Dear Barry.

For your memoires.

And for an inside view of what I have come to learn is the real FRI, where themajor preoccupation is generating cover-the-ass paper.

You are a lucky one - no nasty seacks about you, no fabrication under The First Law, Cover-the Bureau(s Ass.

ook at all the paperwork connected with the performance of a normal news function.

Ten of the top brass had to take time from fighting wrime for this inconsequential matter. The "External Affairs," General Intelligence and (Domestic) Intelligence Divisions had to have copies. And, of course, the Personnel Records Units, which recorded the loyalty of retired Maynor of Sylvester or both.

For the future you may want to recall that the wheels of the FEI turn with sementics as their axle grease. There is merely a technical formulation that enables the decial of the basic fact because there has to have been at least one such communication of the period and should have been more than one from the known and reported threats against JFK. I spent some time on one in two books, with faceimiles of FEI reports and the text of that particular threat, which was bugged. (Remember, the President's motorcade in Mismi 11/19/63 was cancelled and he helicoptered to the Interamerican Press convention? The FEI had no problem setting around that - it reported, analyzed and dismissed a different reported Florida threat, an irrelevancy, from Tampa. It was all Florida, wasn't it?)

I doubt there are many major crimes on which the BEI spends as much high-level and field office arises time as it did once Mark Lane and Jim Garrison started improving upon what the former clark William S. Walter said. You came into it in 1975. It was then a rehash of 1968.

This is one of several such flaps that the FKI believed tarnished its image so it went to great and ridiculous lengths to polish with paper never intended for distribution or critical examination.

It never considers simple, straightforward truthfulness even when in normal concepts that would be better for the FRI. Its paramoidal view, now computerised and automatic after years of Hoover and under those of his selection, is that it must protect itself from a vengeful everybody class in the world. In this case it apparently fearedbeing charged with negligence even though there was no connection between any of the known threats and the actual orims.

Too bed you didn't think of phoning me. I had an entire chapter than hadto be edited out of one of my books on other known threats of the period.

The other large post-Warren period flap was over the Oswald visit to the Dallas Field Office and his leaving an unscaled note for since retired SA James Patrick Hosty, Jr. In that case also everyone in the press and the Congress (which was comed over both flaps) forgot Occam and simple approaches. It was known at FEHEQ as well as throughout the field office contemporaneously and FEHEQ decided on milence, to sit on it. You'd never know it from the records of the intensive FEHEQ investigation for there is no mention of this in all that appear paper.

I've made separate files of duplicate copies if you ever known of a graduate student looking for a good thesis.

Best wishes

Harold Weisberg

emorandum

SUBJECT:

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY 11/22/63 DALLAS, TEXAS

- Mr. Callahan

- Mr. Adams - Mr. Jenkins

- Mr. Gallagher - Mr. O'Connell

- Mr. Cooke

- Mr. Nettles

- Mr. Moore

- Mr. Wannall

At 11:50 a.m., 9/30/75, SAC Sylvester, New Orleans Division, telephonically advised that former New Orleans SAC Maynor had just advised him that at 6:25 p.m., on 9/29/75, he received a telephone call from a person identifying himself as Barry (Suffman (phonetic) of the "Washington Post." Suffman asked him if he had been the Special Agent in Charge of the New Orleans FBI Office at the time of the assassination of President Kennedy. He said he was running down some information obtained from former FBI Clerk William S. Walter about a teletype that was allegedly sent to Field Offices from FBIHQ on 11/17/63, advising that an attempt would be made to assassinate President Kennedy on his trip to Dallas, Texas

Maynor advised Suffman that he could not confirm the existence of such a teletype because there never was such a teletype. Suffman then asked him what he had told Walter to do upon receipt of the teletype. Maynor told him that he had not given any instructions to Walter because such a teletype was never received. Suffman said that he had information that a news release was being made today about this alleged teletype in Houston, Texas.

Suffman then asked him about receipt of a teletype after the assassination in which FBIHQ instructed the Field to examine interview reports to be sure nothing conflicted in them regarding dates and information. Maynor told him he had no information regarding such instructions, that he had no further comments to make and asked him if he had contacted FBIHQ regarding this matter. Suffman said no.

For information.

WEN:sls

PERS. REC. UNI