Dear Jim, re selection of copies from the Hoover O & C file in today's mail 4/19/84

While Lil is making copies of a few few personal comment and subject filing a few observations about records I'm not copying.

The reflection of Hoover's interest in collecting anything at all, even the incredible, like the nonsense about the alleged JFK marriage to Durie Malcom (Blaufeldt well-known fabrication), that could be interpreted as critical of JFK or Bobby, is interesting, especially because of the number of such incredible records he kept in his office. Ditto for the report that Arthur Krock ghosted JFK's Profiles in Courage. Again, how, when and with what help he did that book is well and publicly known, so as of the time Hoover got that crap it was known to be crap. (These also indicate what others in the FBI fed to Hoover.)

Capriciousness in withholding as well as improper and unnecessary withholding is illustrated by a record that has neither an O & C identification number or a record-copy number, the 3/6/64 DeLoach to Hoover " RE: WHITE HOUSE LIAISON." The b7C claim is made to withhold what cannot properly be withheld, the name of the Minneapolis SAC, Held. Moreover, that name is disclosed in each of the other relevant records in this series.

Similarly, Document 2 is the charge-out form covering RFK's approval of the King wiretap, 100-[redacted] 16670-254. As of 12/13/73 it may have been transferred and withheld but it was disclosed earlier and I have it somewhere. (I'd be surprised if a copy is not also in the OPR records disclosed to you.)

Document 1, 62-17799-424 (a file in which there are other records relating to FBI conferences on this matter with the Secret Service) improper withholdings include the [redacted] name of Clint Hill, Jackies's security guy. He testified to this, published, it was in the papers and all over radio and TV, yet it is withheld (p.3) as b7C.

It is amusing that the FBI comments that Rufus Youngblood offered his life to save JFK as illustrative of Secret Service bravery, although it was not until long after that car left the crime scene that Youngblood covered Johnson, yet makes no mention of the fact that Clint Hill, who reacted very rapidly, almost did get killed by the front bumper of the car he'd jumped off of to rush to Jackie's aid. Resumed 5/8- The Zapruder film shows clearly, especially in the stills, that the bumper of the followup car from which Hill leaped and ran to Jackie's side just did touch his pants leg. It was that close. (Page 3 of 62-27799-424.)

There is no number on the Hoover memo of 11/29/63 to his top brass, reporting on his phone call from LBJ. This is quite interesting for a number of reasons. One is that LBJ was apparently feeling Hoover out on those he was considering for his Commission. Five of those he mentioned to Hoover were on the Commission. It is significant that LBJ made no mention of Warren Only. Not five-six. Dulles mentioned first and earlier.

Great interest in what is new, last sentence second graf on 2, relating to the rearrest of Silvia Duran by the Mexican police, they "will confront her with the original informant." We have never heard of <u>any</u> informant involved in that matter. In the context of what we know it seems that the informant must be on her, unless that crazy woman novelist had surfaced by then. If this is a possibility, perhaps Bud is interested in this formulation.

In the first graf on 3 Hoover, correctly, states that the pictures do not show any police recognition of Ruby when he was about to shoot Oswald or when he did. I do not recall any FBI record analysing those pix in any disclosed record or any of the Commission's. I do not recall that the FBI by then had and forwarded those pix, either. It thus appears that there is a file of info that has not been disclosed.

The next graf is explicit in stating that the FBI decided that the first and

third shots hit JFK and the second hit Connally. The rest of this graf is not correct and does not come from any disclosed record. The last graf reinforces this explanation of the shots. Also graf 5 on page 4.

Document 436, DeLoach to Mohr, 4/24/64, page 2 graf 1: DeLoach protests unnamed "Department official," who is Katzenbach, then acting AG, who told the Commission "that the FBI was 'leaking' information. I told Manchester that this allegation had of course been false." Actually, it was under DeLoach himself that the info was leaked, including to a reporter friend of mine. These contents of the FBI report, CD 1, that it wanted out, started being leaked for appearance on 12/2/63, with the major stories 12/5/63. As Katzenbach told the Commission in executive session 12/5, nobody but the FBI could have done the leaking. (Ford was DeLoach's informant on the Commission.) At least some of this particular leaking was by Tom Bishop, who was directly under DeLoach.

"Oswald was a non-violent type of person," page 2, graf 3. How much more non-violent can one be when one hand-delivers to the FBI a letter threatening to blow its Dallas office up, which FBIHQ did know, according to the Inspector General's investigation of it after this was leaked in Dallas in 1975.

Although Hoover added three notes stating he would not see Manchester, he did and he blabbed a bit, boasted a bit, it was disclosed, and I have a copy in the Manchester subject file.

The record filing of this copy was eliminated in xeroxing to eliminate the right margin, where that is always noted. This copy is from 94-37374, which appears to be on Manchester, the book or both.

Document 453 does not have the main record copy file eliminated in xeroxing. This copy also is from the 94-37374 file. The original is in 62-111371 as Serial 10. I have a note on that file indicating that it includes 62-109060-3417 as a NR copy, of a memo on Manchester's meeting with Hoover, re this book. A copy was designated for a different 94 file, Xed out. Hoover's response, Document 454, also NR in 94-37374, apparently is # 8 in 62-111371. In the course of checking my incomplete file of FBI file numbers to see if I have a record of 94-45162, which the Xed out number may be, I learned that I do not but that there is still another 94 file that holds records relating to this matter, 94-48768, which is a recorded copy of a memo that is Not Recorded in the main assassination file, 62-109060, after Serial 3325. All these files for one author, one book, one meeting with JEH? Document 455, original # 7 in 62-111371, had a copy designated for another file, number illegible. In this one A. Jones another of DeLoach's leakers, stated (in graf 3) that rather than leaking "we have remained meticulously silent." This memo summarizes their contacts with Manchester and concludes with its "cordial" nature since he wrote what the FBI liked in 1955. Hoover then noted, "I will see him" and states the time. Document 456 is #6 in the 62-111371 file and also originally was designated for the file the number of which is illegible. Although Lesar did not provide a copy of the DeLoach memo reporting what was said at the meeting with Manchester, I assume a copy of it also is in the O & C file. My subject-file copy is from a main assassination file, I think 62-109060.

I think it is a fair inference that although previously strong in his refusal to see Manchester, Hoover changed his mind on learning that in 1955 Manchester gave wide distribution to a Hoover article.