

for under a coat.

1/10/71

Dear Jim,

Your letter of the 3rd is very interesting, so I'll take it from the top and maybe I can, from this great distance, make the right suggestions.

You misunderstood what I said about knowing who killed JFK. I have no idea what the names are. I meant I think ~~ix~~ understand the forces and the reason, which is not at all the same things as you imply.

On the kids: can you keep this to simple, comprehensible, things?

Your friend C seems to know what he is talking about. All you report is credible. There is but one fact with which I have trouble, and to that I'll return.

Hosty is in KC, was disciplined. But not for his knowledge but for messing up. He let the cat part-way out of the bag, he talked loosely to a Dallas cop, in a moment of great emotion. Oswald accused him of essentially what you report, harrassment, and he did do this kind of personal harrassing, despite the best official efforts to cover it up. It is not generally known, but he did go in for the personal stuff, too.

Let me tell you what I believe and perhaps you can find a way of trying it out on C to ascertain if it might be the case, if he knows. I think a now-retired agent, Fain, hooked Oswald for the second time when he visited him in Fort Worth in 1962. I think Oswald had some kind of minor government connection when he first went to Russia. He returned disenchanted with both governments. Oswald was unwilling to do Fain's bidding but felt he had to agree.

What Oswald was informing on in N.O. remains a mystery to me. There was no pro-Castro activity of any kind there, and he was not of the right. What he seems to have been doing is establishing a cover for use elsewhere, and the only use I can detect is in Mexico. This would not seem to be for Bureau purposes, raising the question, for whom and for what purpose(s)? And, in any event, he failed there.

It is, of course, possible that Oswald so hated the Russians on his return that he could have been willing to become an informant. But I think it not probable. The question then comes up, how was he persuaded? Stick or carrot? Two gross possibilities are threat and pay...One of the mysteries is that N.O. interview. What happened in it? I think he got the man he didn't expect. There were two. The name of the second is hidden. It is never, ever, mentioned anywhere, which makes me believe the second man may have been the one who handled him, and I have some hunches along this line. The report refers to one, Quigley, which doesn't really make sense. And I know there were two. The other possibility is that neither was the right man and LHO got P'ed off.

How did ~~LHO~~ Hosty muffle several confrontations with LHO? He had to have found it child's play to find him, if he didn't know or if he wanted to. He knew where he worked, which is enough. This part is unclear. And how did Hosty slip notes under the door, that being a rooming house, where a note under the main door, entirely unreported, would have had to have had the right alias on it and why do that when there is a mailbox? If this happened, it had to mean that Hosty had access to the house and knew which was LHO's room, which probably means he had to have been working with someone inside the house.

I'd be inclined to believe that LHO was not harrassed at work, where there would be too many witnesses. I am also inclined to suspect that there was no face-to-face meeting in Dallas or LHO might have indicated it instead of restricting himself to alleged harrassment of Marina only. But it is possible he hid it. His complacency under the great pressure has always indicated to me that he felt he had some kind of official protection. I have

encountered exactly this attitude in N.O., where some have made clear that they have been told they are under such protection (in this case, no reason to believe the FBI's).

There is nothing to indicate that Truly was approached. There is only one deletion from his testimony, of which I am aware, and that reflected on the mental capacity of another man. Except for harrassment, I see no purpose in such an interview, and with the perspectives of the people who ran the TCRD, had this happened, I think LHO ~~had to be~~ would have been fired unless what I regard as more unlikely happened, that they told Truly LHO was working for them.

What do you mean by "the bureau was generally confused about who was Oswald before they decided to cover-up..." Do you mean was he working for another agency, like CIA, or the Russians? (I think the latter highly improbable.)

This is an area where what you can learn from C could be very helpful. I have much that relates, and I have never had any doubt that LHO had some kind of federal connection. In fact, that is the very first thing I ever wrote on this subject.

I've finished my book on the King assassination, but C's quitting over this is very interesting, especially if he told you why. I'd presume because of the cover-up nature of the investigation. But with him being in the KC office and Ray and escapee from the not-distant Missouri pen, he may have more specific knowledge that I'd be interested in. If you ever tell him about me, before the book comes out, you can tell him I tear Hoover up over this and his racism, his cheap spying on King and what he did with it, etc., as he'll see when the book is out. Perhaps you might tell him if you think it wise that you have been in touch with me and I have written such a book. But it seems like at least two months before I can get a copy for him, and it might be better if it just happened, if he got the book in a store, read it and reached his own decision about me and whether he would want to say anything. If he is a decent man and can bring himself to trust you and me, I think he'll be happier if he unloads, for as time ears, his conscience may plague him. I'd like very much to be able to talk with him, very much.

Telling you to ~~just~~ how to proceed with such scant data and knowing nothing about C is at best difficult and can lead to wrong suggestions. But I think continued casual conversations, followed by the most complete notes, is the beginning. If you feel that his conscience is bothering him, I sure as hell can show him more than sufficient proof of the dishonesty of his former associates in all assassinations, and he should be burned on about King's, if not JFK's. If you continue to discuss this with him and he continues willing, I think at some point he'll wonder about your interest, and that might be the time to tell him that you've read my books, etc.

Maybe it is possible that his own thinking will develop to the point where he concludes he has to give meaning to his experiences and will be willing to help, not by wrongly telling secrets but by helping establish truth where he, even if indirectly, has been part of the lies, and as decent men ought, by desiring to help right wrong. If he has any genuine concern for the future of the country, including minorities, I think this kind of development not impossible. Suggesting more is hazardous, for I have no basis and, of course, with so many people already (and needlessly) hurt by the permacating dishonesty, I would not consider doing or suggesting anything that could in any way hurt another, be he a total stranger, and most of all not a black man, who, inevitably, in this country, has already been hurt too much. If no white man can fully appreciate this, I do think one from a minority can come closer than others.

Unless he indicates otherwise, I'd not discuss these kinds of things with him in the presence of anyone else, including your wife.

All of this does fit. The one and minor problem is with the notes under the door. There was an immediate report that LHO worked for the Bureau and it was neither answered, disproved or even effectively denied. It set the Commission on edge to begin with. The

own "investigation" was so "st incompetent" or "sloppy" that it didn't even include copies of the newspaper stories that immediately reported the alleged LHO-FBI connection. Let me level with you and you can, if you elect, with him. I am satisfied I have in my possession LHO's identification and the manner of his payment and I have copies of the FBI's pre-assassination reports that it withheld from the Commission. (N.O. only.) One of the possibilities is the reverse disenchantment, that is, the Bureau was not happy about what he was doing and suspected he might be serving other masters. There is no doubt that what he did in N.O. brought him close to CIA types, and one Bureau informant (this is not generally known and has never been reported), was mixed up in the same kinds of affairs in a way that can link with Oswald. I have all this proof in my possession, including what seemingly was denied the Commission. In fact, I have reason to believe LHO did not work alone, may have good leads on who worked with him, and have the unquestionable proof that the Bureau knew, whether or not this was their guy, and the equally unquestionable proof that they had this guy's picture and removed it from all available copies of the originals and withheld it and his identification from the Commission.

These things—and my silence about them may persuade C that my interests are genuine, not for sensation, and that I can keep my mouth closed. You might be surprised at who trusts me, who has trusted me, and my keeping all trusts. And, I do plan a book on Oswald as an agent, raising the question and developing the proofs I already have. The negative proofs are mind-blowing, like I have the official proof of the destruction of some of the evidence.

Pushed for time. That stuff in the Powers book is crap. LHO served no purpose in this affair and there was no knowledge relating to the flight he could have given the Russians that they needed. Either they had the capacity for bringing U-2s down or they didn't. If they did, their own equipment was enough. If they didn't, no information could have helped them. They knew of the flights. The guy who wrote the book phoned me and discussed this with me at some length before he wrote it, indicating he agreed with me. I suppose the commercial temptation was too much for him. He knows it is crap.

Many thanks. This is very helpful. I hope you can develop it. And I do think that if C can ever unburden himself, he'll feel better. His fears may have to do with whether or not he can trust the one to whom he speaks, you, and with what, if anything, you do with anything he says. He has no way of knowing it, but I would never break his trust, which means I would never disclose my source and not use what he asks not to be used. Even if he did not ask it, if I felt anything would tend to finger him, I'd not use it, except for my own understanding. Not in print. I have hours of tape-recorded interviews not transcribed and in bank vaults of just this character, and other interviews, where specific recall of detailed fact is not involved, of which I made no records. In all of this it is essential to do what the government, especially the Bureau, did not do and today does not do. They have just released to me the most incredible information about a man that should not have been disclosed under any circumstances. I will never use it. It is both personal in the most intimate way and irrelevant. Where I have had access to other official information of this sort in the past and felt I had to use it, it is so carefully masked that it is impossible for the reader to detect any identity. What I am saying is that we, who seek truth and justice, can never succeed without the most scrupulous regard for the rights of all individuals. Good cannot be accomplished by hurt, by bad. We just can't do what the government did. We must be honest in every aspect of every thing we do. If we are not, we cannot succeed and we ought not.

Sincerely,

I almost forgot your postscript. It really fascinates me. And the assignment of a black agent to investigate the NSRP does, too. When my book on the King case appears, you will find a barbered version of what I know of their threats to kill the President (I have official records of four), one in some detail, but less detail than I have, and if C is up tight about the FBI performance in the King case, his teeth will be on edge when he reads the suppressed reports I got and print and reads the full Miami tape. You may remember this from the last chapter of Oswald In New Orleans. The Miami incident is the real reason for the change in JFK's arrangements there, and that tape includes the threat against King by the same guy (who later died of a heart attack). It apparently was never given to the Commission. I have much more on all of this than could be printed in an already too-large book.

How the Kansas City NSRP people could be related to Ray's Atlanta and New Orleans contacts can be the most significant information, and I would very much like to know everything I can. I think perhaps New Orleans (and what you do not mention, Baton Rouge) may hold some of the key missing links. Atlanta is obvious, and it is obvious Ray was not alone in any of this, especially not in these cities. That Stoner got to Ray as early as he did is fascinating, but I am aware that this could have been through Jerry, who is that type (if C did not know this, it might interest him). Jerry is very close to Stoner and is a virulent racist (more anti-Semitic than anti-black).... That area was strong in "inuteman activity. Is there any indication of an NSRP link with them?... And then Stoner winds up handling Ray's legal matters after he is blackjacked into copping a plea and wastes most of the possibilities? He is now out of the case, the criminal aspects, and having mess both aspects up rather well, is restricting himself to the civil cases that might, in other hands, have succeeded. Here I level with you again and with permission to tell C if you elect. I really can't counsel you and I leave it up to you, but I want no repetition of it. It took me more than a year to do, and I did it without any contact with Ray. He finally got the idea that it would be a good idea if my lawyer were his lawyer and it is now the fact. I am working on the legal end, to get a trial. It should be apparent that whether or not, as it does, this is to defend Ray, it is more to bring out the truth about what did happen and what did not - to solve the crime and to make the institutions of society function. There is to be a hearing 2/23 to determine whether or not there is to be a trial, so there is little time here if anything is to be forthcoming. As a matter of law, I think we have enough. C will understand that in political cases, the law often is not sufficient. I had to go to court to force the bureau to let me have some of what they were suppressing (limited by the law to what I could precisely identify). I have significant suppressed bureau evidence of an exculpatory nature and contraining the most serious reflections on its honesty. They will be in the book, by the way, but again space precludes completeness. I have 200 pages of this kind of thing. They caved in the day before the hearing on my suit and they tried to stall for a long time. I finally got a summary judgement against them which, if C is a lawyer, I think we will find rather exceptional. The case is in Federal District Court in DC, CA 718-70. The judge was Curran. So, there is almost no aspect of any information on the King case, Ray or the NARB or any other extremists or racists that could not be valuable. Most of all the names in the various cities, and I have a hunch "ouisiana may be the nitty-gritty. I have some, but frankly I do not know enough to make a valid appraisal. Those "certain heavy dudes" may be exactly what I need. I am pretty familiar with New Orleans, having done extensive independent work there. Garrison and I didn't agree on most details, never agreed on approach, and, privately, I tell you he never conducted any real investigation and had he the capability, which I think he didn't (he is brilliant in other ways), he was not staffed to do it. People who wouldn't talk to them talked readily to me. The question was simply of trust. This includes "the other side". I hope you can find a way of going into this, perhaps separate from and without mention of the JFK aspects, unless C has reason to suspect a link, with him. How I wish it were possible for him and me to meet and talk, for him to understand me and my objectives. However, if he understand I have refused to do a book on what I have done on the King/Ray case, for a major publisher, broke as I am (they fear the subject itself), he can understand the genuineness of my purposes. But I just can't afford to go out there. The only chance would be a paid public appearance.