, that also is fraudulent, obviously. I'm not taking time to check the worksheets.

You will recall that recently I've noted how unusual it is that some FBI people were sounding off to the press, one James Patrick Hosty, Jr., in particular. He has since

retired but his blabbing of what is not even good propaganda preceeded his retirement. It is not often that the FBI tolerates a public attack on a Congressional committee by a Special Agent and I can't imagine that many Special Agents within days of retirement have ever done this. Nor can I imagine that Hosty endangered his retirement by doing it.

What is involved is the suppression by the FBI of an extraordinary matter for almost a dozen years. Dozens if not more FBI people of all ranks knew about it and not one said a word until, by one of those remarkable coincidences, the retirement of the Dallas SAC was safe and secure. Then only was there a leak to the Dallas paper less inclined to publish any criticism of the official account of the JFK assassination.

It seems that the only official candidate for assassins, officially elected to that ~~position~~ distinction, went to the Dallas FBI office two or three days before the assassination. He asked to see Hosty, who was not in. So, without bothering to seal it, he left a note or letter for Hosty. With it sticking partly out of the envelope the receptionist read it.

Then the President was killed, Hosty head Oswald's name and recognized it as a case he had, and with what is described as "the memory of an elephant," never once gave thought to this letter. It turns out that in all the varying accounts the one consistency is that it was a threat. The more common versions of the threat have to do with the bombing of the FBI office and/or the police headquarters. Naturally the FBI assured the Warren Commission and the country that Oswald had no history indicative of any tendency for violence. And said nothing of this. And after Oswald was in lone assassin, destroyed his note/threat

Even when Hosty was rushed over to interview Oswald, he claims, this note "never entered my mind."

That this was widely and apprehensively known throughout the entire Dallas Field Office is clear in the affidavits I've read. It was known on high level in FBIHQ.

There is more. Like Hosty's complaint prior to the leak to the paper. His complaint was made in person to Director Kelley, who then made some inquiry no records of which I've yet seen. (What does this do to any WD claim?) But I think you need no more. (There are other WD claims written on some of the Hosty blab pages I've read.)

Until Watergate I never believe that any number of Americans could conspire and not one of them let a word out. This was years before Watergate. And oddly enough the Commission was supposedly investigating a report of Oswald's having an FBI connection, which the FBI and its Director assured the Commission was false. Only several of the SAs whose statements I've just read state they understood Oswald was a source or informant. So it is only natural that elephantine memories should fail and that none of these people would think of providing any information to what after all was only a Presidential Commission. Or to the FBI's own inspectors, one of who my was assigned to Dallas immediately.

In this connection you might find appropriate the content of the Commission's 11/22/64 executive session transcript, the one they decided to destroy. It is in Post Mortem.

Harold

In fairness to the FBI I must tell you that two witnesses informed the Commission about Oswald's visit to the DFO and of his leaving a note there. So the Commission did know and it had ultimate responsibility. (Marina Oswald + Ruth Paine.)

However, as you now know from the earlier attachments and as I knew all along the FBI did have the Commission's testimony and did go over it carefully, in FBIHQ as in the FOs. So the FBI also knew, aside from all the silent employees never censored for their silence, that Hosty had received a note from Oswald and that Oswald had been to the DFO.

Unless records are withheld the FBI made no record of this matter at the time it went over the Commission's transcripts or at any time prior to the leak to the Dallas paper. Quite exceptional, I think. I therefore assume there is withholding, perhaps by storage in other files, and appeal the withholding. (One of my earlier requests includes this kind of information.)