

2537 Regent St., Apt. 202
Berkeley, Calif. 94704
November 14, 1968

Mr. James T. Devine
Assistant to the Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20530

Dear Mr. Devine:

Thank you very much for your letter of November 8, 1968, responding to my previous inquiries about a certain copy of the pamphlet "The Crime Against Cuba."

You advised in your letter of September 11 that "the record copies in this Department are identical to those submitted to the Warren Commission." In my letter of September 13, I pointed out that some of those copies bear a certain rubber-stamped address, and some do not. I asked specifically what impression, if any, appears in the Quigley copy. I further asked whether your previously quoted statement was intended to mean that the Quigley copy was transmitted to the Commission. You wrote in your latest letter that "the Quigley document is identical to the 11 copies transmitted to the Warren Commission which contain the rubber stamped impression: FPCC / 544 Camp St. / New Orleans, La."

In the context of our correspondence, I see no reason not to believe that you meant that the Quigley copy bears that address. In my study of Warren Commission records, however, I have observed that, especially in correspondence with other Federal agencies, apparently minor semantic ambiguities may well have substantive significance. Taking your latest letter by itself, it is possible to interpret "the Quigley document" as meaning the printed pamphlet, before any marks were added. One might point out that the Quigley copy most probably differs from the others in that it bears certain identifying marks, such as Mr. Quigley's initials. (You made such a distinction in your letter of September 8.) To clear up any possible confusion, I would appreciate a completely unambiguous statement from you, saying, for example, that "the copy of the pamphlet 'The Crime Against Cuba' which was obtained by FBI agent John L. Quigley from Lee Harvey Oswald on or about August 10, 1963, does (or does not) bear, on page 39, the rubber-stamped impression 'FPCC / 544 Camp St. / New Orleans, La.'"

I assure you that I take no pleasure in extending this already lengthy correspondence. However, since I consider this a matter of some importance, I do hope to have your reply in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Paul L. Hoch

Paul L. Hoch



OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

November 8, 1968

Mr. Paul L. Hoch
2537 Regent Street, Apt. 202
Berkeley, California 94704

Dear Mr. Hoch:

In reply to the questions contained in your letter of September 13, 1968, the following information is set forth.

Question 1: Your assumption is correct. Our position is based on the applicable section of 5 U.S.C. 552, and upon the fact that the document is available at Archives.

Question 2: The Quigley document is identical to the 11 copies transmitted to the Warren Commission which contain the rubber stamped impression: FPCC
544 Camp St.
New Orleans, La.

Question 3: See the response to Question 2.

Sincerely,

James T. Devine
James T. Devine

2537 Regent St., Apt. 202
Berkeley, Calif. 94704
September 13, 1968

Mr. James T. Devine
Assistant to the Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Devine:

Thank you very much for your letter of September 11, 1968, concerning my previous request for access to a certain copy of the pamphlet "The Crime Against Cuba."

I believe that your examination of the record copies of this pamphlet in the files of your department has provided you with all the information I am interested in. However, I must ask for clarification of three relatively minor points in your letter:

1) You indicated that the pamphlet obtained by SA John L. Quigley from Lee Harvey Oswald on or about August 10, 1963, or a copy thereof, is presently in the files of the Department of Justice. Am I correct in assuming that your position is that, since it is in the "investigative files," it is exempt from public disclosure under the provisions of § U.S.C. 552(b)?

2) You wrote that the Quigley copy of the pamphlet bears no markings (other than those needed for filing purposes) by which it can be distinguished from copies transmitted to the Warren Commission. However, some of the copies submitted to the Warren Commission by the Federal Bureau of Investigation can be distinguished from others. Specifically, of the twenty copies of the pamphlet which form FBI Exhibits 99 and 303, nine copies have nothing added to page 39 and the other eleven bear the following rubber-stamped impression:

F P C C
544 CAMP ST.
NEW ORLEANS, LA.

I am confident that your letter was not meant to be evasive on this point. Since this is of some interest to me, I am specifically asking you to advise me exactly what stamped impression, if any, appears on page 39 (or on any other page) of the copy of the pamphlet obtained by SA Quigley. (Of course, a copy of the relevant page, with certification, as I originally requested, would be just as satisfactory.)

3) Your letter states that "the record copies in this Department are identical to those submitted to the Warren Commission." Was this intended to mean that the Quigley pamphlet, or a copy thereof, was in fact transmitted to the Warren Commission?

Thank you again for your assistance. I hope to hear from you, at least on point (2), quite soon.

Sincerely yours,

Paul L. Hoch
Paul L. Hoch



OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
WASHINGTON, D.C.

September 11, 1968

Mr. Paul L. Hoch
2537 Regent Street, Apt. 202
Berkeley, California 94704

Dear Mr. Hoch:

Your letter of August 9, 1968, to the Deputy Attorney General in which you refer to your previous request for access to a certain copy of the pamphlet "The Crime Against Cuba" has been referred to this office for consideration and reply.

In order to clarify this situation I have examined the record copies of the pamphlet in question maintained in the investigative files of this Department. The pamphlets including the original copy received by Special Agent John L. Quigley, have no markings or other indicia, other than are necessary for filing purposes, by which one copy of the pamphlet can be distinguished from another. The record copies in this Department are identical to those submitted to the Warren Commission.

I trust this will clear up the confusion.

Sincerely,

James T. Devine
Assistant to the
Deputy Attorney General