

460 uncl. Arch, Releases, in office files

Dear Paul, Your last two lists, notes

2/4/78

If I repeat myself or seem to be saying other than I have written you before I hope I have your tolerance. I'm into much too much, with immediate time pressures, yet I want to make my files as accessible to responsible people as I can. Thus I laid all else aside then you r undated mailing came this morning, interrupting it only when I could not avoid doing otherwise. I regard what you are doing as important and I see possibilities of its use in FOIA matters. Also of value to those who may use my records.

I'm not sure how much of what I'd like to do will be possible. The accumulation of what I must read and annotate for Jim in FOIA matters also is now quite large and it is being added to almost daily. But ideas have been taking form. I'll probably know a little more before bedtime because I expect two local college freshmen, sisters, to do some work on the files and on refiling what the Nat. Enq. people took out to use. If they work okay and if I can swing it I'll probably be able to get them to take care of the new stuff and gradually file the old stuff that is unfiled and straighten out the overflow files, moved from my office, several file cabinets full of what is of less immediate usefulness.

I think I'll have to start files relating to each Section as I have records relating to those Sections. Here your notes can be of great value to others even if I never use them. They can also be of value to me. But to do this I think I'm going to have to file a set for each record referred to and mark each copy with that Serial, etc. An alternative is a set of notes for each Section and separate hand notes for each Serial, referring to the paragraph of your notes.

If you have any suggestions or any experiences from which I can benefit let me know.

One suggestion I would make, considering that some of those who will use your notes, not just here, will be working with actual Sections and Serials, would be to include them on the notes proper. It will be relatively little work for you to do this but it requires cross checking and noting for all others. The AIB people can give you the Section Numbers if they have not. I have my second batch in cabinets that include beginning and ending Sections and Serials on each drawer. As files are used and refiled they will be inserted in file folders. This will tell all users immediately that someone else has read those pages. It will also identify the contents of each Section by the Serials included within it. I do not expect to be able to afford the time and money of extra handling for making such folders up except as they are used and my students refile them.

There is so much that takes time in using these records that scanty as my time is and limited as my cash resources are I'm undertaking these costs at a time when I do not expect to be able to begin any thorough examination of all the records for a long time. I'm doing it in the expectation that it has important values for the future, and in the present can save the scarce time of any users.

I will be enclosing a check for \$25 as a contribution to the costs you incur. If the Nat. Enq. people accept my suggestion I'll recover from them for the copies to them.

Your notes of 2 Jan 78 were in what came today with your list beginning with #165.

On p. 1 notes, last graf, you say you are enclosing 101 and 102 from 1976 Arch. releases. Not with this set. I probably have all of those releases but have not been able to do anything with them because I was ill. It is one of the jobs I hope these girls can undertake, establishing a file on that release. If you have an inventory of it that would help much.

I see the name Rosen, no first name or title. I also noted initials used elsewhere. I suggest that making up a list of full names, functions and the various FBI Divisions could be helpful to others. To me also because I forget. Al Rosen then was head of the General Investigative Division. Doing this is too much for me. I tried to start it with King records. But it can have much meaning in the use of your notes and the records.

Hosty: If I can remember I'm going to use something like this to indicate subjects and places for duplicate filings. At the top of p. 2 you refer to an WC staff interview with Frank Ellsworth on Hosty. I have some info on him I believe others do not, from those who knew him. I'd like to file this memo with my other Hosty records, which others can use when they are here and when the papers are in Wisconsin and you are in California.

(I can't jump up and down to get the past list to annotate the notes as I read.)

Hoch Manuscript: Referencing like this is excellent but it serves remarkably few people. Few now and perhaps fewer in the future without other reference to your ms. at some point.

Scott, Peter Dale: Same comment. I think there should be references that can be understood in the future by those who do not know you and Scott. Also, there should be references to published work other than your own. I've seen several points at which some of mine at least are relevant and they are more readily available to others. I have no ego interest in these comments. They are intended to make your work more useful.

FBI: Orwell in the or perjury is a way of FBI life - reur notes on Items 103-5. Shocked as you are and should be - so what else is new? There is even worse than this within my experiences, I think I can say extensive experiences, and it includes the fabrication of the self-serving. When I have completed annotating the records on me there will be such of this. They lie as they would hope to be able to continue breathing - all of them. The higher in rank the grosser and more deliberate the lies. They do ~~not~~ fabricate, generally but not always in pursuit of the cover-the-ass basic FBI need and method. You do not reference this to your apt ^{edro} Charles comments. Because of the importance of the agencies in this work I think that kind of cross-referencing and perhaps the creation of an appropriate file and title for it could be of considerable use. I can see a doctoral thesis on such a subject if it can obtain academic approval. There is the material for it. If you had been able to keep up with my FOIA litigation you'd have seen many instances of overt perjury and more of false swearing and big lies. This permeates all and I think you realize that the Commission and its Report also lied and hold lies.

I realize this kind of thing takes time, but I think for one like you very little time and that it is worth the time and will magnify the importance of this large and valuable task you have undertaken.

Your graf on the effect that could be amplified. You would be in error if you assumed this this kind of practise ended with Hoover's death.

But haven't you noticed how few agents incurred the tyrant's wrath? They know what is expected of them and rarely err in performance. What is a little lie among them?

Marina Oswald, control of: Item 108 in your notes. There is a factual basis in WW II on this and you should bear in mind that you will find much more on this, much more definitively than in the Scott reference. I have seen such a record, a Hoover 2/24/64 7-pp memo. Robert Oswald, you may have forgotten from having read one of my drafts, was paid to help out. James Martin was an important element of this. So was Isaac ^{on} ^{evine}. (Remember ex sess?) And it is an important part of the story. She was also kept happy by having sex readily available. They then used this as a weapon. Etc. I think this is important but I think you've notes the least important by keeping it too much in the family, so to speak, and without include a reference to Marina's overall importance, which I hope you will agree is great in the "investigation" and in the Report. You will find that Hoover did not believe her Nixon and Walker tales and figures Martin incited them for sex. This is at the bottom of your p. 2.

Testimony and Evidence, Alteration of: Your p. 3, Items 123, 124 - If you do not mean, re Belin's altering a question, what I have in WWII you might add such things in the future. Others also did it. I have cases with Liebeler, testimony and other records. You here refer to Serial 169 but your notes on it in the list do not refer back or mention the subject. There are space limits, of ~~xxx~~ course but I think here also you are onto something of importance and value to others and could include more. Perhaps by beginning to number your sets of notes and paragraphs within them?

My Belin and Liebeler alterations of questions were in each case misused in the Report. I think this makes them important and the question you raise also important.

Hoover, Totality of Control by: Your p. 4, Item 122. (here you do what I suggested but there is something wrong with the reference 62-2367. If you have abbreviate, please change as to 109060-2367 otherwise you are building in enormous confusion. Each of the field offices can have a file 62-2367 and the HQ file of this number would be of an entirely different nature.)

I suggest that again you are too much within the family and that you might want to recall some of my writing on Hoover's and the FBI's totality of control. You need not

what I have written about the Commission's responsibility (from the Intro to WW to the First to throughout PM) and its willingness to be under Hoover's domination, despite its vocalizing otherwise but I think you should understand that the name of the FBI game from the very first moment was Control. Thus Hoover and all those under him from the first knew they had to draw clear and firm lines and they did this. They resisted every independent step the Commission started to take. Your comment on Shaneyfelt and its desire to use the 2 film as a time clock, for example. Think Shaneyfelt didn't know better?

You will find consistency in their extending this to the possibility of the timing of the shooting and their extending it to LEO.

I intend these suggestions constructively. The headings are rough and for my own later uses.

Attached with the list beginning with #87. These look like they can be helpful to me: 95,102-3,105,106,117, 122-128, inc.

On the list that begins with #15/5: 168,169,210,217,225,227, 237, ~~24~~ 240,241,242.

Are you sure that all "SS says autopsy photos available, but not needed now" is worth no more than a ** evaluation? That they were available to the FBI prior to an 11/26/63 memo was written and that the FBI, at the very outset of its investigation found them "not needed now" both says extraordinarily much, I think.

Autopsy dx. X-rays, for above graf.

Can you think of more basic evidence for any investigation?

Or how the FBI could have filed CD1 if it had examined that photographic record?

Thanks,