

## **CHAPTER 20**

### **An Industry Killing of an Important Investigative Lead**

That there is this JFK Assassination Industry suggests that it is made up of those who work on the facts of that assassination. In varying degrees this has a little truth in it. For almost all the amount of truth ranges downward to virtually none, to the fact that the President was assassinated. There are those who believe that the crime itself was merely incidental to what they are told by their unique insights and understandings is the reality, a reality that exists in their minds only. They know and they write that Lyndon Johnson did it or was behind it. That it was the mafia that did it or was behind it. That is was the CIA. For them the established fact is a problem they have to overcome because there is no fact to accredit their beliefs in which they have full and unquestionable confidence.

They are not alone in beginning with their conclusions in mind to begin with. That is the actuality of the official components of this industry. It is with the proof of this in official documents I obtained from my many FOIA lawsuits and other efforts with which I begin NEVER AGAIN! J. Edgar Hoover, whose word inside and outside the FBI was never questioned in the government, decided immediately that the crime was the work of a single "Red" and from the moment of his instant vision nobody in the government expressed any other view or knowingly did any work that led in any other direction.

The Warren Commission inherited this and never deviated from it. So, like the mythologizers of the other side, for it established fact was not proof, it was a major difficulty to be overcome. Working in complete secrecy, the secrecy that is the enemy of truth, it concluded as closely as was possible to what began with Hoover, that it was that one lone "Red" who did it. The Commission's anguished confession in what it expected would be permanent secrecy, that Hoover had boxed them in, I did bring

to light, thanks to FOIA, in several of my earlier books and in transcripts of its executive sessions that even before I could publish them myself I gave to the media.

Established itself confronted the Industry with its major problem. Both sides of the Industry.

This is because fact itself destroys most of the theories of all elements of the Industry on both sides or is at the least uncongenial to it.

It was inevitable that in varying degrees, varying down to almost none, the Industry would be in contact with the fact. Officialdom was compelled to go through the motions of the investigation it never really made or intended to make. In the course of this it could not avoid some fact that disproves its theory. But it was blessed with secrecy and helped by the mass of records it could unload with its partial end of secrecy in its Report. It was helped, too, by the willingness of the media and of many of the people to believe its theory and that its theory was not a theory.

It became almost sacrilege to question the official conclusions, to the degree that the media never did report that the Commission's conclusions are based on what it says is fact that the FBI and the Secret Service both disagree with.

But, no matter. They all agree it was that one lone nut of a "Red."

Who by that same official evidence was no "Red" at all and by that same evidence was not and could not have been the assassin.

This was obvious beginning with my first book, which was the first on the Commission and that momentous event, the assassination. Despite being the first book on so important a matter it was rejected by more than a hundred publishers internationally- without a single adverse editorial comment. The official evidence I brought to light in it exculpates the only official candidate for assassin, the one officialdom anointed assassin, to the exclusion of all others.

Garrison, to a degree I believe is sufficient we have seen, lived in his own clouds, those generated in his mind. And as we shall see with a sampling only, the component of the Industry of which he was part is so large it cannot be encompassed in a single book, fact no insurmountable problem to that component.

Allen Dulles, who headed the CIA before one of his and its endless disasters compelled the President who had to accept responsibility for that disaster to let him go after a decent interval, was also a Member of the Warren Commission. Lyndon Johnson was not concerned about the inappropriateness of appointing him to the Commission when there were suspicions that the CIA was involved in the crime. Johnson's concern was with the acceptance of the Commission's conclusions, conclusions he knew it would not dare have differ from Hoover's. Johnson knew from Hoover himself before he decided to appoint his Commission what Hoover believed.

In his memoirs, The Craft of Intelligence (New York, Harper & Row, 1967), Dulles stated a simple truth that did not originate with him, nor did it originate with me when I became aware of it 30 years earlier. It is a well-known truth long known, that in a difficult investigation seize upon a fact and bulldog it.

In anything as complex as a major political assassination there are many facts to bulldog. They all cannot be, not by private persons.

In terms of the official mythology that was presented as the solution and to begin with was widely accepted as the actual solution (by the media most of all) one of the facts that was never bulldogged is that Oswald was not really alone. If he was not, with him assumed officially to be the lone assassin, then there could have been a conspiracy despite Hoover's instant vision virtually the moment of the assassination there had not been.

The FBI and the Commission did not avoid the fact that when Oswald returned to Texas after his sojourn in the USSR, to which he is said officially to have defected when he was quite careful not to do that, Oswald did have a few social acquaintances within the White Russian community in the Dallas area and with Michael and Ruth Paine, who were friendly with that community of White Russians. One of the byproducts of this less than diligent official inquiry is the mythology that an offbeat member of that community, the emigré archeologist and petroleum expert, George De Mohrenschildt, was Oswald's "babysitter," a phrase indicating intelligence control. How De Mohrenschildt could have met that imagined responsibility from Haiti, which is so distant from Dallas and where he lived and worked for the more than half year before the assassination, was never of any concern to those addicted to this particular mythology. A not insignificant number were. Of them Garrison was the best known.

Typically, fact did not intrude upon this lingering mythology. The fact is that De Mohrenschildt and his wife, Jeanne, in common with others of that White Russian community, were concerned about the needs of Oswald's young wife and her child and with their second infant due soon, tried to be of help to them. There is the additional fact that the offbeat De Mohrenschildt found Oswald's ideas, even more offbeat in that community, provocative and interesting, as he also did the unusual thing Oswald had done, go to the USSR and appear to have defected and then to have re-defected.

The persistence of this mythology led to De Mohrenschildt's suicide after being persecuted by it for more than a decade. Even though, as he told me himself, Earl Golz, then an investigative reporter for the Dallas Morning *News*, issued a warning to leave De Mohrenschildt alone because he had just been discharged from the psychiatric ward of Parkland Hospital. De Mohrenschildt nonetheless was put and kept under the pressure he could not stand while he was trying to recuperate in the home of a wealthy friend in Florida.

First it was by Edward Jay Epstein then working on his book that when it emerged was Legend: The Secret World of Lee Harvey Oswald (New York, The Readers Digest Press, 1978). That is a different formulation than was given when that book was first announced. The change in Epstein's book coincided with his close association with James Jesus Angleton, the paranoid former head of CIA Counterintelligence. His paranoia almost tore the CIA apart.

Following Epstein's interview, extraordinary pressure for a man just released from a psychiatric ward, De Mohrenschildt was faced with what he also could not avoid, an official interview, by the Florida-based investigator for the House assassins committee. It was only moments before Gaeton Fonzi was due at the home in which De Mohrenschildt was seeking to recover from Epstein that he killed himself.

In Fonzi's book of 448 pages (The Last Investigation, New York, Thunder's Mouth Press, 1993), he does not mention De Mohrenschildt's name. (See its index, page 442)

De Mohrenschildt was being bulldogged by mythology, not for fact essential in any investigation. Fonzi's failure to mention him at all makes that clear. (Fonzi originated several mythologies. One is that Governor Connally was not wounded until less than two seconds before the President's head is seen to explode in the Zapruder film, despite Connally's clear reaction to having been hit seen much, relatively, earlier in that film. Connally's account is amply supported by the official evidence itself. And the other has to do with the fiction that one Antonio Veciana, an anti-Castro Cuban, was brought together with Lee Harvey Oswald by one Maurice Bishop of the CIA, in public and in broad daylight. That would have been the most radical violation of all intelligence tradecraft. Fonzi assumes that Veciana worked for the CIA in his book. He offers no proof, only his assumption. But as with most mythologizers, assumption is the equivalent of solid proof.)

If these persecutions that drove the poor man to kill himself served any purpose at all, it was to establish an Oswald association, to establish that he was not entirely alone.

This particular De Mohrenschildt mythology was given its major impetus by Garrison. And in the midst of that a Netherlander who was supposed to be a journalist, William Oltmans, made a big TV deal of it. Yet while entranced by and playing games with this nonsense, Garrison was totally indifferent to evidence he had, from me and from those 26 volumes he poured over, evidence that in New Orleans Oswald was not entirely alone.

This evidence had official origin and to Garrison's knowledge I carried several aspects of it forward.

The first visual evidence that in his mysterious activities in New Orleans Oswald was not alone is the TV footage showing Charles Hall Steele III distributing handbills with him. This meant nothing because Oswald had picked Steele up in the unemployment line. He offered Steele a few dollars to do that, never having known him earlier. But Steele himself knew that there was another young man helping Oswald with that when Steele joined them. So, there was the investigative lead, learning who that other man was. Steele was confirmed in this by Jesse Core, then the information officer of the International Trade Mart. Core reported this to the FBI and later to me.

As my notes of that Core interview state, this third man fled as soon as Core made loud complaints about that picketing, which he believed reflected on the ITM. Core described him as a fairly large man who weighed about 200 pounds. In a New Orleans FBI teletype to Headquarters two days after the assassination (62-109060-1188) Steele is quoted as describing this other man helping Oswald as a six-footer, with olive complexion and dark hair.

Whether or not the same third man, the New Orleans police and the FBI knew as soon as the

police checked their Oswald file that when in Oswald's first demonstration in New Orleans, immediately after he had the handbill Douglas Jones had printed, someone other than Oswald handed one to a harbor policeman. When the FBI checked that handbill for fingerprints, it identified fingerprints but they were not Oswald's, as the FBI told the New Orleans police. But under FOIA the FBI refused to disclose whose prints they were to me. And if Garrison ever tried to learn, I did not know of it. He said nothing about that man working with Oswald.

That day Oswald was picketing the carrier Wasp. It was docked at the Dumaine Street wharf.

What is perhaps most provocative of all, as we have seen, is that as soon as the New Orleans FBI got wind of the Secret Service interest in investigating those Oswald handbills and was going to interview Douglas Jones about them, that New Orleans FBI Office immediately alerted FBIHQ and it immediately got Secret Service headquarters to order its New Orleans office to end that investigation. (New Orleans File 100-16601-119) If the FBI had not been able to freeze the Secret Service out of the investigation it could have faced big trouble.

When the FBI spoke to Jones and his assistant, Myra Silver, both indicated what the FBI reports understate and fuzz over, that it was not Oswald who picked those handbills up. (165-82555-393, 394, 394A, 395)

Then, too, much as the FBI sought to avoid it and as the Commission did entirely, others saw Oswald with at least one other man participating in his demonstrations. Two others who believed they had another man in movies each happened to take of Oswald's demonstrations when they were vacationing in New Orleans, do have confirmation.

The only actual bulldogging of this many-sourced lead of Oswald not being alone in New Orleans was in the official avoidance of doing anything about it so that Oswald would be alone in the

official "solution."

If any book produced by the JFK Assassination Industry reported the existence of this New Orleans proof that Oswald was not alone I do not recall it. I did have it in Oswald in New Orleans in the captioning of the FBI reports of its pretended investigation. From 1967 on it was not secret.

J. Pat Doyle, from Portland, Oregon, who was engaged in electrical construction work for the Charles T. Parker Construction Company, with his wife Charlene and their children Jim, 14, and Sharon, 11, were attending a trade convention in New Orleans at the time Oswald was arrested. With the Doyles were the Matt Wilson family. Wilson was an independent electrical contractor. The Wilson children were Marsha, 13, and Donald, 11.

Jim was playing around with his 8mm movie camera when what Oswald was doing got his attention as their party walked along Canal Street toward the river from the Jung Hotel.

Jim took some movies of it that later proved to be of interest.

They also became the subject of controversy.

The same thing happened to John Martin, then a student at the University of Minnesota at Minneapolis, over the pictures of Oswald he took at approximately the same place and time.

Pat Doyle and Martin both told me they offered their films to the FBI. Both told me that when their films were returned views they remember were in it were no longer there. Martin told Schoener and me when we viewed it the day I spoke at the university. Pat Doyle told me this twice later that year, 1968, the second time the day before Christmas. He then told me that his wife Charlene confirms this because they had both viewed the film before lending it to the FBI.

This is also true of what Martin told me.

There was another man marching with Oswald and this other man carried a picket sign while

Oswald carried a home-made placard hanging from around his neck.

That was a week to the day before Oswald with at least those two others helping him picketed outside the old ITM building, the day Oswald made TV with his picketing.

The place where the Wilsons and Doyles saw Oswald picketing on Canal Street is little more than around the corner from that ITM building. That time is the time Bringuier et al attacked Oswald and got them both arrested.

All four Doyles and four Wilsons had no reason to lie. Nor did Martin. Or Core. Or Steele. Nor did the New Orleans police have any reason for finding some way of placing false fingerprints on Oswald's literature and at the same time removing his prints. And this does not include Jones and Silver and what they knew and said.

This comes to 14 reasons to believe that Oswald was not alone in his New Orleans activities, 14 reasons from the FBI's own records alone.

Then there are what I made no effort to tabulate, all those who reported seeing what Oswald was doing to the Garrison office, some of whom said he was not alone. I learned pretty much the same thing from Mrs. Elise Cerniglia, the fine wife of a surgeon who volunteered to run Catholic Cuban Relief in New Orleans. Without trying to place a number on it, she told me that at about the time of these two incidents many Cubans complained to her about what Oswald was doing, some of those Cubans also mentioning that he was not alone. Lopez, the service manager at Foreign Car Imports, who was himself a New Orleans activist in the anti-Castro Alpha 66, told me he had seen Oswald and others at the ITM and that they were working from an old Chevy parked across the street.

And all of these do not include those in the FBI's reports of Oswald's handbill distribution some of whom told the FBI about Oswald not being alone.

However, without all these other reasons to believe that Oswald was not alone, the FBI did not have fewer than 14 reasons to know he was not in whatever he was up to in New Orleans, as it stated in its quoted reports. But as all those in the FBI who had this knowledge weighed it against the importance to them of Hoover's decision that Oswald was an entirely alone assassin, the scale was always heavier on the Hoover side of the balance.

As it was with Jones and Silver and that mysterious fingerprint from the Oswald picketing of the carrier Wasp, the FBI did have some reports on the Doyle and Martin films. They do not, of course, include the Doyle, Wilson and Martin accusations that the FBI eliminated portions of those two films that they believe held pictures of the other man with Oswald. Instead those FBI reports state that when those films were examined they held nothing new or of value.

Those FBI reports, some of which I here cite and quote, are all written as though by some Inspector Clouseau of the spoof movies.

From my files of FBI reports on these matters I here refer only to seven from Portland in 1963. As the Portland FBI office and two of its agents in particular understood what they were looking into, this Oswald picketing and the attack on it by those Cubans is a Jack Ruby matter. The Jack Ruby nobody knew about until more than three months after this event, each and every one of the reports by William S. Brown, who appears to have written them, and Julius A. Bernard. Each report that has a heading is headed in capital letters "JACK LEON RUBY, aka Jack Rubenstein!"

Not only was this Jack Ruby filing never changed, for some reason not apparent in the era of xerox machines, the copies given to the Commission were retyped, although nothing in their content was changed.

The FBI could take that kind of time for this "Jack Ruby" matter, but where each of the persons

with personal knowledge they interviewed referred to this other man with Oswald and the fact that he was carrying a picket sign on a stick, either they did not ask any of the Doyles or Wilsons for the most rudimentary description of him or they omitted it if it was volunteered.

While at headquarters most of these Portland reports were placed in different sections of the main Oswald file there, even at headquarters this business that had no relationship with Ruby at all was filed as Ruby information.

From the initials on the unsigned letter the Doyle movie was sent to headquarters on November 27 by Brown. In that letter he reports what was nowhere else reported:

"As the DOYLES and WILSONS passed the area, the two demonstrators were 'rushed' by eight Cubans (Mr. DOYLE counted them) ..."

In all these reports the only interest the FBI had in what was in that film is that one of the demonstrators was Oswald.

When Martin in Minneapolis phoned that FBI office and offered it the movies he took, so great was the Minneapolis FBI's interest in the assassination of its President in getting all the information it could about the man the FBI accused of assassinating him it did not accept the offer of Martin's film until writing the New Orleans office and asking if it should, "if the use of the above film would be of any value to New Orleans." (Apparently this letter never got to headquarters either because the copy I have is from the Dallas files where it is 100-10461-1832.)

New Orleans suggested that it might take a peek, again no copy designed for headquarters. (100-10461-1999) Minneapolis did send the film to New Orleans. The copy I have from New Orleans has an illegible filing instruction written on it. But that no copy went to headquarters is clear. (The copy in the Dallas Oswald file is Serial 2210.)

When the Martin film reached New Orleans, at some point the proper procedure was followed for a record it was to retain. It was filed in an "FD-340" envelope for the holding of evidence. (100-10461-subfile 1A32) On this evidence envelope it is described as "Roll of film apparently depicting Oswald's presence in N.O." This is a description with no useful purpose. Oswald's presence in New Orleans was so very well known and established it needed no "depicting." And according to this same evidence envelope, it was 20 days later that the film was returned to Minneapolis. That same day New Orleans wrote Minneapolis saying it was returning the film because it "was found to contain nothing of value to this case." When the assassination of a President was being investigated by the FBI, ascertaining this required 20 days! They sure worked hard and rapidly to solve that crime!

Still again, no copy to headquarters.

However, that was greased lightning in speed determining no value in the film compared to headquarters, to which Portland did send the Doyle film. It took headquarters 65 days to return the Doyle film to Portland, telling Portland no more than that it "has no further need for this film and it is enclosed herewith for return to J. Pat Doyle." (105-82555-1584) The note on the headquarters file is longer than the message of the letter to Portland. It refers to the film as including "a few shots" of Oswald being arrested "for distributing FPCC literature and creating a disturbance." Oswald was in fact distributing only his own literature that had no connection with the FPCC and it was not he who created the disturbance. Moreover, the mere distribution of literature is not a crime.

Without telling Portland, this note states that headquarters made and kept a copy of the Doyle film.

There is no FBI record reflecting that Martin's film held what he told Schoener and me it held.

In the late 1960s I started using the Freedom of Information Act in an effort to get copies of

these films from the FBI, those who took the films having told me they had been altered after they loaned them to the FBI. The way the FBI mind works in freedom of information matters, my request, then required to be addressed to the deputy attorney general, when he referred it to the FBI, the FBI routed it to its domestic intelligence division! (105-82555-5655) My information request is referred to as my "allegations." The domestic intelligence division's letters to the FBI's New Orleans, Dallas, Portland and Minneapolis offices were written by the special agent who earned a unique but little-known distinction after he retired and entered the practice of law in Washington. His name is Lish Whitson.

When the FBI decided, all its other efforts to ruin Martin Luther King, Jr. having failed, that it would try to wreck his marriage, drive him to suicide or both, its laboratory faked a tape made of selections from its massive collections of tapes of its electronic surveillances on him. In addition it drafted an "anonymous" letter that was truly scurrilous. It addressed both to his wife, having taken the proper precautions not to leave fingerprints on anything it sent. Then it got Whitson to fly to Tampa, taking the same precautions to leave no prints on the package, and to mail it to Mrs. King from there. I obtained the FBI's records on this, at least some of them, under FOIA. Once again that FBI concept of freedom of information that it is the right of the people to have under the law: in the two different versions of its own faked-up letter that on two different occasions it let me have copies of, it withheld supposedly under that "freedom of information" law in these two different versions of the same single ugly and evil letter different parts of its own evil. For which there is no exemption in that law.

New Orleans replied promptly. Its registered letter (105-82555-5658) refers to its having gotten a duplicate of the WWL-TV film of "OSWALD distributing leaflets on 8/16/63 in front of the International Trade Mart." It says from whom it got that duplicate and cites the file and page references

to its being sent to headquarters in its first paragraph.

In its second paragraph it says the same thing about the WDSU-TV film.

In the third paragraph it reports having sent six stills from that film it got from Johann Rush and that is also sent to headquarters.

Its fourth paragraph refers to its special agent Warren DeBrueys having shown copies of those prints to various people in a supposed effort to "identify the persons therein."

This is the complete New Orleans response.

The Minneapolis response consisted entirely of sending headquarters copies of its record I refer to above, with copies to the other involved offices.

The Portland response consisted of reminding headquarters that it had sent the Doyle film to it and that headquarters had returned it.

Dallas took six single-spaced pages for its response. (105-82555-5659)

Its rehash of what its files show on the Martin film concludes with the opinion that it "was found to contain nothing of value to this case."

Perhaps this is as good a point as any to interject what the FBI considers to be of no value.

In my FOIA lawsuit for the records of the Dallas FBI office (C.A. 78-0322, later combined with 78-0420) I got a number of records with which the Dallas office did not trouble FBIHQ. It sent headquarters no copies of them. Several relate to the offer of Eastman Kodak to show the FBI what the amateur photographer, an engineer named Charles Bronson, told Eastman "was taken at the instant President KENNEDY was assassinated." His movies, "he feels quite certain," show the building from which the FBI said the shots were fired "and he feels that the window from which the shots were fired will be depicted in the film."

Agents Milton Newsom and Emory Horton went there and looked at the film. They declined free copies on the ground they had "no value."

In Newsom's words in his report, with Bronson's Leica his "film did depict the President's car at the precise time the shots were fired; however, the pictures were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes." By not clear enough for identification, what Newsom meant is they do not show Oswald with a smoking gun. They are quite clear and can be used to identify at least 50 and perhaps more witnesses. There is also evidentiary value in knowing exactly where those witnesses were and so that they could be called to testify. Bronson's pictures were clear enough to be printed in the Dallas *Morning News* more than a dozen years later.

Of Bronson's movies, Newsom wrote, "These films failed to show the building from which the shots were fired."

My friends Gary Mack and Earl Golz, both then of the media, looked Bronson up and saw his stills and movies. They found that not only did the movies show that very building- they have 87 individual frames of that very supposed sniper's window very shortly before the shooting.

While I do not here go into all the importance of the evidence in Bronson's movie, I do note that the film and still of the President the moment of his assassination were to the FBI of "no value." What, then, can be of value? (89-43-493, 89-43-518)

Returning to that Dallas rehash, under the names of all the Doyles and Martins it does state, Dallas having its own ass to cover, that "two individuals" were seen in that demonstration. It reminds headquarters that the Doyle film was sent to it. It concludes, "The Dallas office had never had this film."

It then rehashed the files it sent headquarters on the TV news footage. It is clear in saying that Oswald had two assisting him, the second never identified. It even includes the New Orleans incorrect

identification of two occupants of the ITM building as those helping Oswald distribute the handbills. In the course of its rehash it gives William as DeBruey's first name when it is Warren. Nobody picked that up inside the FBI. And it concludes, having picked that cute one up from Lish Whitson, that it is sending copies to the other offices involved because "they have also been asked to furnish the Bureau pertinent information concerning HAROLD WEISBERG's allegations."

With this diligent effort to respond to a request by a citizen for information to which the law says all citizens have a right unless that information is within one of the specific exemptions of that law, the FBI replied to the deputy attorney general in Hoover's name with the letter bearing the initials of an agent then in the general investigative division. From the initials on the first page of this file copy from the main JFK assassination file that has no serial number on it, it was first approved by much of the FBI's top brass, those that are clear are the man next to Hoover and his closest friend, Clyde Tolson, and the heads of the domestic intelligence and general investigative divisions, William C. Sullivan and Alex Rosen, respectively.

All this for a simple request for information that is not secret and is not within any exemption of the Act and for which not even a claim to any exemption is made in this response that is a nonresponse to that simple, lawful request, properly made of the deputy attorney general of the United States.

Can it possibly be that such a simple request, for nonsecret information, really was important enough with all the heavy responsibilities the FBI bears for it to have taken all this time of so many people, including those with the greater responsibilities within the FBI?

Hoover has to know of a simple request for information?

His sidekick and closest aide and message and communications filterer Clyde Tolson's time was requested?

That of at least two heads of the FBI's busier divisions?

And Hoover, too?

All this involved in a simple request for nonsecret information?

This makes sense only if much more is involved. It cannot be the request itself. Of the other possibilities what seems to be most reasonable, if anything involving the FBI in the disclosure of JFK assassination information is reasonable, is the content of the information I requested.

The FBI saw to it that I would get nothing.

Law or no law, the FBI is a law unto itself.

By imagine the director of the busy FBI involved in a simple request under the law for a copy of an amateur film the FBI itself said had "no value!" No value yet worth all that high-level time in the FBI?

All this was prelude to responding to the deputy attorney general. In that response, six of the nine copies of which were directed to the two assistant directors, Sullivan and Rosen, and to four special agents, one of whom was an FBI inspector and another seems to have been the one who wrote this for Hoover to send, Hoover told him to tell me where to go.

The copy disclosed to me is from 62-109060, the main assassination file. Atypically it is not stamped as a Not Recorded copy, which it is, and had no serial number given to it. The "original filed in" number on the side is illegible, made more so in the xeroxing. It can be taken to be what was the FBI practice in those days, directions to file my FOIA requests in its "subversive" file it had on me.

True. It had me filed as a "subversive" and it filed my FOIA requests as subversive.

For years.

Without telling the deputy attorney general that the FBI had a copy of the Doyle film, this Hoover letter says of it that it "was not furnished to the Commission because the arrest had been

completely documented ..." By the standard of this non-sequitur, the FBI would not have most of the pictures it has and would not have taken most of the pictures it ever took.

Moreover, my request had nothing to do with "documenting" the arrest of Oswald.

It had to do with unknown persons with Oswald and in the films that were the subject of my requests.

What the FBI saw to it was not "completely documented." In fact, not documented at all.

Thus with regard to the Doyle film it told the deputy, "It is suggested that Mr. Weisberg obtain prints of the Doyle film from Mr. J. Pat Doyle. ..."

The law of the land required the FBI to provide a copy to me, all those involved in the FBI knew and so did the deputy.

With regard to the Martin film the FBI told the deputy that its New Orleans office had reviewed the film and it "was found to contain nothing of value in the investigation."

Under the law that all involved knew and understood very well, what I wanted the film for has nothing to do with what the FBI regards as "of value." Again without telling the deputy whether or not it had a copy, it said, "It would appear that Weisberg should contact Martin ..."

In the course of this it inserted a red flag very quietly, "No mention of Martin was made in reports to the Commission." So, the deputy knew that the FBI had kept it a secret from the Commission that Martin had taken movies of the subject of the Commission's investigation and was also a witness it might want to question.

As my request is referred to, and the deputy had it, the FBI says I had also requested, "All reports on, of or about and interviews with James Powell, Army intelligence, who took a picture or pictures in Dealey Plaza ..." and copies of them.

What the FBI did not tell the deputy is that after taking at least one picture, Powell, with his camera, then entered the TSBD where, like all others in it, he was kept inside it by the police for about two hours. During that time he had the run of the place and his camera to use. That is why I asked for all the reports and copies of interviews and referred to his picture as possibly in the plural. None of this did the FBI address. It did interview him and it did not give me any copies of that interview or of anything else.

"It would appear Mr. Weisberg should contact Mr. Powell ..."

Not under the law. Under the law I was to do what I did, "contact" the deputy. And under the law he gets what is requested from the department component and decides whether it is under any exemption, the sole basis for not providing it.

And so what Powell saw, spoke or wrote reports about- he was an intelligence agent- and any pictures he took of the building search still remain a secret except for one exterior picture sent me years later.

And if there was to be a referral, that under the law should have been to the Army, not to any individual.

For the commercial TV footage, which I had already examined at the stations and was provided with a copy of one, it tells the deputy to tell me to go to the stations. And thus any notes, comments or observations, if any, by the FBI, were withheld along with prints.

For its own file copies the FBI added a note that is about a quarter of the length of what it prepared for Hoover to send the deputy. Probably the note was to influence those higher up as well as to make a cover-the-ass record of why they were violating the law. As usual it begins with my writing allegedly being critical of virtually all the government, says it "contains inaccuracies, falsehoods, and

deliberate slanting of the facts" which in not a single instance did the FBI even try to prove in the many thousands of pages I have, and then it says I was fired with nine others by the State Department "because of a suspicion of being a Communist." If the FBI knew that, it is not in any State Department record I got under the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts nor did State or anyone else ever say or write me that. The truth, as the FBI knew very well, is what I say in The State of State chapter above. But Hoover and his honchos needed nothing more for them to agree with what was proposed in the draft of the letter.

Then it says, "A check of Portland, Minneapolis, Dallas and New Orleans records was necessary to be certain we can give the Department complete information on Weisberg's question, which related to possible cropping or editing of film by the FBI."

About which there is not a word more here or, as we have seen, in what was sent to the department.

The FBI does not even deny to itself, for its own records, that it eliminated any of the movie footage!

While this may not in itself be proof that the FBI did that, if it was to give the department "complete information" about it and did not do that does suggest it did remove parts of those films.

The underlings did not even tell the top dogs they did no such thing.

How many reasons other than that the FBI did eliminate some of the film can there be for its not saying a word to even suggest that it did not other than that it did? All the checking referred to above was, in the FBI's own words, for this particular purpose to provide "complete information on Weisberg's question, which related to possible cropping or editing of film by the FBI."

And then it goes to all that trouble only not to say a word?

With all those top people involved in a simple response to an ordinary FOIA request, can that be for no reason at all or because none of them had anything better to do?

Or can it be that they are telling Hoover and several of his closer assistants and the deputy attorney general, this is something about which we have to be very careful, giving them to understand without making a record of it that there is a reason for violating the law and not letting me have what the law says we are all entitled to have? Like proof that they did toy with the film?

These people are neither dopes nor idiots. They know what to say, how to be responsive, and how it will be taken when they go to all this trouble not to be responsive.

It makes those on the top witting without a record reflecting that they were made witting.

So, if we cannot be certain, there is at the least a solid reason for suspecting that the FBI did doctor the films and did eliminate pictures of the other man with Oswald. One or more men.

More reason than this, too.

This is what the FBI's records show. It is worse. They lied and when later I appealed and spelled the FBI's deliberate lying out, it made no denial. It just ignored that, knowing full well that it could get away with almost anything at all, especially if it could embarrass the government over the JFK assassination.

When I was able to sue the FBI under FOIA and my lawsuits included headquarters, Dallas and New Orleans records and this information and film I had sought many years earlier that the FBI "hawkshaws" told top leaders and the deputy attorney general so little about, I filed this appeal with the Department's appeals office:

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg re JFK records, PA appeals 5/28/79  
"Doyle, Martin, WDSU-TV, WWL-TV film; Mary Moorman pictures;  
Oswald associates- "Third Man"

My FOIA requests- records of not provided; appeals not acted on: Warren Commission testimony and other records, FBI commentaries, analyses withheld

In prior appeals I have appealed continued withholdings of copies of the captioned photographs and records relating to them and the photographers. To now the FBI has refused to provide copies of any of the photographs and began by refusing to make the appointment it requires for any examination of any copies in its public reading room.

Subsequently I have made for you copies of 105-82555 Serials 5655-9 inclusive. They are attached hereto. At this point in the files it appears that the request and DJ-118 form are not attached although I believe they have been disclosed. No response is attached at this point either.

Reference to these requests as being of 12/15/70 is not accurate. Almost three years ago I prepared a list of my ignored requests for use in C.A. 75-1996, when I testified to them (without rebuttal) and gave a copy to the Department. A year or more ago I provided a copy to your office when I was told the FBI could not provide copies of my FOIA/PA requests. The first listing for 1969 follows:

January 1, FBI photos, reports filed, not given to Warren Commission, taken by Moorman, Powell, Doyle and Martin. Number of repetitions of this request. They include WDSU and WWL news films. No compliance.

Although the attached records make no reference to the Moorman pictures and the FBI and Secret Service went through elaborate rituals of returning them to her and then fetching them again for the Commission, the actuality is that the Dallas office made and kept copies and kept the fact secret.(I have had no compliance with this request.)

As the incomplete list of requests states, to then there had been no compliance with the matters referred to in the attached records. There since has been no compliance.

It is faithful to my experiences with the FBI and my reading of many records for FBIHQ to have represented FOIA requests as "allegations." (5655)

It is faithful to the FBI's dedication to Orwellian practice for it to indicate to the field offices that they are not to inform it whether they have copies of the photos, which I did request.

Serial 5658 reflects the inconsistency, arbitrariness, and capriciousness of the withholding of the Pan American Films names, an earlier appeal that has not been acted upon. The names are not withheld from this record, which was processed by the same FOIA unit only much earlier.

(It is not unusual in both so-called historical cases for this FOIA Unit to withhold in records processed later what it had already disclosed. This relates to specifics and generics both.)

Page 2 of 5658 refers to the WDSU photographer Johann Rush having provided copies of six different frames of his 16mm movie film. Here the representation is of "OSWALD and a person later identified as CHARLES HALL STEELE, JR." The representation is of knowing untruthfulness, as other attachments show and as I informed you earlier.

As I also informed you, Secret Service records place the number of individual photographs provided by Rush as 17. The FBI gave the Warren Commission only two.

The initials of case Supervisor Robert P. Gemberling appear on 5659. It begins with complete fidelity to the infidelity of description by both Portland and Minneapolis as quoted above. It then provides an entirely different file number for the Portland records, 89-21. There is no explanation of how Dallas could have had this number if it had only the indicated records which bear the Portland number 44-225 only. Or, it appears that other records exist and other files should be searched.

The Doyle and Martin films are of an incident of exactly a week before those of the TV stations. In all official accounts Oswald was entirely alone when on 8/9/63 he was distributing FPCC literature of his own creation. However, Gemberling slipped up a bit in his description of the allegedly worthless Doyle film: "... motion pictures of two individuals on 8/9/63 on Canal Street, New Orleans, carrying signs bearing pro-Castro inscriptions with leaflets in their hands." (Emphasis added.)

To the best of my recollection any and all other references to an Oswald associate on that date was memory-holed from all other FBI reporting and all records provided, regardless of the sources of the records and most importantly from any Warren Commission records I saw at the Archives.

My own inquiries in New Orleans leave no doubt that Oswald has other associates in his literature operations. My sources include FBI sources. I have and have read the FBI's reflections of its interviews with those I also interviewed. The FBI's versions do not include what I was told, which is to say than among their omissions is the foregoing about another person with Oswald on 8/9/63.

(In this connection I remind you that you have not acted on my appeal relating to the fingerprint not that of Oswald on a leaflet obtained by the New Orleans police on the occasion of an earlier Oswald literature operation, at the dock where the carrier Wasp was moored, Dumaine Street. If you consult the same list I provided you will find that on the 1/1/69 date of my request above I also made an FOIA request relating to this. I have appealed and re-appealed that denial. The information remains withheld as to today.)

On page 3 of 5659 there is reference to "a third white male" in what Steele allegedly told the FBI. I happen to have interviewed him as well as Jesse Core, mentioned above on this page. It was not merely an unidentified other man, it was another Oswald accomplice. These two are not the only ones who reported this to me and I am sure to the FBI, which managed not to report it. Core was a regular FBI source and he identified the other supposedly unknown men in the picture the FBI used. There are still other such references but an important one (page 4) states what the FBI's pictures do not show either of the two named men doing, "passing out handbills." The covering up of this in the next paragraph states that the other two of these three are the two named above in the report, EHARA and ALICE, both of whom had offices in the building involved. They were not leafletting. They were observing it.

As I informed you earlier, the WDSU films were three separate films when given to the FBI. The bottom of this page identifies each of these separately and does not even indicate that when the FBI received them, which it also does not state, they had been spliced together. Rather than stating that WDSU loaned the FBI the film for copying the top of the next pages says that Pan American "made available a duplicate copy" of all three in one. Pan American did not have WDSU's film, WDSU did.

These records raise questions about the Dallas index. Does it have a section on photographs? Is there a separate filing of them of which I have not provided with copies, what I would assume to be a norm? Or a list or inventory? Neither is provided.

My requests include copies of the photographs. These records do not say the FBI does or does not have copies. I have not received any copies.

Six Rush stills are mentioned repeatedly, I have not been given copies of them or of the enlargements. This raises additional questions: did the FBI fail to give the Presidential Commission full-frame copies of the two photographs it did provide? The enlargements referred to appear to be of parts of those frames only.

The top one of the attached pages shows other distribution. Those of most interest to me are to W.C. Sullivan and Alex Rosen. Their Domestic Intelligence and General Investigative Divisions represent two of the many sources of information within my requests that have never been searched despite my many requests.

In this connection I remind you of the history of the Long tickler, a separate record that did not exist anywhere else in the FBI so far as is known and was in one of the places I asked to be searched back in 1976.

FBIHQ did not tell the field offices "Here is an FOIA request for photographs. Please send copies if you have them along with the other related information requested." That would have been easy, direct and could have led to prompt compliance. Instead there was the elaborate

means of telling the field offices not to let FBIHQ know it they had copies. There is no record reflecting whether or not FBIHQ had copies of the pictures and other information requested. Instead there is the also elaborate repetition of the earlier inaccurate information by which photographic proof that Oswald had accomplices in New Orleans is avoided. Their photographs also are withheld. There is no record showing what FBIHQ did with the picture it received. (Generally the Lab was included in routings and for examination of photographs.) There is no DI or GID record.

This is that appeal in full. It is five pages of detailed explanations, questions and documentation of the FBI's misrepresentations, distortions and evasion in its non-response to me. It is a fair illustration of how the FBI frustrates the intent of the law. True to Orwell, it seeks to control our history by denying the people information about it they are by law entitled to have.

Except for making a record it was a waste of time. The FBI knew very well that there was almost nothing it could not get away with. It also did not like the appeals officer, Quin Shea. He was an honest man who sought to have the Department live within the law. So, it had him kicked upstairs to a supposedly better job he soon quit and it had him replaced with some young right-wing extremist lawyers who were no less determined than the FBI to see to it that nothing they could get away with withholding could slip through. With the Republican administrations they became fixtures. They did what those administrations wanted done.

It and they cost the government a fortune in lawyers' time and the cost of defending lawsuits that were filed only because these extremist of the right wanted to violate the law those administrations of the right opposed and wanted violated, the law that could lead to exposure of what they did not want exposed of their own misdeeds.

What I sought is what the Commission did not want to know so it ignored the leads it could not avoid having and the FBI could not avoid letting it have.

The FBI also did not want any Oswald associate identified and it went to some trouble to see

that it did not happen. As with the Jones Printing Company, to which it took only a picture of Oswald. And to which it did not return on learning that it was not Oswald for whom that job was done.

After forcing the Secret Service out of the picture as soon as it learned the Secret Service might learn the truth.

All of this was not a matter of any interest to Garrison, unless we assume that when Boxley lied and said that Jones had not said it was Oswald and said it was Thornley for whom he did that little job Boxley did that for Garrison, as he did very much, the most ghastly of all following in the next chapter.

The Garrison who had charged a New Orleans conspiracy to assassinate the President and then was supposedly investigating it.

If all of this was not enough to see to it that no private investigation could carry this forward, certainly not one all alone and without resources, my situation, then the JFK Assassination Industry saw to it as best it could.

The one solid lead I could try to go ahead with, that one fact to be bulldogged, was the Jones-Silver identification of Kerry Thornley as the man other than Oswald who had that handbill printed and got it. However, I believed they mistook Thornley for someone else. I knew and I'd published that Oswald had nothing to do with Thornley once smart-aleck and political idiot that he was, Thornley red-baited him. Thornley admitted that in his Commission testimony I'd reprinted earlier. So it did not make sense that Oswald would have used him, or vice versa.

In addition, I did not believe that Oswald could be made up to look like Thornley. But not being an artist or a makeup artist, I could not try to change any Thornley pictures to see if I could make him look like Oswald. I did not trust Garrison's people to have it done in New Orleans because Garrison had Thornley under indictment for perjury, and that could have led to some less than honest

way of doing it that could please Garrison.

Of those I knew who might be able to do this honestly I thought of Fred Newcomb, then a commercial artist in Sherman Oaks, part of metropolitan Los Angeles. So I asked Newcomb to see what he could do to see if Thornley's pictures could be made to look like pictures of Oswald. My intent, clearly, was to prove that was not possible, as Newcomb's work did establish, as part of eliminating Thornley as the man identified by Silver and Jones and then to start a quest for the man who so much resembled Thornley.

But Newcomb was then close to David Lifton and Lifton is, fortunately, one of a kind in all his many evils, misdirected and self-promoting and -aggrandizing genius of so many devious forms that he is.

Lifton was also friends with Thornley. They became friends when Thornley lived in the Los Angeles area, after he left New Orleans. More on this follows but at this point, there is the unanswered questions, who was Oswald associated with when the government, despite the clear contrary evidence, insisted he was entirely alone?

This question is relevant whether Oswald was or was not the assassin.

The official evidence so misrepresented and lied about does not convict Oswald. Quite the opposite, it exculpates him. So either way, his associates are clues and leads.

As soon as Lifton learned what I asked of Newcomb, he knew immediately that without any question at all there was a conspiracy between Garrison and me to frame his chum Thornley. Who from what I learned about him is a natural to be the friend of a scoundrel, an egomaniac, all-wise, all-seeing, all-knowing one like Lifton who is also, as we shall see, both a thief and a braggart as a thief. Being Thornley's soul-brother as well as friend, Lifton, needing to learn nothing, to ask no questions, knowing

and understanding all as he does and makes clear he does, launched a hue and cry about this. It became another of his innumerable inventions. Inventions explode from his fertile, uninhibited and thoroughly twisted mind. This one was that Garrison and I were conspiring to frame Thornley.

That Garrison had nothing to do with it and that I had exactly the opposite intention did not and could not have occurred to Lifton. He always knows more and better than the truth and that if pops into his mind makes it instant truth to him. In this he is like J. Edgar Hoover. Like Thornley, too.

He was not content to get it going in his own area and with other critics. When he exhausted those possibilities he spread it to where Thornley had moved and had a job that did not exceed his intellectual capabilities, pumping gas.

Lifton's irrationality, and his irrationality is the equal of his crookednesses in the evils to his credit, put an effective end to any effort to learn who it was with whom Oswald was associated in New Orleans.

Certainly Garrison, who had the authority and the capability, if not the demonstrated interest, was not going to walk into the wall of fire it would then have meant for me.

Nobody with any knowledge was going to face what it was clear would have to be faced in saying a word. Not and automatically make himself part of that conspiracy Lifton invented.

As we learn in more detail later, Lifton had a Baltimore cop working for him while working for Lifton's enemy, Baltimorean Harrison Edward Livingstone. The word is that when Lifton learned that this cop was doing illegal things for Livingstone's money, he told that cop, Richard Waybright, that if he did not do what Lifton wanted him to do, Lifton would report his illegalities to a friend he claimed to have in the office of the state attorney general.

A man who had been a friend of Lifton's and had done him considerable favors finally could

stand him no more and stopped keeping his secrets is my source. Whether or not that is how Lifton got his hooks into that thief of a cop, it is without question that they had that relationship, as we see and as I have documented in that thief-cop's own handwriting.

Many of my records have disappeared. The only person in the world with any real interest in them is Lifton. The only person having access to them and to more is that cop/thief.

It then follows, like the day follows night, that Waybright stole them and sold them to Lifton. Which is what Lifton's former friend told me and what Livingstone, for whom that cop/thief works, told me he suspected.

Some of what is missing is only copies.

The FBI kept and obtained copies of its records reflecting the extent and the success of this total fabrication by Lifton which ended that line of inquiry. They are records of Lifton's seeming campaign to help his friend Thornley, but it was all aimed at me. It was also intended at the same time to make Lifton's pretense of owning the assassination subject seem more real. He has a long history of denigrating others to make himself seem more important.

Of this we see more than enough later in what is far less than could be included but is enough to reflect him and his career in the JFK Assassination Industry from which by various and not infrequently devious means he enriched himself more than any other of whom I know or have heard.

What had actually happened is that when I had copies of the four pictures Jones and Silver had selected as the likeness of the man they dealt with on that job - and this they had done although it is not what I had asked of them, to select the pictures that most closely resembled the man they recall - there was no free typewriter in Garrison's office. I had no typewriter with me and I'd asked Ivon for the use of one. My handwriting is poor, so I did not want to write the letter to Newcomb.

Ivon took me into the typing pool and asked Lorraine LeBoeuf to please type the short memo I would dictate to her. I dictated it and left for other work. When I returned to read, sign and mail it, intending to save me time, she had mailed it unsigned, with the pictures I had left with her.

Instead of using what I had expected, a sheet of plain paper, she had used what she usually uses, a sheet of office stationery, something I had not expected because it was personal for me, not for the office.

With his rare talent for seeing what is not true as the truth, Lifton knew immediately that Garrison and I were conspiring against his friend Thornley. And were doing it this openly. Even though Garrison knew nothing about it at all, the unlikely was immediately real to Lifton.

There also is, of course, an obvious possibility, that he saw immediately the mischief he could cause by misrepresenting the whole thing, which is what he proceeded to do.

He did, without any checking at all - with his exceptional intellect and understanding he has no need to check anything - stir up quite a storm. The papers, by then not without some cause, were more than willing to publish anything that was or could be made to appear critical of Garrison.

My first knowledge that his evil was still marching on came several months later when a Tampa, Florida *Tribune* reporter Tom Raum phoned me. It was immediately clear that Raum had been fed a carefully distorted account or had made up his mind what would make him a scandalous, exciting story or more likely both. Before we finished talking it was clear that it was both, that it had been angled as fed to him and that the Lifton in him immediately perceived what emerged as Liftonian in his stories as it was in what Lifton did invent.

He did make quite a sensation in Tampa. Big stories, big play, all dishonest.

His first story, with four pictures, three of those I'd sent to Newcomb, takes up 32 column

inches on page one alone in the set of copies I have from the FBI's files (62-109060-6118). (Yes, Tampa clipped and mailed them to headquarters where they pleased many.) Not even counting the headline it was four columns wide. Inside there was an additional 10 inches.

His second story, which was given 26 and a half column inches, has a deliberately distorted headline of three decks of type three columns wide.

And it was all so sloppy it even got my name wrong.

There are such reporters and there are such papers and their readers have no way of knowing if they are reading what they have believed is a decent, responsible local newspaper or a local version of the supermarket tabloids.

All this about nothing at all and months after it got the initial Lifton touch and was no longer, by normal news standards, worth any mention at all.

Rather than report what that deliberate and intended dishonesty nothing can be done about told the people of Tampa area and anywhere else the story may have been picked up, what I wrote the editor reflects his double Liftonization of nothing but evil of intent and execution. I use the letter because there was no denial.

However, I do want to emphasize the deliberateness of Raum not phoning me until, as he said, he was already past his deadline. That means he had his mind, if that is what he used, made up and his story written before he even made a pretense of checking or asking a thing. It also means that the story and the story-line were set and that nothing at all could be done about it. It was not a breaking news story. In fact it was months old. That meant there was no less "news" or feature value to it a day, a week or a month later. But Raum waited until he was rushed and was past his deadline to phone me:

This letter is for the record, for to expect honesty or honorable intent from a reporter

like Tom Raum is to expect love from a whore.

His purpose, as well as the more open one of lawyer Arnold Levine, was propaganda. This is what you printed.

It is quite obvious that, after a lapse of more than eight months, there was no sudden urgency in his printing his "story" on November 27. He could have done what is normal with reporters of honest intent and, following normal practices, called me. However, he carefully delayed until after deadline, as he specified in his call. But then he'd have had the truth with the falsehood - or no "story," no warrant for his smear.

His second story is no less dishonest. It is a careful selection of what he could twist to serve his original dishonest reporting blended with lies. I tell you I have an accurate record of our conversation and can prove this. For example, "Weisburg (sic) did not explain why he was allowed the services of Garrison's typing pool." This is not only a lie but a deliberate one. Two paragraphs ahead, he selected that part he thought he could use.

Any reasonably bright editor reading this language from the second paragraph of the first story would know his reporter was not dispassionate:

"The possibility was confirmed to the Times today by Thornley's attorney ... " (my emphasis). Apropos of the contrivance of the lead, "Did New Orleans Dist. Atty Jim Garrison commission a set of deliberately (my emphasis) 'touched up' photographs ..." This is straightforward crookedness.

There never was any such "possibility," it could not possibly have been "confirmed," and there was no such purpose as that imputed.

This seems to make it clear that, unless you employ incompetent editors, Tom Raum wrote as the paper desired, dishonestly and as a propagandist. I'd prefer to think otherwise and to have your contrary assurance. Without it, I have to assume that his further deliberate omission of what he acknowledged to me by phone, that checking out any possibility may result in exculpation and in this case would seem to have is no less than what you expect of and accept from him. What Raum told me is that Thornley does look like Oswald, more so without any change in his appearance.

Were it not for the lamentable willingness of the allegedly free press to convert itself into an arm of government, our country would be in better shape than it is. This is more subversive of genuine freedom than in those countries where the press is known to be government controlled, for the people are deceived by the pretense of independence.

Calling a literary whore a literary whore to his face need not offend him. He knows that is the

way he makes a living. He takes offense only if it is in public. This is true also of Raum's pimp, also known as editor. Those who sell their bodies and in that spread dangerous diseases do less harm to society than those who corrupt and poison the public mind.

Which is also true of the JFK Assassination Industry.

It was no surprise when I heard not a further word from that whore of the minds Raum or his pimp of an editor.

(Years later, when I filed requests for all their information on or about me of all the then 59 FBI field offices, the Tampa office wrote that it had no records on me at all. That was a lie, not unique in FBI responses to those requests. But the fact is that under date of December 5, 1968, it sent copies of both stories to FBIHQ when they are filed in 62-109060-6118. It is from FBIHQ's main JFK assassination file that I got copies of both.)

It was, as we see in more detail later, no surprise that Lifton was capable of getting this going. This kind of intendedly hurtful and dishonest activity is typical of his career of commercializing the assassination, of his dishonest efforts to undermine the credibility of all others under conditions that effectively preclude his exposure. It is designed to make it appear that he is the pre-eminent subject expert and that he alone can be trusted when the fact is there is nobody in the Industry who can be trusted less.

I use this part of his, to use the favorite word of the FBI for those who criticize it, his "nefarious" career at this point because it meant the end of any effort to learn who Oswald's associates in New Orleans were. If Garrison had developed any last-minute interest, this also would have chilled that. And it told the FBI, with this story on file, that it need only show this story to explain away why it found no "value" in the films or in following the leads it first kept the Secret Services from developing and then

buried in its own files without any real effort to learn who Oswald's associates were.

Hoover's instant vision is that Oswald was entirely alone. Nobody in the government wanted to risk proving Hoover did not know what he was talking about.

And nobody did.

In the middle of my duplicate "subject" filing of these Raum articles from the FBI's files was its commentary on Thornley as a writer. It was written by an FBI headquarters domestic-spying expert who was within a few years to become an assistant director. On May 18, 1965 Raymond E. Long wrote his domestic intelligence division boss William C. Sullivan about the little more than a pamphlet by Thornley that was offered as a book to a public that displayed little interest in it. Thornley had not been able to do anything with his amateurish scribbling about his life and observation in the Marines titled The Idle Warriors.

Once there was Oswald's name to be exploited Thornley added the published transcript of his Commission testimony and a few other words to it and called it Oswald. The New Classics House (ugh!) in Chicago in 1965.

Of it Long wrote (105-82555-5425) that contrary to Thornley's and the Commission's representations, "in the Marines Thornley was not in frequent contact with Oswald...nor was he a close friend of Oswald."

A large part of this pamphlet-sized "book" is the reprinting of Thornley's Commission testimony. Long's conclusion is,

This book by Thornley is not a good piece of literature. The language in the book at times is raw and there does not seem to be any continuity of contents. It sells for seventy-five cents a copy in paper back form and appears to be an effort by Thornley and the publisher to

make a quick financial killing. It is doubtful if it will achieve this purpose.

Long was correct on all counts.

It is worth remembering and I therefore repeat the FBI's reflection of its own investigation, if that word can be used for its farce. SA Donald C. Steinmeyer said of his interview of Jones, twice in its single paragraph, that Jones was not absolutely certain in saying that he could not identify Oswald, "although he could not be positively sure, he said he did not think (it) was Oswald" and "he could not positively say the person ... was not Oswald but he did not think it was." SA John McCarthy's words he attributes to Silver are "she stated she could not recognize the person in the picture (of Oswald) as the person who placed the order for the handbills." (105-82555-393,394,394A,395)

At the very end of the New Orleans six-page roundup the same day of those two interviews, December 3, 1963, with a full page given to the identification of Oswald as the one who did get the phony FPCC applications and membership cards, the handbill is gives this but a single sentence: "Neither Myra Silver nor Douglas Jones, proprietor, Jone (sic) Printing Co., could identify photo of Oswald as person ordering handbills." (62-109060-1447)

From its own account of its own investigation the FBI wanted only an identification of Oswald. It made no effort to learn if there had been anyone else, for example, in doing what I did, show Silver and Jones many pictures including of some known to have had an association with Oswald in the past.

It also misrepresented what Jones and Silver told it, from what they told me: they were certain it was not Oswald.

This cannot be because the FBI had no purpose in doing it.

Its most obvious purpose was to end what Lifton perpetuated its ending of an effort to identify the man or men associated with Oswald in New Orleans, the same Oswald the FBI and the

Commission say was entirely alone.