

Dear Bill,

9/3/95

There is nothing new in the USA today story of 8/30 saying that a former FBISA said that Oswald was an FBI informer other than attributing it to an affidavit by Gary Carver Gayton. I had that, with Gayton as the source, in the late 1960s, but Gayton would not talk to me, dealt with me so to speak through an intermediary, and that made me uneasy and then the intermediary lost patience with me.

Just before the story appeared someone raised that matter with me by phone. Perhaps it was Gary Aguilar. I then remembered the name of the man I refer to as the intermediary and I have what I have filed under his name. His name was Jim and I think his last name began with a P. If so I could find this by going through the P parts of the files but believe it is not worth the time.

As I remember it Jim's landlord was Gayton, in Seattle or Portland, in that area.

I am not certain but have the impression Gayton may be black.

Part of the story is that Gayton worked with Hosty, I think in Kansas City. I have trouble believing Hosty would have said to anyone what in this account he alleged said to Gayton. I also have trouble, if I remember the story correctly, believing that Hosty would have left notes for Oswald at the Beckley rooming house. As I now recall it, two times.

At first Jim referred to Gayton as "C" only then as Carver.

After a while Jim moved to New Orleans and I heard from him from there. That was at the time of Garrison activity.

On a hunch I checked and I have a Carver Gayton file. In it is a 1972 memo to friends both now dead, the man an AP reporter, saying all that this story says and why it dead-ended with me. It has the Gayton address in Seattle and the man's name was Jim Gichenauer. I'm not checking my Gichenauer file. Most is in it. Not worth it.

This story quotes Newman in a way that again makes me wonder what function he had in Army intelligence, wonder whether he was an academic teacher and little or no more, because he knows nothing about what PSI means to the FBI. He is quoted as saying it "suggests Oswald was a 'low-level' informant for the bureau." It suggests nothing of the sort. The story refers to the initials meaning "potential." Over the years I've forgotten but it means probationary and I think that is the word represented by the letter. In fact when one is a PSI one is an informer but on probation, usually lasting about six months. All FBI informers begin with this probation, regardless of the value of the information they deliver.

Buck Revill is quoted as dissembling and misleading the report by his use of FBI lingo and semantics. He knew very well that if Oswald had been a PSI there would be Dallas records and HQ records in files with the 134 classification. HQ approval is required for using anyone as a probationary informer and for full status after probation. Thus, too, there are undisclosed Ruby 137 files. The FBI refused to give them to me.

2  
in GAs 78-0322/0420 combined where they were relevant.

In practise had this been true Oswald would have been known as DL????PSI and if he had passed his probation he would have been known as DL????SI. Same file. There would also be in Dallas if procedures were followed a contact report, a printed form, filled out for every contact with Oswald and for Ruby, with an evaluation of the information gotten on each contact and if documents or other things were produced they would be in an evidence envelope that as I recall as FBI form <sup>FD</sup> 340.

Because Oswald was quoted by Delgado as saying his favorite book was The Animal Farm I had difficulty believing he would be an informer but on the other side he was so virulently anti-Communist I could believe he might be willing to be that kind of an informer. I suppose that is why I spent some much time on the phone with Cochenaur and in correspondence with him.

In passing, my copy of my memo of 1972 to Jim and Jennifer White is a carbon copy. My typing then was good enough and all my file copies of that era are carbon copies.

There is one other thing that probably influences me then because it impressed me from the outset. Oswald's <sup>cl</sup>amness on being arrested and charged and suggest to me that he did expect someone to come forward and make it clear that he was not the killer or the assassin, that someone with some authority would do that. Thus the lead and summary of the first thing I wrote on the assassination, at the time of the assassination, sent to the literary agent I then had, began, "Lee Harvey Oswald could not have been persona non grata to the FBI." That actually cost me my agent.

With this story saying that Clayton denies he ever said such a thing or that Hosty said it I do not agree with Newman's "very powerful evidence" that the ARRB should follow but I do believe it should make an effort. I put it this way because the FBI will not allow it into its files rooms and because without access to them whether it destroyed records cannot be determined. For example, there is not a single mention of the note that without question Oswald left for Hosty in any Dallas or HQ record that is disclosed yet without question there were communications between Dallas and HQ on that and in fact it was HQ that directed Shankling to destroy that note after Oswald was killed and there would be no trial. I have proof of what I say in an FBIHQ tickler.

The documents Newman is quoted as saying Clinton should order released do not seem to refer to this from what the board has stated in its releases.

est,

Harold



# JFK paper links FBI to Oswald

By Sam Vincent Meddis  
USA TODAY

A newly uncovered JFK assassination document is reviving questions about a possible connection between Lee Harvey Oswald and the FBI.

The 1976 affidavit to the Senate by former FBI agent Carver Gayton suggests the bureau used Oswald as an informant prior to the John F. Kennedy assassination, says author John Newman.

"This thing has been kept under wraps for 20 years," says Newman, who says he discovered the affidavit at the National Archives while doing research for his new book *Oswald and the CIA*.

The FBI, as far back as J. Edgar Hoover's tenure as director, has steadfastly denied Oswald ever worked for the bureau. FBI spokesman Mike Kortzen Tuesday declined comment on Newman's claims.

Meanwhile, a 30-day deadline expires today for President Clinton to decide whether to allow the release of additional JFK documents.

The federal government's Assassination Records Review Board voted last month to unveil 15 still-sealed documents, but the FBI appealed to Clinton to block the release.

The White House said Tuesday Clinton will allow negotiations between the FBI and the review board to continue before making a decision.

Authorities say the contested documents do not involve the Gayton affidavit, although disclosure of FBI informants is a central issue.

In his sworn affidavit, Gayton says he was told about a year after the assassination by then-FBI agent James Hosty that Oswald "had been a PSI" (potential security informant) for the FBI.


Authorities say Gayton, who couldn't be reached for comment Tuesday, later denied that Hosty made the remark.



NOVEMBER 22, 1963. More than three decades after the killing of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas, speculation rages over his death. Among the theories: involvement of the CIA, the Mafia, Fidel Castro or the Kremlin.



**NEW FIND:** Author John Newman details his assertions in a new book



Hosty, who is writing his own book on the JFK case, denies ever making that statement to Gayton.

And the former Dallas FBI agent who monitored Oswald's activities declined to explain, except to say that the matter will be explored in his book. Oliver "Buck" Revell, the FBI's former criminal in-

vestigations chief, says the PSI designation does not necessarily mean Oswald became an informant.

It merely suggests that the FBI had an interest in possibly turning him into one because of his Marxist connections, Revell says.

"I've seen nothing indicating he had any sort of informant status," he says.

But Newman, a former career U.S. intelligence analyst, says the PSI designation suggests Oswald was a "low-level" informant for the bureau.

Like a lot of things about the JFK assassination, the affidavit is fresh fodder for conspiracy theorists.

More than three decades after the killing, speculation still swirls — with allegations of involvement that include the CIA, the Mafia, Fidel Castro and the Kremlin. The Gayton affidavit sheds no new light on whether Oswald was part of any hit team or a fall guy for a larger assassination plot.

Nor does it show an FBI cover-up.

But it provides "very powerful evidence" that the review board should further probe the FBI relationship with Oswald, and that Clinton should order release of the additional documents, Newman says.



With regard to the rest of your 8/30, Lil is feeling better and is eating a bit better but is still weaker and a bit more unsteady on her feet. And more tired.

I'd put it that while the Simpson case is about to be wrapped up it is far from ready for that by any concept of real justice. There is the pressure from the jury that has been so abused by such long sequestration that is pressure on the judge who mismanaged the case so much in its earlier days to have a jury and there is the pressure on the defense to get the case to this jury before <sup>it takes</sup> ~~it takes~~ more jurors but there is no pressure at all on the prosecution which knows this jury will not convict.

You raise not all the questions <sup>by</sup> enough of them for the truth to be clear.

I believe that in time there will be a great number of instances of serious prosecutorial misconduct that come to be known. One ~~the~~ question is how much of that will <sup>be</sup> to keep out of the record. Another is what the defense has learned or can learn and what opportunity there will be for getting it before the jury. You may remember that at the outset I told the AP that given the complaints in LA I could tick off, off the top of the hat, parallels in the JFK and King cases. Especially on the evidence. I think I sent you a copy of my letter to Cochran that the defense has ignored, about the condition of the foliage where Simpson is said to have fallen in going over it and of the three <sup>loud</sup> ~~hand~~ knocks coming from a single fall. The timing of those knocks coinciding with when Fuhrman was actually there rather than when he testified he was there. And it is not only Fuhrman of the police.

Fuhrman could have gotten a search warrant by phone or radio and made no such effort or <sup>made</sup> any such report by radio saying he was entering from fear there would be another victim, something like his bullshit explanation of illegally searching.

And the delay in getting the <sup>o</sup> corner there is incredible.

If the jury does last and if it does not convict, absent an acquittal I can see Cochran arguing that he cannot be tried again because of the abuses by the "people", which does not really represent the people and does include the police.

I ~~can~~ can also believe that Cochran will file suit for false arrest in an effort to recover costs that are in the millions I am sure. Even over the faking of evidence, which was done. And the leak of the alleged results of the DNA on the stockings about which Ito was so prejudiced was to prejudice all possible jurors and could have come from the police or prosecution only, nobody else even knowing that the stockings were sent for such testing. But the pictures show he did not even sit on the bed to take them off and no blood from the shoes, which would have been inevitable, anywhere.

There is an enormous amount and there certainly will be books on this and I do expect what I'm surprised there has not been, public outcry over such things as Ito's outrageous ruling on the Fuhrman tapes, especially where the defense has alleged he faked evidence and <sup>the</sup> prosecution stupidly presented what turned out to be proof, that the glove is too small for him. Best,

Harold