

Dear Jim, PA request, Dallas Field Office, 4/7/78 HW 4/14/78

The form letter covering the 83 pages is signed by SA James A. Abbitt. It claims exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(7)(C) and (D), without indicating which is claimed to relate to what.

Last night I wrote an appeal in a letter I had started earlier to Quin Shea.

Because I think it may be helpful to the Department I will be sending him a carbon of this, probably with some copies of the records.

I would guess that (b)(1) is claimed with regard to Bringuier and Ronnie Caire. Bringuier was an informer for both the FBI and CIA. Both were involved in the CIA's Cuban activities of the early 60s. Both were also involved in political campaigns, Bringuier in Nixon-Agnew with other CIA types. My recollections are unclear with regard to Caire's official connections but I am clear that he was involved with Sergio Arcadha Smith in some dubious fund-raising. In this, incredibly, one of the addresses used is the same 544 Camp St. that Oswald used, the same building that housed the CIA's Cuban Revolutionary Council's New Orleans office. (I exposed this in Oswald in "New Orleans.")

Serial 89-43-5621 is illegible. I am asking that it be replaced by a legible copy Birmingham and HQ should have provided copies. Probably both have added relevant records.

This is because the AIRTEL is a typical case of the FBI's generation of false paper of the cover-the-ass kind. My recollection is so certain I'm not bothering to check. What this record does is have Zapruder saying what he could not possibly have said to cover the FBI's gross error. My error consisted in taking the FBI's word. I could not imagine that an agent would file a false report on the technical details of the camera that had filmed the killing of a President. But rather than being involved in any "out of context" use I used the Barrett report referred to in facsimile in Whitewash II.

The FBI report, which is quoted in the airtel, did say that the camera was set at 24 frames per second. This is a slow-motion speed, not normal speed, which I also did say. However, the normal setting is 16, which means 18 fps. Zapruder would not have said, as the airtel says, that normal is either 16 or 24, written in to pretend the FBI did not err and did not misinform the Commission. (Which says something about the care exercised by Gemberling and others in Dallas and at HQ, where Hoover also read every piece of paper that went out.)

Zapruder also could not have said that the ED 302 "was correct" whether or not he did say the statement "had been taken out of context by Mr. WEISBERG."

The reason for this false record is explicit: "The above is being furnished the Bureau for its information (sic) in ~~the~~ the event inquiries are received with respect to the book "Whitewash No. 2" by HAROLD WEISBERG."

(For your further information the FBI kept unloading the Zapruder camera while it held onto virtually everything else, much not related to the crime. It was this book that forced the repossessing of the camera from the Bell and Howell library. I set this forth in full, again in facsimile, in Whitewash III. Until then the camera was not available at the Archives and could not be examined, despite Ramsey Clark's executive order. Now this just happens to coincide with Hoover's issuance of a press release pretending to answer charges I had not yet made but were in the manuscript of the book, one copy of which disappeared in New York. And this is that press release the FBI would never give me, the one you finally had to go for under FOIA.)

Newspaper stories from the "New Orleans papers follow. These are not all the stories that mentioned me. It is a selection that just happens to have what can be taken as prejudicial language. I'll illustrate with a later one. Well, I come to one in an illegible serial, the T-P of 5/17/67: "author Harold Weisberg also claims to be privy to the innermost secrets of Mr. Garrison and there is little reason to doubt that he is," is a direct quote attributed to the La. ACLU. It is probably an accurate quote but it is

false on all counts. I was not "privy," I did not want to be and I never claimed to be. This was the line of the Shaw lawyers, one of whom later apologized for it. They did not subpoena me as they did the others. And the ACLU later apologized. But my point here is to give you an understanding of the selective use of news stories by the FBI. It does not have the account of my refusing to say anything when I left the grand jury room, in which I was unique, or my explanation of why I would say nothing. Yet NO FO sent Dallas FO a news story that falsely seeks to link the subpoenaing of Warren deBrueys with my testimony.

(Consistent with this there is Serial 6779, on Bringuier's spurious suit against Orest Pena for defamation.. It says that Bringuier's attention was drawn to the testimony by my writing. That the case was thrown out is not included in these news stories. On this I skip ahead to what appears to be Serial 8386, S-I 6/13/68, a story about Bringuier's spurious suit against me. But the news accounts of the throwing of that suit out of court and of Bringuier's later confession to a reporter that he filed such suits for publicity purposes are not included.)

(Consistent with this the selection of the 11/8/67 S-I story to send to Dallas "Warren Case Critic Plugs New Book." This was Oswald in New Orleans and it was not on sale anywhere in Louisiana. As usual I was then working on tracing Oswald's new Orleans career.

(In summary the selection of news stories from the Dallas field office, which includes not one from a Dallas reporter and not one of or relating to my Dallas broadcasts, is not faithful to what I was doing and is consistent with creating prejudice in records set aside for retrieval and use.)

This gets pretty cute in an illegible story part of which can be read, having me and "ark lane in "a well-planned conspiracy." Knowing that I have never had anything to do with him I thought this might amuse you."

I am asking for a legible copy of this story. Part of the banner headline can be made out. It will serve to identify, "SHAW ASKS." The date is 2/6/68, the file 89-43.

Serial 89-43-illegible, 3/27/68, Director to Assistant Attorney General Edwin L. Weisl, Jr. I am asking for a legible copy of it.

I also note that copies should have been provided by HQ and DJ.

It begins by referring to Weisl's letter, which is not provided.

It concludes with a record of a copy to Fred Vinson, Jr., which also should have been provided.

The first paragraph withholds the name of the member of Senator Robert Kennedy's staff who gave the FBI the copy of Dick Sprague's list of pictures. I am without doubt that the FBI had this from other sources, including Sprague's publication of it in Berkeley's magazine. And I don't care about the name. But I do question the need to withhold it.

Because this is an important record and because it is not entirely legible I am asking for all copies in the appeal.

This also is the FBI's creation of false records to cover the ass. Despite what this record says where it can be read the FBI did not get all pictures and did not analyze all for the Commission. Examples, far from all, will follow when I get to my ignored 1968 FOIA requests for the Martin and Doyle films.

Paragraph 3 uses these words, "a review of the books published by these critics was conducted..." I have not been given any copies of these reviews.

The bottom of the first page indicated a carbon to New York. It did not provide a copy in response to my request of it.

One of the importances of this record to me is the clear reflection of how the FBI misled the Department. Not the least is its false representation of what it gave to and did for the Commission.

Where the FBI was really uptight about JFK assassination pictures Dallas has provided no records. I have difficulty believing that HQ would not have informed it or had some communication with it. Prior to this date I had published an entire book on the subject and had devoted a large part of the second book to it. We know that there was an aborted scheme to "stop" me by having the FBI sue me through Shaneyfelt.

With an entire book on the suppression of the pictures and all the turmoil over my quite accurate reporting relating to the Zapruder film, the missing frames at the crucial point and the hiding of this by Shaneyfelt and the FBI in its numbering of the frames and so much more can you believe that the Office of Origin has not a single piece of paper relating to any of it? What I wrote of the Dallas Field Office and the pictures and what it did and did not do is most of the third book.

I am saying I believe Dallas has and knows it has other records relating to me.

Serial 89-43-8538 is of New Orleans origin and should have been provided by it.

First I fill in the missing names. The woman is Dione (right) Turner. The person of whom she spoke to Bringuier is Philip Geraci III.

This also is an illegible record. I am appealing for a clear copy and for all copies because of the possibility of notations and because of the extensive withholdings, which I also appeal.

This is an important record because of its falsities, regardless of the source and for other reasons having to do with a deliberate FBI coverup.

Geraci was a Warren Commission witness. What this LHM reflects of either it or the actualities is false. The falsification bears on whether or not Oswald did or could have had any spook connections, including with the FBI.

In this connection and in connection with the claim of (b)(1) in the form letter and in the absence of any "reasonably segregable" content on part of page 2 and all of page 3, I call to your attention more than that it is public that Bringuier informed for both the FBI and the CIA.

This entire story also related to whether there was an Oswald-Ferrie and/or a Geraci-Ferrie connection and to the FBI's withholdings from the Warren Commission relating to both and to Ferrie's reported activities as a gun-runner and in connection with his investigative work for Carlos Marcello's attorney - even that he was in attendance on federal court in the Marcello case at the time JFK was killed. (This in itself led to an entire mythology. Ferrie was in the witness room with SA Regis Kennedy whose report makes no mention of it - at least in the version given to the Commission.)

I knew Dione well. She is possessed of an extraordinary mind and serious psychiatric problems. I hear from her infrequently. She was then an exceptionally good source as well as the most accomplished liar I ever knew. She was, without any possibility of doubt at all, an official informer. I am not specifying for what agencies but I do mean this in the plural. I have two agency confirmations and she made claim to still a third. She certainly has emerged from the most serious tangles with the law with rather light punishment and if I am to believe her most recent account with continuing and generous support. She is capable of having gone to Bringuier, who does not say how well or even how she knew her. (He did and he set Phillip up for a gang bang at the rundown flophouse, The Silver Dollar.) She could have misrepresented, as this report misrepresents. She could have lied, as this report reflects lies.

For your information, when I saw where Garrison was going with Philip I went to see his parents to try to forestall what impended. In the end I succeeded in saving Philip from a disaster and obtained much valuable and confirmed information, including about Bringuier, false swearing to the Commission about one of its more important points and the alteration of the Geraci transcript by Wesley Liebeler, to accomplish the covering up. Take all of this literally.

Where this report refers to complaints that forced the end of the selling of those Cuban bonds by Bringuier - Oswald made that complaint!

Dione knew that I had interviewed both parents. I spoke to her on the way to their home. She lived not far from them in Retairie. (Her LSU address referred to in the LHM was merely her student box number.)

Philip was then in Vietnam, with little prospect that Garrison would be able to bring him back. But then the father was electrocuted and Philip was brought back. He was then subpoenaed three times and ignored all three subpoenas. This was the cause of one of the more serious and intense of my many disagreements - in this case fights - with

Garrison personally and with members of his staff, lawyers and cops both. I'll explain the reasons.

They were wild and this loaned itself to the most irresponsible treatment.

Dione, Philip and one not named, Raul Navas, were then still kids. (There was another whose name escapes me, the one who was with Philip the time they met Oswald at Bringuier's. I spoke to his parents, too.)

This was the kind of investigation in which they were all incompetents. They also had a hangup because the investigators were all cops assigned to Garrison and another cop, a friend of theirs, had been a friend of Oswald's in high school and did swear falsely to the Commission about Ferris. The investigation held great promise and I did not want it messed up.

There was homosexual involvement and I did not want people hurt needlessly. There is a possible case of seduction of one or more of these by a close friend of Clay Shaw and that was relevant to nothing.

So I made a deal - if they would stay out of all of this and keep me informed I would handle it and let them have the results.

After repeated violations of this agreement and total failure in all of them the Garrison office, through Alcock, made a new deal when Philip simply ignored their subpoenas: If I got him to talk and informed them they would stay out and would leave him alone unless I developed what required DA interest.

I then spoke to the family lawyer, Lillian Cohen, who used her maiden name although she was married to Judge Louis Trent. I told her I wanted to interview Philip in her presence and the details of the deal with Alcock. I was in the Garrison office when at my suggestion to her Trent confirmed the deal. She then arranged for Philip to be at her home on a Saturday afternoon for the interview. His mother was with him. By agreement it was taped, with the mike on Lillian Cohen's desk and under her control. And what followed blew her mind - satirically. Not the least is the official (not-Garrison)-kidnapping of Philip the night Ferris died. He was held in seclusion for a week by officials of two different police jurisdictions. One of those who did this is one who also swore falsely to the Commission. My files hold the tapes and complete details, with the mother's confirmation.

Here those Garrison nuts really had something - but because of their involvement with the cop, I presume, did nothing. Ferris was one of those Garrison had charged with conspiring to kill JFK, remember, even if he was dead.

To further entertain you, Lillian Cohen was the lawyer for the cop turned hippie, another Gaudet, who was framed with a publicity stunt for Nixon when Nixon went to N.O. to address the VFW. It was so hasty a frame that without knowing the details but knowing what it was patterned on I was able to give her details that were not known so she could defend him - even where the false report came from. Before that one was all over the poor cop turned hippie was the subject of a manhunt in which he could have been killed in the Arizona mountains.

Am I giving you a picture of why there should be more and other records if not a suggestion of what may be in what is withheld? (My interview with Philip was after this date, @ 10/11/68 on the LHM.)

There was no ill family member. The father was electrocuted.

There is in this LHM proof of some of what the FBI withheld from the Commission and of other falsity in testimony before it. Not attributable to Dione.

(That I spread KGB propaganda is obviously false but might this not have been expected to have been the subject of either inquiry or comment? However, in this connection I remind you that it was not long after this that I wrote to AG Mitchell to ask for an inquiry into reports that reached me of FBI agents going around in H.O. after me and ~~had~~ defaming me. This was referred to Hoover, who never made even pro forma denial. I have received no record indicating that he even responded to Mitchell. In part this was referred to Belcher, in Criminal, who had not provided relevant records under PA.)

Serial 89-43-7818 has the entire first page and part if not most of the second page withheld. The subject, whose name is withheld, is Richard Rye. The reporter, who

then was not a reporter but had the biggest talk show on the west coast, at KCBS, San Francisco, was my good friend "Arv" Morgan. Some of his broadcasts when he was in Cleveland were classified by the ~~at~~ FBI and withheld in the Warren Commission's files in the archives, believe it or not!

Now if the FBI wants an affidavit ~~1/22/71~~ Rye gave it and the Secret Service in connection with a report he had threatened the President, I can provide it. As you can gather, I came to know Rye well. He has been here and he still phones me intermittently.

New Orleans has supplied some records on this but not a copy of this record. I reported the threat to the N.O. field office.

I could go to my records and fill in the Cosa Nostra names from what Rye told me.

Rye later got into a hassle in New Orleans when he went there with a subject of FBI interest who I also had met. This person and Morgan were both in the territory of the San Francisco F.O. Can you imagine there being no records there and none relating to any interviews with any of these people provided by ~~1/22/71~~ S.F.?

The threat was reported at a joint that was likely also of FBI interest, the Magic Mushroom.

As I remember it there was an LA. and a San Diego involvement. Their records?

89-43-9030 is relevant in C.A.75-1996. As I recall the copy provided in that it does not withhold what is here withheld and this does not withhold something that was withheld in that case.

I don't know why the date is obliterated in this copy of the Washington lawyer's letter, 9030. That he is a lawyer also is withheld.

This record should have been provided by Dallas F.O. in C.A.75-1996. There are three serials here, 9028-30.

I am appealing the poor copy ^{of} ~~of~~ what has an illegible serial from the 89-43 file, the 1/22/71 Director to DAG letter. This should have been provided by both HQ and DAG and by Criminal.

The DAG's letter of 1/25/71 receipt is not provided. I find myself wondering if the reason can be because my letter does not really say what Director says it does.

The 1/20/71 (/) unclear copy whose Dallas identification is illegible should have been provided from Baltimore and HQ files.

This is also true of Serial 9180, which follows. (The initials are those of the Frederick RA, Ronald Lichtinger, to whom I gave the bullets and who returned them to me. (There is no record of the latter.)

Page 2 refers to "the enclosed plot" which I gave and is not here.

12/10/70, Director to Baltimore, illegible, appeal for replacement. Baltimore and HQ should have provided their copies.

(From these records one would never detect that a duplicate of the so-called "magic bullet" in the JFK case had been created by my source - without it having passed through two bodies.)

Serial 89-43-9307 originated in New Orleans, which did not ~~1/22/71~~ provide a copy. I believe that the New Orleans record is more extensive than this one. HQ should have provided a copy.

Serial 89-43-9320 begins with large withholding on page 1. The names withheld are of Edgar Eugene Bradley and Assistant Director Tom Valley of the Secret Service. I do not believe that a proper (b)(1) claim can be made for this. If there is (b)(7)(C) or (D) then some should have been reasonably segregable - if either applied. This vicious fabrication got around. There was no consistency in the withholding. One set of copies does not withhold Bradley's name, as I have addressed recently.

New Orleans did provide some records relating to the Rye/afia threat but not the one above. This record certainly would have gone to New Orleans, which did not provide it, as HQ also did not.

Serials 89-43-9513 and 9716 are both AP stories from Dallas papers on two different Commission executive session transcripts I obtained under FOIA and gave AP. No copy has been provided by HQ or any other FOs. The first was repeated in the same day's Dallas afternoon paper, included here, serial illegible. The headlines indicate why I believe other FOs clipped this story: "Alleged Oswald-FBI tie aired" and "Warren Paper Reveals Pro (be?-illegible) of Oswald-FBI Report." The third one, 9716, has a hand note added, "1 copy sent Bureau..."

100-10-461 9257 (digit eliminated in xeroxing) is one of several records relating to my FOIA request on Ronnie Caire. Others follow. This one does not reflect an FOIA request.

This airtel is dated 10/13/70. It was stamped Confidential, then stamped as exempt from automatic declassification under Category 2 by 222, then released with what was marked with "(C)" masked.

I find it interesting that the text as released does not include my first name.

Gemberling's response to the Bureau's 10/13/70 is not really responsive. Where I had said that Caire's address was masked in Oswald's address book he wrote that "in the event" I could ~~relate~~ "relate" how it was masked "it is possible that some pertinent observation could be made."

The Bureau did not ask me. I believe it did not have to, that my letter referred to Oswald's using the side or Camp Street address rather than that on Canal Street in New Orleans.

My recollection is that the Bureau told me it had no records.

This record has file numbers written in at bottom of indication of copies.

The N.O. 10/19/70 airtel to Bureau has an illegible serial. It obliterates all the material relating to Caire, extending to the bottom of the second page.

Neither N.O. nor HQ provided copies of these records.

Interestingly, and bearing on the possibility I think I indicated earlier of having heard that Caire was an informer, the "(RM)" added to file designations in the King records represented "Racial Matters." Caire's known connections extended into the Cuban community.

Beginning at the bottom of page 2 there is reference to what does not ~~appear~~ appear earlier, my FOIA request for the identification of the fingerprint on an Oswald leaflet obtained by the N.O. police- from Oswald. The print was not Oswald's or the cop's. There was an existing question of an unidentified Oswald helper. Stating that the prints were not Oswald's, which this airtel repeats, was not an end to an investigation but a beginning. (If there is not more on this in the other Caire records there is what is relevant in the records relating to the requests I made for the Martin and Doyle films.)

100-10461-9250 (?? Unclear serial) is the 10/9/70 airtel from HQ to Dallas and New Orleans from which large portions are obliterated on each of the two pages. The first follows mention of my request relating to Caire.

This airtel lays down the line that they do not see what I was referring to in saying Oswald had masked the address. Dallas was asked for its observations. The second obliteration follows this.

Reference to the fingerprint request follows.

My request is Serial 924? (obliterated in xeroxing.) It includes what HQ omitted in each airtel, "Lee Harvey Oswald also applied to him for a job." "him" is Caire and the FBI supposedly conducted a complete investigation of that and all other employment and employment applications.

I see I did state the two different streets in the request. And that Oswald had used the CIA group's address. This information was not sent to the FOs, but Dallas clearly knew by a copy of my letter. It is here. With the airtel and my letter HQ was telling the FOs now to reply without compliance, with letters the FBI could give the DAG if necessary. (I also provided how the FBI masked the CIA outfits address to the Commission.)

With the response to me not provided, without any more information I believe there is basis for appeal here in the effort made to avoid the request and to obtain pre-determined replies from the field.

My DJ 118 form, Serial 9245, also gives both streets for the building in which Caire had his office. In Dallas Gemberling handled this. He was in overall supervision in Dallas. Nothing on this, these, was provided by N.O.

100-10461- 9275? (unclear) is by Portland PD to Director and Dallas, 12/23/70.

Portland has provided nothing in response to my request of it. I think it denied having any records.

No serial is on Director to, N.O. Dallas, Minneapolis and N.O., date 12/15/70.

(I believe my initial request was earlier. Requests plural. One for the Army Intelligence Agent Powell's film and reports is ignored here and he was in the Dallas unit and in the Depository at the time of the assassination.)

No office provided a copy of my letter, to which Portland refers in the first graf. It was one of four enclosure with the Bureau's 12/15/70, none provided.

This states that the Doyle film was sent to the Bureau. It neither told the Commission that it had the film nor gave the Commission copies of it. Doyle Sr. told me that what was returned was not the untouched original. It is my recollection that he said some scenes were missing. His airtel concludes "The film was forwarded in order that the Bureau might make copies of the pertinent scenes if it so desired."

It is my recollection that the second page refers to a record not in the Commission's files. It is not in mine and I sought all available records.

The Bureau's airtel on returning the film was not provided, either. Date 1/31/64.

Serial # 100-10461-9272 is so bad a copy it should be replaced. Copies were not provided by the other FOs listed or by HQ. Nor are their records from the other files indicated in writing. All I believe basis for appeals.

This is a dishonest record in giving a false description of the film by John Martin. It and the Doyle film have importances carefully withheld from all these records and from the Commission. They are both movies of Oswald handing out leaflets on Canal Street, which is an essential part of the Commission's report. Oswald is in the Martin film and a different view of him than I have seen anywhere. There also is more than "a group of Cubans."

This record refers to others not provided.

Before going on to the rest of this airtel let me tell you that I have a copy of the film Martin had in 1968. I turned him on when he was in my audience at the Univ. of Minnesota, Mpls. Gary can confirm all of this. When Martin told me of having a movie of the Oswald arrest in N.O. and offered it we drove right to his place. We then drove back to the campus and viewed it. And examined it physically because Martin said it was not his original film. He said he could tell because he always wanted a little film between scenes, useful in later splicing, and there were no such frames in this film.

(This was the occasion of the first funnybusiness with my luggage when I caught the plane.)

Gary had a dub of the film made, returned his to Martin and send me the copy. I also have a few frames that are enlarged.

I made the request because of what Martin told me and the fact that the FBI never let the commission know anything about Martin. Unlike the Doyles, there is no reference at all in the Commission's files.

Now, where the second page ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ refers to the Doyle film it has this description: "pictures of two individuals (emphasis added) on 8/9/63 on Canal Street, New Orleans, carrying signs bearing pro-Cuban inscriptions with leaflets in their hands." So one Lee Harvey Oswald becomes "two individuals" and the film is of no value and the Commission is not told? And I get nothing under FOIA?

There is no prior reference in any official files to more than Oswald in that particular operation.

Page 3 holds more on the FBI's withholding of pictures. This is in reference to the film by WWL-TV and WDSU-TV. It refers to six pictures furnished by Johann Rush. He was

the WDSU photographer. He actually made 17 prints. The Archives told me that at most three, not six, are in the Commission's files. It may be only two. (I also did much tracing and checking and interviewing related to this in New Orleans.)

Again it is pictures of others with Oswald that are withheld. This report says "Oswald and other individuals passing out leaflets." They found only Charles Hall Steele, Jr., and I have my interview with him on tape. There was another he did not know. He is not alone in this, in confirmation of the pictures and the unsuppressed reports.

There follows an account of an interview with Jesse Core. It is nothing like what Jesse told me. It omits much that is important, including on the alteration of the original WDSU footage, confirmed to me by the then news director, who let me have a copy of their remaining footage, which was returned by the FBI in other than the original condition according to both men.

The last paragraph refers to my requests as my "allegations" and says that copies were sent to N.O. Portland and Minneapolis. One provided any copies.

The 12/15/70 HQ airtel lays out the line that my requests are "allegations". It asks them to provide "information pertinent to Weisberg's allegations," not to comply with the DJ-118, which was sent to all field offices involved. This record says.

Comment, 4/15/78:

These records disclose much to me that would not be apparent to even a subject expert who has not done the work I've done. I believe but with the passing of time can't be certain that they also disclose FBI withholdings from the Commission in addition to what I've noted re Bringuier, Caire and Oswald in New Orleans. When I have time I'll write you about some of these matters because they may become important in compliance or to put it another way, may figure in improper withholdings.

These records show the existence of other records known to exist and not provided. I've indicated, I hope at least for the most part, where the routing directions specify this and where added filing designations signal files not searched.

These records show the sending of records to field offices that were not provided by those field offices.

They withhold names that cannot properly be withheld and where there is no need to withhold in any event. As with Bradley. And with Bradley as an illustration, where the names are withheld those names signal where to find other records not provided.

These records show how the FBI circumvented the Act when it could not ignore my requests. Earlier we obtained records showing that ignoring my requests ~~was~~ was a high policy decision, if initiated below Hoover was approved by him. With regard to the only records provided relating to my many requests Dallas, which is the Office of Origin and is supposed to have all such records, came up with only the requests about which the DAG wrote the FBI. Meaning which the FBI could not ignore because Rolapp in Kleindienst's name asked how to respond.

At this point the records show that the FBI again rewrote the entire thing and signaled to the field offices what line they were to take to accomplish non-compliance that would be outside the comprehension of the DAG's people.

In turn this relates to subject content, where the FBI, having gotten away with withholding from the Presidential Commission, had the same motive for withholding still.

Taking the matter of Oswald's literature distribution, which can be translated into drawing public attention to himself, I have done much work on this. There is and there was no doubt that he had at least one other associate. This may or may not relate to a question of conspiracy or to one of serving an interest. But it does relate to the character of the investigation, its minimal adequacy. There is much on this I'll not now go into except that I'll add that in the hours I spent with him in a friendly relationship Jesse Core told me much, including his relations with the FBI, who saw him, how, etc. (He was, properly, a normal FBI contact, because of his role at the Trade Mart.) He told me, and was confirmed, what was in the WDSU film before it was given to the FBI immediately after the assassination and is not in it now. This is confirmed by the existing records. When I obtained a print of the film I feared improper interest in it so I had two prints made. Sure enough, when I was having stills made from one set it suffered a mysterious disappearance.