

Kr. Lonnie Hudkins
5 Chestnut St.,
Franklinville, NY 14737

5/26/96

Dear Lonnie,

I've been intending to write you for some time. I've not used the phone because increasing weakness has me retiring even earlier, before you are at work, and because I've been working intensely to get as much on paper as I can while I can. The volume is now considerable. It is a series of manuscripts under the general title Inside the JFK Assassination Industry, Two parts were published by Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen, as I suppose you know. The second to be published was sat on after I finished it in 1992 until last year. Then it was published with the descriptive title omitted from the cover so neither the stores nor the book purchasers had the slightest idea of what it is about. They also forgot the index which had been set in ^{type} and not even read and corrected. It is NEVER AGAIN! For a long time I could ~~not~~ get any copies. I offered to buy them six times without response! Finally, months later, I got them to send a box to Jim Lesar, who promised to hold a Washington press conference for me and then didn't. Eventually I got them if you do not have a copy and would like one.

If they did a single thing to promote either book, even sent out a single review copy, I've not heard of it.

What I went through on these two, which got to them by accident, I do not want to go through again so what I'm doing is intended as a record for history. In the form of book manuscripts.

Some I started some time ago and laid aside for others that, when finished, I have been returning to. The one I'm working on now is on the men, of the Commission and more of its staff. It has the working title of Honorable Men. In the Marc Antony sense.

In lengthy parts that deal with the executive sessions of 1/22/24 and 27 I came on this reference to you. I delayed writing you because I believed I would come to more. + have. This more is the chapter in which I have a thick file of FBI and some Secret Service reports. I've that chapter to reread and work on but I won't get to that until tomorrow now. With those reports I have a copy of my 12/21/92 letter to you to which I recall no response. I have no intention of writing what may embarrass you but if you were fired over that by Hobby that was pretty dirty and because he was under Jaworski pressure even dirtier and I like to include such dirty things when they all refused to make any investigation at all. As they should have. If you do not have that letter in it I also said that the idea of getting you fired seem to originate with the Commission 1/27/64.

I'm sorry you do not want to talk about 110669 but you seem to be the only

source of it. It would be good if the record for history could be better, more informative.

The records say that both Sweatt and Alexander were your sources. There is ^{almost} ~~almost~~ no reference to Goulden. You are quoted as saying Sweatt was your source. Alexander is quoted as saying he knows nothing at all about it. You are quoted in another memo saying that "A local official told him that Oswald was an FBI or CIA informant." Belli is also a source. He told a Hearst reporter that Oswald was an FBI informant for thirteen weeks. *Ruby in eight weeks.*

I have a ~~fat~~ fat file of those documents to reread after all these years before I reread what I wrote so long ago. In skimming them I saw these references to you.

What I am writing about is not you or Sweatt or Alexander, etc. It is about the men of the Commission and the dishonesty of some. This includes my relationship with Russell, from whose archive I have some records that reflect a high opinion of my work and what he said to the Commission in the executive session he formed when the presses were about to roll on the Report. He refused to agree with the single bullet theory and was convinced the agencies had not told all they knew about Oswald.

Who was, by the way, strongly anti-USSR and anti-Communist.

But if the situation has changed, as perhaps from the death of a source, I'd like to know ^{if} anything else you can tell me. That would reflect what should have been and was not investigated. Which all those men had the obligation to do.

They kept on talking about having to interview you but as you know they never did and I believe never intended to despite what they were saying. Hoover encouraged them to even if you'd assert privilege. McCloy said you had none. Based on what he said was British precedent.

I hope your health has improved or at least is steady and not deteriorating. Mine is and has been. A month ago I was in the hospital for two weeks. They said it was and was not congestive heart failure. They found my kidneys are not as efficient as they should be and that I'm anemic but they found no blockages there. Only ^{hardening} of the arteries, as there is elsewhere. Haven't been able to use stairs for several years, must support myself with a cane when ~~to~~ walk and after about 200 steps have to stop and rest. But I'm still writing and will as long as I can. In 10 days I have a cardiology checkup at Johns Hopkins. They did three bypasses on me in 1989. ^{He} ~~He~~ is close to needing a hip replacement, so we have his and her canes. Her's is an antique. Was her grandfathers.

We hope ^{you} ~~you~~ are all as well as you can be. Sorry it has not been possible for you to get here.

Our best,

Harold

In reading them all I saw nothing new or unusual about you.

There is an FBI teletype of an ordered interview of Wade quoting him as saying that at that 1/24 session with the Commission about Oswald as an informant there was more speculation that he might have been a CIA informant.

There is also a 1/24/64 memo from Bertram in Houston to chief quoting Inspector Elliot Thacker as indicating belief the number was not S179 but was 110669 was believed by most news people to be that FBI number. That info. is probably of the day before because Bertrem refers to Thacker's call of 1/23.

It does not say where Thacker was and I recall no other such reference and no such story.

The CIA was so uptight about the passing reference Rankin made to it its "record copy" was stamped "For FOIA Review on. [sic] May 1976." It would be "reviewed" for "disclosure" ^{after} beginning thirteen years! Without any classification claimed or legitimately subject to claim!

Not only that, there is no information in the Rankin memo that came from the CIA so it had no basis at all for making any kind of claim to withhold it and the information in it!

That it did this does justify suspicion of the CIA.

This is because of a single sentence on page 3:

indent single space
Wade stated that he was also aware of an allegation ~~that~~ to the effect that Oswald was an informant for the CIA and carried Number 110669.

This numbering is consistent with CIA numbering. I have seen examples of it often on CIA records. *It is used instead of names on these records.*

Wade was correct in telling Warren and Rankin that the number attributed to the FBI was not as its informers are numbered for identification or as accounts are kept.

Hudkins told me that he had made the 172 and 179 number up to use on the phone in the belief that the FBI was ^ptaping his and other phones over this report. Hudkins also told me that not long after that was on ~~the~~ ^{his} phone he was visited by the FBI.

Before then Hudkins and my wife and I became friends and in an effort to learn more about this I primed a reporter ~~I~~ knew to question Hudkins about the entire matter, including the fake numbers. In the course of this Hudkins claimed not to remember the entire ^{exact} number but he did give that reporter the first four of those six numbers correctly.

Of all the people of whom I know only my two friends, Hudkins and Henry Wade indicated any knowledge of that number.

When I asked Wade about it, my recollection after so many years is that he said he had no recollection of his source. When I asked Hudkins he just refused to answer.

Given out friendly ^{continuing friendly} relationship I interpret this to mean that Lonnie

will say nothing that might tend to identify his source.

On Wade's part ~~his~~ if he said he has no recollection, which may well be true, it can also mean that he ^{was} is unwilling to identify a confidential source.

If there is any other reference to this number in any Commission record of any form or nature I am not aware of it.

Rankin and the Commission dropped it after keeping this number secret.

There was no mention of it in that January 27 executive session transcript, either. This means they did not even tell the other Members of the Commission about it!