

Hosty

to Director and back Allen from Harold W. Isberg 1/12/85

This is the third page of a memo of the batches of Hosty records disclosed to me, the third as sent to me. I got this separately in part for my own filing and in part because I want copies of only two from this larger batch. I'll keep the original of the memo because it will make better copies for my subject filing. For the same or similar reasons I'll do the same with the second record, a long one of about five xeroxed selected pages only. Please do not take this to mean that I believe there is nothing else of value in this batch. There may well be and I may well have missed it because I'm into what now appears to be my annual sieges of bronchial infections, this being the third straight year. Last night is the first in two weeks that I got four continuous hours of sleep. But the apparently appropriate medicine brings its own problems, one of them the subject of complaint by my ulcer. So, I suggest your own examinations and if you'd like questions, I'm accepting them as I receive them, filed separately as disclosed to me.

The 12/31/75 Director to AG covering a memo to the Senate Intelligence Committee (FBI code name not used here "Senstudy") and the memo itself are typical of how the FBI lies when it wants to lie and perverts its lies so it can, if necessary, shake them away. Not even only with indignation. (866)

Item 1 reflects the Senate's interest in the Hosty censuring. The Senate referred to me and the FBI has never volunteered that he was censured at least twice, as is reflected in his own memo on the previous page of my memo reflects. The Senate is told to come to work to see what it wants to see. Those records were disclosed to me. Reflects the FBI's respect for the Senate, not and those are redacted copies, withholding from the Senate the names of others then disciplined, or the same cover the Bureau's assheads, when they'd done nothing wrong. Their names also, to the best of my recollection are disclosed.

So, - an 2 refers to a request for records relating to the second censuring of Hosty, "on or about September 29, 1964." ~~SENATE~~ Doesn't the FBI know? I suggest a possible explanation of this formulation: proofs of the Warren report were out and given to even the press 9/24. I have a press story I've given it to Wisconsin. But I've seen it. It is page proofs of the final version of the Report. SSC is told to go to FBIHQ to see those records. They were later disclosed to me.

Until about this time the FBI refused all requests for such information from the Congress on the ground that it was making an investigation and had not completed it. I've read the records of its investigation and what it was really up to in keeping everything under wraps and its control so it could create a situation in which no action could be taken against anyone. I have separate subject-file copies, I believe with memos, of what for me are the originals.

Item 15 is written in a manner that leaves it up to the reader to comprehend the FBI's question, and from the language I take it this is the Hosty destruction of Oswald's pre-assassination letter to him. The request indicates that the SAC was underinformed or misinformed, as the FBI refers to the request, and the FBI was not about to get the matter straight for the Senate. The language here is, "Item 15 requests all materials pertaining to the meeting subsequent to November 24, 1963 and prior to the submission of the Bureau's initial report to the White House..." My emphasis. The report referred to, CDI, was forwarded 12/9/63 and it makes no mention of the Oswald letter and its destruction. But if you will look at Document 1 in the first batch where I've copied it for you with a synopsis at that point, 12/3, that states that this was "handled" at Dallas on 11/24. and "then led to a not refer to Dallas's first knowledge but to its solution. It also, of course, is acknowledgment of Dallas's knowledge, withheld from the President, his Commission and the people in the so-called definitive report.

Hasty - De Mitr

Dear Jim and Mark,

1/5/85

I've read the two thin and unidentified batches of Hasty material Mark got from the FBI and I got from you today. It is all semi-serving, self-righteous, self-indulgent and irrelevant. But it does faithfully reflect 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 identify it as a mere error.

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

I don't believe it.

On the incredible factual error in the panel report. I had a page 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!

My thanks. I give it reading.

Best,

Received 1/12/85 because there are almost all near cord copies, obviously from a tickler, they lack positive identifications I can use. Where I've thought of it I'll have copies attached.

The first copy, typed sideways, was on a legal-sized page. I use the standard size because that holds what I am working a out, the statement that Oswald "was contacted by KVD," referred to the main investigation. There was nothing at all like this in any main report I've seen. Rather the opposite, NK's statement that he had not been. But what is confusing about this is that it can also be attributed to the Van Carter and Brown. But the alleged KVD contact is repeated, which reduces the possibilities of simple error at Dallas. Mark may want to consider giving this to Turner or another reporter, who can then ask his own questions of the FBI. I suggest this, as soon as possible.

The first page of Document 1 in the next batch, 1 B 3 on "Hasty note construction," is the first unequivocal statement I've seen that Oswald was aware of this. (I guess I should say that I recall.) It also refers to Oswald's "handling" of this on or by 11/24/63. 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 (intense) perjury when Hoover and Hasty swore to it. I put the paperclips on. Again I think use should be offered promptly. See also 3 B 4.

2 B 4, "Rosen characterization of FBI 'standing with pockets open for evidence to drop in.'" by translation, the chief of investigations stated they did not investigate the crime itself. Again I recall no earlier record saying this and again I recommend that if it available to Turner or another.

I admit the FBI had an "adversary relationship" with the Commission. In giving no voice to it for brooding Oney's choice as general counsel they also disclose that our first unlocated Ford was fronting for Hoover. DC 1 reflects and emphasized the FBI's preparation of dossiers on DC staffers "after" report was out. Blacked out only? The checkmark at -- was on the original. Someone was emphasizing that the FBI and CI (Singleton) were "pre-arranging" their answer to the Commission. 7, referring to the FBI's preparation of dossiers on critics, exists in another form I'll send to. Note to the FBI they had some notion of what they were told to do in 632/4420.

Additional note to JL: It is not the case 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 reflect 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 overhear or tap. "After she had her name correct, including maiden name."

Hosty's 10/24/70<sup>3?</sup> to Director, FBI, 44-34012-191, Doc. 24 (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 1970 because he states that is when he and Willey spoke in KC, of which I'd 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, 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 case way of referring to a threat to blow it up! (FBI's discussed for including copies of printed pages of his testimony)

Bassett to Held, 6/17/76, is an FBI report 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 coming for the FBI admitted some knowledge.

Page 5 identifies this copy as from "admin folder." C does 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, hardly 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.

Continues separately with third batch of records.

Handwritten initials: HNY

The FBI report five volumes to that report and there was nothing in the world to prevent a sixth if necessary. No it is not space that kept all mention of that insignificant and suppressed later out of the FBI's reporting.

In the language that follows the FBI lies without actually lying, "...all Bureau ~~personnel~~ officials and supervisory personnel were interviewed by the Inspection Division..." not all as of that time. This clearly refers to those still in the FBI at the date of the memo, DeLoach, Casper, Belmont, and I recall, was not interviewed because he was ill. But he is directly involved according to IC records - have.

It is inconceivable that once Oswald was picked up by the police and the FBI knew it in Dallas that Dallas did not cover its own ass by telling Miami immediately that Oswald had left the latter allegedly threatening to blow the FBI office and police up. It also cannot be believed that in this situation Shanklin ordered the destruction on his own authority.

What Kennedy needed and the FBI knew it needed is what happened on and before 11/24, not subsequent to it. Or that I expect perpetual secrecy unless some errant copies are around if anything was put on paper.

Item 10 is a cutie because of its typically FBI conclusion. I must admit that I do not recall this affidavit by, or statement by SA Joe B. Pearce. And while anything is possible, I find it hard to believe that I'd forget his saying that "Oswald was an informant or source of SA Hosty and it was not uncommon for sources to occasionally come to the office" to leave a note for the agent running him. While I acknowledge the possibility that I've forgotten, with my from-the-first interest in Oswald as someone's risk I do not believe I did. I therefore am inclined to believe that this was withheld from me. Bearing on this possibility, according to my office car file of subject files in the basement, I had none on Pearce. He was not by any means unknown to me. I remember him as writing names "JD Pearce," or investigative clerk, not an SA. I see this in his affidavit. The FBI's phony conclusion is that this "was looked into by the President's Commission, and there was no substance whatsoever to this particular claim." How did the Commission "look?" It took Hoover's and Belmont's self-serving statements and the FBI had no connection with Oswald. Even though at the 1/27/63 executive session makes unequivocal, Dulles told the Commission that to lie about this would be dishonourable and proper and the 11/21 address discloses the Commission's view that it would never get an answer and that the FBI wanted it to fold its tents and go away because by then the FBI had solved the crime.

A comment on how the FBI can hide by its filing, and make a literal interpretation of a search slip to deny the existence or existing records it knows exist. Note that this is a tickler copy and we have no idea what the record copy says. But this is designated for a single file only, that on the Senate committee. There is no indication of any assassination filing. So, the search slip could not disclose assassination filing and the FBI would therefore decide that Kennedy was not relevant and the record not responsive, responsive as it inevitably would be. It also is interesting that Oswald's was written on the top, suggestive, but not necessarily a tickler filing. Filing instructions are never written on the tops of pages, only on the bottoms.

It also can be seen what <sup>F</sup> reads as that id - may be Oswald's, or tickler.

Ball's statement of his appearance on page 100. (Ball's pages attached) the name linkage, the date, and not typed, are very interesting for possible indexing or duplication on a tickler. The name is not underlined but in marginal to this appears to be at all times, Ruby is correct. For example, are. This suggests a tickler card of the name of the informant's name, a card of information that would get, rather, perhaps, to inform the FBI of rather than necessarily control.

Consett's report is an interesting one. It says that he heard that before the assassination the alleged assassin carried and left a note. (2)

Page 9. Consett's report. Consett states that "on night in Dallas he at one time opened a call case on Ruby." This reflects what is the FBI's practice, the keeping of records related to Ruby as a <sup>FBI</sup> but none produced in 71-4522 despite my repeated requests for it. This also reflects the fact that such records should appear on any search slip. And that, when automatically if a search had been made. (There should <sup>in fact</sup> be at least <sup>10</sup> dozen informant contact forms in the file plus the request for permission to use him and the granting of that permission.)

The questioning about Wilson's disciplining of the informant who used Ruby as a informant is especially found in a reproductive may be handled in Ball's mind with a report to Wilson from a source that Ruby has been used by Bill Ray Griffin (deceased), informant who had been disciplined in New Orleans and before assigned to Dallas. (Griffin's hip-pocket ~~xxxxx~~)

In general, the time, effort and energy wasted on the line possible theorizing of so many critics by the committee is apparent in this report of its questioning. That time and effort might well have been devoted to reasonable leads, not idle and unsupported theories based on distortions and exaggerations.

Page 13. Consett reports that he went to Dallas-TV to get a picture of James Earl Ray. He did not get a picture, as he was not allowed to enter the building.

The FBI has been told by Dallas that they were told that the investigation was to establish that Oswald acted alone."