

FBI-11W

Dear Mr. [Name],

1/17/63

I've read the two thin but unidentified bundles of hokey material that got from the FBI and I got from you today. It is all self-serving, self-righteous, self-laudatory and irrelevant. With it does faithfully rail at the FBI line in both matters once it got caught.

There is one record of some interest. Because they bear no identifications I can't cite any so I'll attach a copy. I recall no disclosed record that in any way justifies what this says, and at the same time I cannot consider it as a mere error.

It says that Oswald had been contacted by the HVO # of the USSR.

I don't believe it.

In the incredible factual error in the panel report. I had space and I've drafted an addition. I not only had it marked - I had a paperclip on that page to draw my attention to several parts that I'd marked. And forgot!

Very thanks. I give it meaning.

Best,

So under 1/17/63 because there are almost all more sure copies, obvious from a title, they lack positive identifications I can use. Where I've thought of it I'll have copies attached.

The first copy, which I always, was on a legal-size page. I use the standard size because that holds what I am working out, the statement that Oswald "was contacted by HVO," as cited to the FBI investigation. There was nothing at all like this in any FBI report I've seen. Neither the operative HVO's statement that he had not been, but was so confused about this in that it can also be attributed to the Lee Harvey Oswald group. But the alleged HVO contact is repeated, which reduces the possibility of being an error at FBIHQ. You may want to consider giving this to Turner or another reporter, who can then ask his own questions of the HVO. I suggest this, as soon as possible.

The first page of comment 1 in the next batch, 1-17-63 on "hokey note construction," is the first unequivocal statement I've seen that Oswald was a part of this. (I guess I should say that I'm all.) It also refers to Oswald's "handling" of this on or by 11/24/62. This amounts to a confession of deliberate FBI lying to the Commission and the nation that early and thereafter in its line that Oswald had never given any indication of any tendency toward violence, which I think was (inasmuch perjury when Oswald and hokey spoke to it. I put the paperclip on. Again I think use should be offered promptly. See also 1-17-63

1-17-63, "To an other statement of the 'standing with presents operation evidence to drop in.' By translation, the series of investigations state they did not investigate the case itself. Again I recall no earlier report signed by him and again I understand nothing is available to Turner or another.

1-17-63, which the FBI had an "adversary relationship" with the Commission. In giving do we credit for blessing Oswald's choice as general counsel they also disclose that our chief inspector Oswald was waiting for Hoover. 1-17-63 reflects and explained the FBI's preparation of Oswald's report was out. Blackmail only. The blackmail, at a time on a confidential source and explaining that the FBI and the (allegedly) were "law-enforcing" in its power to the Commission. I, referring to the FBI's preparation of Oswald's evidence, exists in another form will come to. Note to all: they have a collection of what they've sent to go to 022/1110.

Additional note to JL: It is not this and most if not all the rest of this stuff eloquent rebuttal of the FBI's lie that it routinely destroys all ticklers after a few days? O322 and other cases.

Note again on critics, C 7, "Subsequent preparation of sex dossiers on critics of probe." No wonder they had Phillips swear falsely. I wonder if you ought not try to find some way of getting this to the appeals court on that one question, what they were directed to do and how they lied about it? Did they need discovery to find this and all else like it?

The next attached page was separate, preceded by a note about the kind of notebook used. Note that this gives a serial. It was disclosed and I used it in one of the cases to recall that the FBI itself said I was fair to it. Until it decided not to like what I wrote. Refers to the Alan Burke Show on WHEW-TV. (New York City)

Note that the reference to teacher is phonetic, Dallas to Director that I do not recall. Suggests overheard or tap. Later she has her name correct, including maiden name.

Hosty's 10/24/77<sup>3?</sup> to Director, Dallas 87-54012-191, Doc. 14 (which also shows how FBI can locate field office personnel records) states, graf 3, underlining in original that he had had an opportunity to review my field personnel file." This is quite specific in identifying the record's existence and filing and, if I do not recall incorrectly, refute's Phillips' attestation that there was none in Dallas. Unless, of course, the whole thing has been forwarded to K.C. In which event Dallas had a record of that and was deliberately deceptive. He is quite specific in identifying as Serial 157 as relevant in this matter and O322. This also discloses that JFK assassination investigation records are included in the personnel files and why the Hosty search slip was blank.

What I told you over the phone, that Hoover, personally praised Hosty's perjurious testimony before the Commission is page 2, graf 2.

On page 3 there is indication that this memo was of 1975 because he states that is when he saw Kelley spoke in KC, or which I know. Now that was two years before it was leaked that Oswald had left a threatening letter for him before 11/22/63 and that on orders he personally destroyed it. Here, living the fiction and hiding behind the FBI's false position, he states, 3rd graf up on 3, "I had absolutely no reason to believe that Oswald was a potential assassin or dangerous in any way." This, certainly, even for the FBI, is a nice way of referring to a threat to blow it up! (FBI's discarded includes copies of printed pages of his testimony)

Bassett to Held, 6/17/76, is an item, source not indicated as not recorded, so I wonder if the obliteration after the first graf, for which a b6 claim is made, is of a file number that could disclose what the FBI does not want to disclose. I suggest that you ask for its examination because pretty much all of the disciplinings and censures is public.

page 1, graf 2 he admits that some in the FBI "are not being truthful" about the threatening note and its destruction. The reference to those "involved" must be some interpretation of "directly" involved because the last graf admits that is still working for the FBI admitted some knowledge.

Page 5 identifies this copy as from "admin folder." C doc. too.

Repetition of Hosty's claim that there was no threat is amusing and he had to have been lying and knowing he was lying from his own description of how he destroyed it, namely what Shanklin could have ordered him to do or how he'd have done it if innocuous. He went to the bathroom, shredded it and flushed it away.

Continued separately with third batch of records.

The 11/24 report have volume... so that report are there was nothing in the world to prevent a sixth if necessary. so it is not space there into all relation of that an efficient and appropriate action into the 11/24 report.

In the 11/24 report... follows the FBI files on... actually lying, "...all Bureau personnel officials on supervisory personnel were interviewed by the inspection division..." all of that time. This clearly refers to those still in the line of the staff of the room, Memphis, Tenn, Belmont, and... was not interviewed because... but was directly involved... to be... a...

It is inconceivable that... was... out the... in... in "follow... also... cover its own... by... in... the... the... to allow the... it also... in this situation... destruction...

What were they needed... it needed is what happened on... before 11/24, not subsequent to it. ... put potential... unless... on paper.

That it is a... of its... conclusion. I... that I do not recall this... by, or statement by... 11/24... possible, ... forget his... an informant or source of... not occasion for... not for the... possibility... forgotten, with... that... I... the... during... subject... in... on... of... 11/21... on... 11/21... on... 11/21...

I expect... by... a... to... if... exist. Not... a... copy... the... copies... no... of... 11/21... on... 11/21... on... 11/21... on... 11/21...

It also can be seen that "the... .."

Additional statement of the... ..

The... ..

Another... ..

... ..

The... ..

... ..

... ..

The... ..