

## PREFACE

When John F. Kennedy was assassinated like most other Americans I spent as much time as I could before the TV tube. TV was broadcasting around the clock, with frequent repetitions and replays. Unlike most Americans I was a former reporter, investigative reporter, Senate investigator and editor and wartime intelligence analyst and troubleshooter in the Office of Strategic Services. And, unlike reporters I had no deadlines to meet in that exceptionally sensational and emotional story. So, I had time to think; and I was troubled by the fact that the Dallas, Texas police were all over TV airing their interpretations of the alleged evidence and the alleged lone guilt of the accused Lee Harvey Oswald. Under our law and controlling court decision, what the police were doing, virtually converting every street corner encounter with the media as a press conference, was very, very wrong.

Two days after that most subversive of crimes, at about 7 a.m. the morning of Sunday, November 24, 1963, when I saw and heard another network recapitulation of the evidence the police said established Oswald's guilt, I turned to my wife, who was washing our breakfast dishes, and said, "This poor son-of-a-bitch is going to be killed. "

"Why do you say that?" she asked.

I told her because public authority was making it impossible for Oswald to be tried and from that flowed the natural suspicion that public authority wanted to avoid a trial. It would not have been possible to use the evidence said to establish Oswald's guilt and it would not be possible to find a jury that had not been tainted by exposure to it and was not, in effect, witness to the crime, I told her. Inherent in my spot analysis was an inference that there might have been a government conspiracy to have the President assassinated.

While I was then not aware of it, years later I learned in Department of Justice and FBI records that almost as soon as Jack Ruby killed Oswald the man then

running the Department of Justice, Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach, acting attorney general with the late Robert Kennedy in mourning and actually the Deputy Attorney General, ~~drafted~~ wrote out on a lawyer's legal pad an incredibly shocking memorandum to the new President, Lyndon Johnson, channelled through Bill Moyers, LBJ's assistant, a memorandum that is to me as shocking as any I've ever read, and I've read hundreds of thousands of pages of once-secret official documents I obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, one interpretation of which supports suspicions of a government conspiracy. Katzenbach's memorandum does spell out a different kind of conspiracy, to withhold and to reach a preconceived, non-conspiracy "solution" to that most terrible of crimes. I shall return to this.

Several hours later, again glued to the tube, I was as shocked as anyone can be when I saw my prediction fulfilled live and on camera, when Ruby shot Oswald with all those police and reporters around and with no effort made to stop him.

I was immediately troubled by the failure of any of the media to raise questions about the impropriety and consequences of misuse of all that alleged information. Then, when days passed and the media were not asking the questions I saw and not pursuing the leads that were apparent in independent inquiries, and I was in the news room of the Washington Post, I raised these questions with a number of reporters and an editor. The reporter who spent most time listening to me was Tom Wolfe. He typed up these questions while we sat and talked but he did nothing about them and before long was finding his destiny in New York with clockwork oranges.

When I was in New York a friend, the late Sydney Kaufman, who'd spent a gratifying and successful lifetime in movies and was well-connected, introduced me to the then publisher, Ivan Obolensky. Ivan was then publishing Ladislav Farago's bestselling Patton, ~~soon a best-seller~~. I wanted to continue investigating so I asked Ivan to get a coauthor. He suggested Larry Brown. I'd known Larry slightly because he had worked for a Senate committee several of those with whom I'd worked and my wife had worked.

I knew also that Larry had been a reporter for the respected New York Herald-Tribune, so I agreed immediately. When we were getting close to the time the manuscript was due, mid-February 1964, and Larry had no copy to show me, he and I met at the Thine restaurant on Washington and decided to agree that I would ~~not~~ suspend my inquiries and write half of the book for him, and we agreed on a general outline. Two weeks later, with my half draft and no word from Larry, I drove up to Philadelphia to see what he'd written. It left me ~~in a state of shock~~ <sup>so stunned</sup> than in driving home to mid-Maryland I kept driving straight and soon found that I had driven through the Baltimore harbor tunnel and was going ~~north~~ <sup>south</sup> to Washington, D.C.

Instead of the factual analysis of the report of the Warren Commission Larry was writing an indictment of the American Civil Liberties Union, theorizing that it was involved with Oswald in the assassination. Larry presumed Oswald's guilt.

The next morning I phoned Ivan's vice president, John Ledes, told him of ~~the~~ what I regarded as the disaster Larry was writing so far behind schedule, and promised to meet the deadline.

In two weeks I had written my half of the book and in the next ten days, working almost around the clock, I wrote the half that Larry supposedly was writing.

Not long later I learned that Larry's politics were those of the Bill Buckley right ~~of~~ and that they were associates.

I'd sent what I'd written to Obolensky and as I completed the other chapter I sent them up. Then I drove up myself and then learned that the whole operation was of Larry's politics. The editor assigned was a woman who was more interested in preparing for a friend's wedding and her next greatest interest was angling the text to the right.

One night I drove John Ledes to the post office. While we were driving he told me "we have a gold-lated best seller" because without the book or anything to show almost 40 salesmen had advance sales for about a 350,000 first print, in those days quite good. Ledes told me that he had to go to Washington the next day and that

we'd talk after he returned.

We did, and while he was drolling into the till he told me they were not going to publish this best-seller. He had spoken to conservatives in Washington and that was the basis of their decision.

As I'd never gotten the "advabce," so also " never got the manuscript back. I had to reconstruct it. I went to New York with it and with Sydney Kaufman away spoke to a friend of Senate committee days. He spent me to see a friend og his at Frederick Praeger's, Mort puner, director of special projects, as I recall his feconstructed title. He read the boom ov manuscript overnight and forecast a fine future for it, subject to Praeger's personal approval.

Praeger did not approve, claiming that they published only established scholars. Years later I learned that Praeger was a CIA publisher.

When Isdney was back in New York he sent me to see his friend was was a vice president of Pocket Books, controlled by Voris Shimkin. In the vice president's absence I was ushered in to the office of Eugene Prakapis. He had to go to Boston, would take t e manuscript with him, and on his return he would phone me. But the subjedt interested him, he read the manuscript t at night and the next morning, after I'd started home, phoned the Kaufmans. It happened that just before I was to enter the Ho;land tunnel I also phoned. Andrea gave me Prakapis' message, to phone him immediately, and when " did he was thoroughly excited. "Mr. Weisber ," he 4xulted," with this manuscript, your background and out public relations and advertising expertise, we have another Green Felt ~~x~~ Jungle" and we'll make you a famous man."

I was to return a week later, and I did. Crestfallen but completely honest, Prakapis told me teh'd not dare publish it because, having only recently published a fraudulent diet book, "it would be like a red flag before the charging bull" of the DEPARTMENT OF Justice. Legitimately, it was feared that Shimkin might be included in those who who indicted, ~~tried and~~ a and later tried and convicted in federal district court. However, he said, they liked the book, regarded it as an important book, and would like to help me. I was only to happy to accept that offer. He then

explained to me that he passed judgement on hardbook reprint rights and that he would like to speak to Doubleday about publishing my book. He told me ~~the~~ man he'd phone was Sam Vaughn who, he said, was Richard Dwight Eisenhower's and Richard Nixon's editor. I heard him ask Vaughn to read the book himself.

Within a short time Doubleday wrote me that if I'd gone farther afield, which seemed to mean conjectured and ~~baseless~~ instead of factual, they might have been tempted. Later, by phone, I was told that ~~the decision was made~~ the decision was made after a high-level conference and was "not editorial and not easy to arrive at."

Well, both major publishers were honest and while a writer hopes for more, he has no legitimate complaint about honesty.

(Pocket Books was also consistent. Two years later, as distributor for Parallax Books, a small publisher, it refused to distribute my Oswald In New Orleans.)

By the end of 1964 Whitewash: the Report On the Warren Report, was rejected without a single adverse editorial comment by some 60 publishers in the United States and a number abroad. With some apparent hankypanky in Europe *and here.*

Through the Baroness Maura Budberg Sidney Kaufman introduced the book to a major British publisher. I got word that they favored the book and then I was told that after having it read by the Warden of <sup>the dock</sup> all Souls, (John Sparrow, they had rejected it. Later Sparrow denied this as well as what I'd been told, that he'd been a longtime recruiter for British intelligence, which, naturally, had a close relationship with the CIA. After the baroness, reputedly the brains of a great British moviemaker, Sidney got Gordon Harbord, a fine gentleman, to represent the book. Sidney also took a copy to a friend he had with the prominent German publisher, Fisher A.G. ~~Harbord~~ Harbord arranged for publication by the ~~firm~~ personally spectacular Italian publisher, Giangiacomo Feltrinelli and ~~he~~ <sup>we</sup> was about to sign a contract with Sir Leslie Frewin, himself a former spook, when, as Frewin wrote me, he was informed that Mark Lane's book was about to be published in England where the market, in his opinion, would not support two books. That information fed to Frewin was

false. Lane's book was not published in England until after United States publication and that was not until toward the end of 9 1966, months after Whitewash was published and distributed.

Years later Fisher ~~wrote~~ informed me that they had twice written me about their desire to publish Whitewash and when some time passed and they had no response had mailed the copy of the manuscript back to me. Neither of the letters nor the manuscript ever reached me. That was when, according to the testimony and report of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the FBI was intercepting foreign mail for the CIA.

Also during this period, as I wrote chapters of Whitewash II I mailed them to Harbord, but first-class airmail. None of these chapters reached him. When I learned that I sent the rest by air freight, which reached him promptly. After a two months lapse he telegraphed me that all the earlier chapters reached him at the same time.

The most provocative suggestion of CIA interference with my publishing was not apparent until after the beginning of the Watergate scandal in 1972. In checking out ~~the~~ the former CIA man E. Howard Hunt another probability became apparent.

In 1965 the editor of the old, the original Saturday Evening Post wanted to excerpt Whitewash. He said he wanted to deal with me through an agent, which I did not have because six had refused to have anything to do with the subject matter. He sent me to Max Wilkinson, of Littauer and Wilkinson. Wilkinson read the manuscript and phoned me that he'd be happy to represent it. Then, about six weeks later he wrote me that serial use was impossible and that there was no publishing probability in the United States. But he'd be happy to represent the book in England, where I did have an agent. The impossible serial use, which he did not observe when he read the manuscript, was false. The men's magazine Saga came to me for the use of a chapter and for it offered and paid more than they had paid Ernest Hemmingway.

In checking Hunt's CIA career out in standard published sources one of the things not unusual in the spookeries became apparent: he had addresses other than the CIA ~~at which he received mail~~. One of those addresses was, of all things, Littauer and Wilkerson, 500 Fifth ave., New York City. (So it happens, and I was never

Jarve wanted to cut him off but I insisted on facing him. It turned out that he was too young to know what he was talking about and had no apparent way of knowing either the truth or his improvements upon the truth to make it conform to his and the agencies' preferences. By the time he copped out it had been rather exciting to me and to the audience.

able to check out the relationship, if any, there was a CIA foundation, the Littauer Foundation.) The CIA did not approve my books and the inference that through Hunt it worked on Wilkinson to prevent publication, earlier apparent at Fraeger's, is unavoidable.

The FBI also engaged in its own interferences, those agencies having a concept of the first amendment not in the minds of the founding fathers or taught in schools and universities. Of these I cite only <sup>three</sup> ~~two~~. When Whitewash first began to attract attention in New York City after I brought out the first printed edition in early May of 1966, I was invited to appear on the Alan Burke Show in the largest independent TV station in the country, then known as WNEW-TV, Channel 5. According to its own records, the FBI undertook to prepare four New York lawyers to confront me on that show. When it was aired, those FBI-fronting lawyers knowing only what it had made available to them, did not do very well in confrontation, except for making the book an overnight best seller.

~~XXXXXX~~ The FBI was again unintendedly very helpful that December when I was in San Francisco promoting Whitewash II. One of what it calls its symbol informants - this means a paid informer whose actual identity is hidden by means of a symbol - tried to bait me on the Harve Morgan show then on the CBS-owned KCBS radio. *TA* The result was a sellout of all those books in that area the next day and an overflow audience when I spoke the next night at the "all of the Flowers in Golden Gate Park.

The finks were not as effective as the spooks in the agencies' dirtyworks.

A month earlier the LBJ White House had asked the FBI about me and other writers and our books. "One of us learned about this for another decade when, the Freedom of Information Act having been amended over official corruption in one of my earlier lawsuits under that Act, the FBI disclosed what it had ~~responded~~ told the White House. Among its fabrications and libels of my wife and me is that we annually celebrated the Russian Revolution with an outing for 35 strangers at our home. Even for the FBI I have come to know that was a remarkably innovated way of referring to an annual gathering of Washington area Jewish military personnel and their



families not at the time of the Russian revolution but after the Jewish high holidays. And it was arranged and conducted by the Jewish Welfare Board, not the USSR, by the cantor Jack Frankel, not the Russian ambassador. What Jack brought these families out for, especially the kids, was what we were doing that the University of Maryland later adopted under its title of Old McDonald's Farm. He ~~had a small farm~~ then had a small farm, our only home. We hatched chicks, ~~from~~ duckling and goslings from our own eggs. <sup>Those city</sup> ~~The~~ kids gathered the eggs, saw other eggs hatch, handled and played with the just hatched fowl, played with and rode on our tame farm animals and had the kind of fine time not often available under modern farming conditions ~~and~~ even in rural areas.

Not infrequently the FBI was as dirty but it was never more imaginative or effective.

<sup>an entirely incomplete and</sup>  
This is a <sup>bot</sup>tailed condensation of untoward experiences foreign to a free society and improper for any agency of government if not also illegal. I could write a book about the others. I mention these merely to indicate the ~~un~~official interest in books critical of the official "solution" of the JFK assassination, and that gets back to the first few words above, the suggestion of government involvement in what happened in Dallas as soon as JFK was shot, all that information (and misinformation) that surfaced much too fast about Lee Harvey Oswald and his strange and unusual past. He was actually called a red before he was charged with any crime.

However, I neither then nor since believed or said that there had been an official conspiracy to kill JFK. In fact I refused the one opportunity I had for major-house publication in this country over that. W.W.Norton had been sitting on his decision for some time. Then on \_\_\_\_\_ it wrote me that (get actual words and quote directly) <sup>beginning at line four of page 138</sup> if I would reorganize the book around what I said on page 138, <sup>4</sup> line 6, it would be an exceptionally important book and they would be happy to publish it. There I had said that the Commission had and avoided "irrefutable proof" of a conspiracy and of Oswald's part in it. In the context of the entire book I

interpreted Norton's desire to mean that I would be charging our government with conspiring to assassinate its head.

The preceding chapter is titled "The Oswalds' Government Relations." Among the things I set forth in it is that Oswald's actual record in his own secret writings is the exact opposite of the official representation of him as a red. He was and he spoke ~~ix~~ in public as a virulent anti-Communist. On page 122 I had written:

Oswald's hatred of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union exude from 150 consecutive pages of his notes in the same (Commission) Volume(16), as well as from other exhibits (16H283-434). For example, in Exhibit 97, (pp. 422-3) he raged, 'The Communist Party of the United States betrayed ~~the~~ <sup>has</sup> itself! It has turned itself into the traditional lever of a foreign power to overthrow the government of the United States, not in the name of freedom or high ideals, but in servile conformity to the wishes of the Soviet Union . . . ~~The Soviets~~ (the leaders) have shown themselves to be the willing gullible messengers of the Kremlin's International propaganda... The Soviets have committed crimes unsurpassed. . . impudenced their own peoples. . . mass extermination . . . individual suppression and regimentation . . . ~~and~~ deportations . . . the murder of history, the prostitution of art and culture. The communist movement in the U.S., personified by the Communist Party, U.S.A., has turned itself into a 'valuable gold coin' of the Kremlin." ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ He also wrote and there quote his having declared that "I hate the U.S.S.R and the Socialist system. He said he had "many personal reasons to know and therefore to hate and mistrust Communism." This is Oswald the red, the man to whom the Russians were "fat, stinking politicians" and the United States Communist Party was the betrayer of the working class; the man, as I also then wrote, who had a career in New Orleans that is so consistent only with what in intelligence is called "establishing a cover."

But despite the official misrepresentation of Oswald as a pro-Soviet red and despite <sup>it</sup> the lure of ~~fame and fortune~~, I was not about to charge the government with conspiring to assassinate the President for fame and fortune, without evidence.

Such evidence did not and could not exist because the government never investigated the crime itself, and never intended to. All the official investigations were designed to make it appear that the instant preconception of Oswald as the lone b nit assassin was credible. The Katzenbach memorandum to the White House referred to above is explicit in stating - before investigation was even possible - that ! "1 The public must be satisfied that Ossald was the assassin; that he did not have confederates who are still at large; tha and that the evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial."

When the Congress was about to investigate the assassination the FBI prepared an outline summary of what it might have to face. That outline is severely critical of the FBI's record and practises and uses some of its own embarrassing language. It dared this because it never expected the record to see the light of day. At one point, in referring to the assistant director in charge of the General Investigative reason, it records [Alex]Rosen characterizatioj of FBI's 'standing around with pockets open waiting for for evidence to drop in.'"

It states that J. Edgar Hoover had an "adversary relationship" with the Warren Commission to which he was supposed to provide faithful and accurate investigative services. It next refers to "Hoover blocking Warren's choice for general counsel," the tradiyional right of the chairman of committees and commissions. Instead of not opposing the Commission the FB this FBI record refers to its "Preparation of dossiers on staff and members," expanding this latter, in its own emphasis, to "Preparation of dossiers on WC staff after the (Commission's) Report was out. With regard to those of us who disagreed with the report and wrote books and spoke,, the FBI itself n records its "subse quent preparation of sex dossiers oj critics of probe." (My owb opinjon is that at least some were unexceptional and uninteresting//) to those of prurient mind and interest.)

Even before Katsenbach's memo Hoover himself had told the White House that "Oswald alone did it" and "must convince the public Oswald is the real assassin."

real

All of this and ever so much more like it before any investigation was made or even possible! It is the government's self-portrait of its fabled agencies in that time of great crisis and since then. It justifies charging the government with combining to suppress the truth; to hide the existing ~~evidence~~ proof that there had been a conspiracy; with deliberate lying to the nation and the world; even to violating law and decency and morality to harm the writers who were exposing it. Nothing new in this. My first four books say as much in having the general title Whitewash. My second book charges an FBI and Secret Service "coverup." Oswald in "ew Orleans says in its subtitle that it makes a case for conspiracy. But not to kill JFK.

I was and I remained very interested in Oswald, in the early days limited to what I remembered of what had by then been officially disclosed. From the first I was aware and immediately suggested that he had official relationship of some kind. ~~and that~~ as the late conservative Member of the Warren Commission, Senator Richard B. Russell, told me in encouraging me to continue investigation the Commission and its works, "I am satisfied that they have not told us all they know about Oswald." He was referring to the federal investigative and intelligence agencies. Russell was quite aware of the allegations that Oswald had served a federal agency. The Commission had held meetings in such secrecy on this that it did not permit access to the meetings or even the stenographic transcripts of them to its staff. What turned Senator Russell on is my taking him undeniable proof that he had been deceived and the record he ~~made~~ intended for history had been memory-holed by those associates he had trusted. Russell though there was a court reporter present, as there supposedly was at all such sessions, and that even if in secret the records of his doubts would exist. There was no court reporter and the existing record was phoned up to make it appear to be a transcript that does not exist because it was never made.

This happened earlier, remarkably enough ~~when~~ on one of the occasions the Commission met in secret, with all transcripts that were made classified Top Secret (when the Commission had not authority to classify anything), to consider reports

t that Oswald served a federal master. What is known to exist I got by FOIA litigation and I have published several of these transcripts in facsimile. The difference between what the respected Commissioners said in expected "top secret" permanent protection from publication and what it said in public could not be greater.

The most exciting and provocative leads I got on the real Oswald was the night before the FBI's symbol informer in San Francisco tried to redbait me into a publishing failure with my second book. As the following pages show in greater detail, the man who asked for confidentiality that I not seek to identify him so he could not be retaliated against told me that the Oswald I was describing from official records was not the man he knew so well when they were both Marines. He did tell me and I was later able to confirm that Oswald was in the government's trust when he was a Marine as no official record even suggests. And I've gotten about a third of a million pages under FOIA that had been withheld earlier.

There was and there was withheld and kept secret an abundance of information in these files that ~~was withheld~~ do indicate that Oswald was some kind of agent and there was suspicion of this of which the Commission, the FBI and the CIA at the very least were aware before the Commission had gotten into what for lack of a better description is referred to as its "investigation."

In the following pages we shall see what the reactions -in secret- was to the official accused Presidential assassin. We assess the possibility belief that Oswald had served a federal agency, the suppressed admission of horror over the fact that there had been a conspiracy and the determination to "wipe" that out. And we shall see what happened and what almost happened to the man who made suspicion that Oswald had served a federal agency part of official records nobody dared destroy.

Any assessment and evaluation of the information of the federal agencies had on Oswald inevitably involves an assessment of these agencies. Much of the information I eventually obtained, after years of diligent effort the agencies sought to frustrate leaves it without question that they would do anything at all to prevent disclosure of what they kept secret from the Warren Commission and that to do this the name of their game is "control." This is the same game they played with the Commission, which was anything but diligent in seeking this information. In order to control, while they preferred avoiding outright lying - and they did that by diverting and misrepresenting and stonewalling - when they saw no alternative, they did lie.

I filed many Freedom of Information lawsuits to obtain the information I draw upon in this book and in all that litigation, extending over a period of two decades, there is not one case in which the agencies did not lie to the federal courts. In this, as they anticipated from much experience with the courts, the agencies were always immune.

If lying to the courts is under oath and is material in the litigation, the lying is a felony, perjury. Official perjury is commonplace in my FOIA litigation.

As an example, in Civil Actions 78-0322 and 0420 combined, I sought the relevant information of the Dallas and New Orleans FBI field offices. Under the law compliance begins with a search for the requested information, that search to be made with due diligence and in good faith. As of the time of this writing, with the requests made first in 1977, the initial searches have not been made. (Despite this a great quantity of records were disclosed to me but these were records of the FBI's preference, not those it has responsive to my request.) In order to avoid the required searches and to stonewall me, as well, apparently, as to rewrite the law before a judge with a record of favoring the FBI and, in the end, seek vengeance from me, the FBI did - knowingly and deliberately - lie. Despite its efforts I did obtain its own records that establish beyond question that it did lie and misrepresent and making myself subject to perjury charges if I were not truthful, I charged it with the felonies

*and its Department of Justice counsel*

of perjury, fraud and misrepresentation. It did not make ever pro forma denial.

Not only did the CIA engage in the same felonious misconduct, it and the FBI actually got put their heads together when they shared common interest to limit what they would let the Warren Commission know. This means to deceive and mislead the Commission, as both agencies did.

In the FBI tickler cited above, there is this item: "Sullivan relationship with Angleton: pre-arranging of answers to Commission questions." William Sullivan was the FBI assistant director in charge of its domestic intelligence division; James Jesus Angleton was the longtime head of CIA counterintelligence. Sullivan retired and Angleton was eased out during the Watergate scandals.

This tickler also lists "Hoover instructions to agents not to volunteer info. to WC." (sic) I published the CIA's identical instructions in the reprint of my third book, Photographic Whitewash and there are many evidences of this as well as the of the FBI's instructions not to cooperate in both the Commission's files and what was disclosed to me in FOIA litigation.

In order to control the Commission and what it could know and decide there was extensive withhold, much but far from all indicated in this tickler which cites the withholding of a considerable amount of information relating to Oswald, one of potential significance being "withholding of 'Oswald imposter' memo of 1960-1961," fear that Oswald's actual identification papers might fall into the hands of the USSR when he was there and be used by an imposter.

Hoover successfully opposed Chief Justice Earl Warren's appointment of his own man as the Commission's general counsel, in this tickler, "Hoover blocking Warren's choice for general counsel." One of the Commission's illegally classified executive session transcripts reflects that Gerald Ford was Hoover's henchman in preventing the normal working of our system, the chairman's right to select his staff chief. Ford, then Republican leader in the House of Representatives, was one of five Republican Commission members appointed by the Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson. Ford was later our first unelected President.

At the same point this tickler describes Hoover's "relationship" with the Commission as an "adversary relationship" ~~and that~~ <sup>It states</sup> he opposed creation of the Commission. ~~and that~~ <sup>those</sup>

That the FBI presumed - dared to prepare "dossiers" on the eminences appointed to the Commission, from the chief justice of the United States, two Senators and two Congressmen will shock only those who are not familiar with the FBI's blackmail and leaked propaganda methods, methods ~~which~~ many prominent in our national life feared. The FBI prepared dossiers on the Commission's staff twice, once when the Commission was organized and then as soon as its report was issued. It thus has on file and available for misuse dossiers on still another United States Senator and at least one judge as well as a number of lawyers who have become prominent.



note on ticklers, as one or together

(I assume that this is an original FBI record because by order of the court the FBI was forbidden to disclose any record originating with the Congress, which exempted itself from the provisions of the Freedom of Information law. Mark Allen and I had, separately, requested all the information the FBI disclosed to the House Select Committee on Assassination. Deteriorated health prevented my filing suit when as is its common practice, the FBI deliberately violated the law. Allen did file suit and that judge ordered the FBI to comply with his request.)

(It is commonplace for the FBI to lie under oath to the federal courts with regard to ticklers. In my litigation its SA John N. Phillips, supervisor in ~~XXX~~ its FOIA unit, swore that the FBI ~~XXXXXX~~ ticklers are "routinely" destroyed after a matter of days. He also described them under oath, as carbon copies of records in the main file only. None of this and much else to which he attested is truthful. The FBI requires its ticklers in many cases and it has JFK assassination ticklers more than two decades old. The various special agents file a wide assortment of information and notes in the ticklers, information not included in the main file and sometimes not included in any file. In political cases, and the assassinations are political cases, the FBI's ticklers include information kept at hand for purposes of defamation. In the so-called "Long" tickler relating to the King investigation of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., it has records on me associating me with bank robbers. These reflect that in at least one field office I am included in not fewer than six bank robbery files when it had no connection of any kind or indirections with any bank robbery. Because of their content these ticklers, in disclosing the FBI's regular indulgence of abuses we once considered were the practice of the police agencies of authoritarian societies only, are seriously embarrassing to the FBI and it therefore practices the felony of perjury to ~~withhold~~ frustrate disclosure of them. The "sex dossiers" it prepared on those known as "critics" of its investigation can be used only for blackmail or defamation. When in my field offices lawsuit the FBI was directed to disclose the information it has on the "critics," Phillips swore that