

Department of History

MU Marquette
University

Charles L. Coughlin Hall
Milwaukee, WI 53233
(414) 224-7217, 224-7385

August 27, 1984

Dear Harold:

I have received your letters of July 29, 1984 and August 23, 1984--no problem at all with the delay.

I think I shall pass at present on the Hoover in the New Deal days. I already have much material on his activities then, supplemented by additional documents of the 1940s from the O&C File.

I am interested in the Jim Bishop material and the two specific examples of "The Director Is Always Right" re the Warren Commission testimony and the follow-up re your discovery on the absence of trees (by the way you did not send me copies of this). Why not send on the whole 150 pages on the Warren Commission testimony--it might make sense to highlight this episode and I might find it better to quote extensively.

Re your separate file on "Hoover's Notes." At this point, my preference is that you be selective. I suspect that the examples come from the King assassination records exclusively and, in the final analysis, this is only part of the larger story of the biography. Clearly it will not be possible to go into detail re Hoover's responses to all the investigations he took an interest in and thus followed closely--and, furthermore, I could not afford either the time or the cost to do so.

I await these submissions. There is no particular hurry--any time this fall is acceptable. Again, let me remind you to send along an itemized bill (whether in the form of a letter--if so, write a separate letter--or formal bill). I can promise you payment within 10 days after receipt of your bill (it does take some time to process matters through the University's Comptroller's Office, which has administrative responsibility over my various grants).

As ever,



Athan Theoharis

Dear Athan,

8/1/84

I've gone over the extra copies of JFK assassination records I have in the subject file under "Hoover's Notes" and I've made copies of some that seem to be of possible use to you. Actually, my wife is making the copies now and when she has completed the copying, when I'm able to, I'll go over them and where explanation appears to be indicated I'll provide it.

For years I've wondered whether the aging Hoover was incredibly Byzantine or was being kept in the dark by his associates. The entire FBI is so addicted to the self-serving! I am inclined to believe, however, that with regard to the leaking, relating to which copies will be enclosed, DeLoach and some others kept it secret from him. The leaking was by them. The report involved is the first sections of a two-part report ordered by LBJ before he appointed the Warren Commission. The first part is of five fancy volumes. As Katzenbach told the Commission in its executive session of 12/5/63, while the FBI denied the leaking it could not have been by anyone else. You'll see also that those who did the leaking kept trying to blame it on Bobby Kennedy's staff. As of the time of the first of these leaked stories, there is no record of which I know indicating that a single copy was out of the FBI's hands.

In this regard I also enclose a page from Liddy's Will with his comment on the Nichols/DeLoach operation.

I'll go over the King subject file for his notes when I can. Then other files.

62-109060-1493 reflects his bluntness, actually in this instance understated, Ambassador Mann was that wild and irresponsible. He'd have launched World War III. This is the FBIHQ main JFK assassination file.

NR of 11/29/63, Hoover says he was in accord with JFK on establishing the Warren Commission. In fact he resented that bitterly, as a transgression on his function and for other reasons.

Stapled together, relating to the leaks: the Report was then still in FBI hands and it was not until several days more elapsed that any copy was given to the Commission.

62-109090-73: Dord was a DeLoach informer on the Commission, disclosed by other records of which I have a separate but still incomplete file. Here Hoover proposes cuing Ford in on coming developments. This is the FBIHQ main "Liaison with the Warren Commission" file.

62-109060-2405, Hoover self-portrayed as "Sherlock Holmes," a la Mann above. What he refers to as "poppycock" was a simple, basic, necessary and performed reconstruction essential, among other things, to the timing of the assassination.

62-109090 NR 2/3/64, the note was reconstructed and added by FBI FOIA and is more of Hoover's Sherlockery. This memo does not state that the notes were in Oswald's pockets "at time of arrest" and they weren't. They were the numbers he got from information after arrest and when permitted to use the phone. Yet despite writing this he maintained there was no conspiracy of any kind.

105-82555-1998, aside from the Hoover note I think you may be interested in how long the FBI keeps trivia, in this case disbursements to informers in the old SIS program of World War II. (FBIHQ main Oswald file, Lee that is)

105-82555-2662, and what I believe I wrote you about the 94 files. Aside from whatever the number eliminated in xeroxing is, there are four in which duplicates were filed. The 44 file is the FBIHQ Jack Ruby file. I do not have positive identification of 62-22925, but it appears to be a file in which Hoover's comments are kept.

105-82555-2050, despite this comment the FBI shuttled the stuff back and forth.

105-82555-IR 3/4/64, one of many records indicating O'Leary/FBI relationship and Hoover's desire to repay his services with a break on how to be released. Imagine the Director concerning himself with such details. *more later.*

62-109090- IR dated obliterated, Hoover is correct in his "narrow interpretations" comment but the FBI had its reasons and lied about them in claiming no connection every with Oswald or Ruby. Ruby was a Dallas PCI, later acknowledged. Whether or not Hoover knew it as this times. I can't imagine anyone risking not lettang him know.

105-82555-2584, Hoover, of all Commission members, attributes the leak to the right-wing Dallas paper to Warren. The TT or story or both err in placing the "shooting," actually a suicide, at Atsugi, Japan when it was at Cubi Point, Philippines. But Hoover was always making cracks about Warren.

105-82555-3453, what Hoover objects to was a duty imposed by LBJ and regularly performed by the FBI. He reflects resentment over the Commission's decision to get a second scientific opinion which it regarded as necessary in the Tippit killing, where the FBI Lab stated it could not connect the recovered bullets with LHO's pistol. The Commission almost never did this and depended on the FBI Lab almost exclusively.

105-82555-3265, trying to learn from informants if Oswald was a red, which Hoover himself said over and over again, he describes as "assinine." (The checks were negative and Oswald wann't a Communist.)

62-109090 NR 4/15/64, Hoover doesn't give a damn about exposing symbol informers in the CP.

62-109060-3004. What underlies this and was suppressed until 1975 destroys the FBI's claim that it did not let the Dallas police know of Oswald's presence because he had no record of any predisposition toward violence. In fact before the assassination he left a note for Hosty saying that if Hosty did not stop bothering Marina Oswald was going to blow the FBI office up. Hosty, in the later investigation, testified that he had been ordered to destroy that note after the assassination and did so. That investigation disclosed that the FBI had been kept informed. I have a fairly complete subject file on this. I can't imagine that Hoover was not in on the truth if only because it would have been too dangerous to keep it from him.

8/2: In thinking about the above this morning I was reminded of other and related records that I think will provide one of your very best Hoover stories. This note as this point is so that you can remind me if I forget. The Dallas police told the truth and had to say it in their own defense. Hoover, however, was outraged. He made a series of outrageous and unjustified demands that were all met by Dallas authorities, including the Chief of Police going onto national television, retracting the truth, and apologizing for it. After all he demands were met, Hoover ordered the breaking off of all relations with the Dallas police, even training. And they were broken off.

62-109090-163 is the FBI's statement of its protection of individual rights and despite its "security" responsibilities staying "withing the law."

62-109090 NR 9/28/64, even Fulton Lewis's defense of the FBI was taken as criticism by Hoover.

62-109090-235, when it had been settled that the FBI would not be the repository of the Commission's records Hoover was still adding notes stating that it would not. ~~By the way, the FBI had been kept informed of the Dallas police's actions and the FBI had been kept informed of the Dallas police's actions.~~ (Nonetheles: the FBI clung to an enormous amount of it for two more years, until Ramsey Clark promulgated an executive order published in the Federal Register 9/31/66, as I now recall. But it was two more years before the FBI gave up the basic evidence.

62-109090-354, the omniscient Hoover didn't know anything about computers and asked "What about this process?"

3

105-82555 NR, with unrelated # 53090 added and DeLoach to Mohr 11 19(?)64, both marked in blue, being poor copies, for repetition of FBI statement that Oswald had displayed no indication of being violent (when he had only threatened to bomb them!), related to above and Dallas police relations rupture.

Illegible #, 11/24/64 Belmont to Tolson on distribution of printed copies of the Commission's appendix of 26 volumes. Dallas and New Orleans were assigned the task of going over these volumes, to cover the FBI's ass again. But when each office was to get three sets, Hoover noted "I see no reason for Dallas and New Orleans getting 3 each." He was not satisfied with the single set allocated to him and said "I want 2 sets." (29 other sets for FBIHQ)

62-109090 NR 11/30/64 Tolson noted on the routing slip, "The ACLU is lining up with us," Hoover added, "We had better keep our guard up."

62-109090-4267, with a bystander slightly wounded by a missed shot during the assassination, with that fact known immediately, reported in the papers, included in the police broadcasts which the FBI transcribed for the Warren Commission, and with him a witness before the Commission, Hoover insisted from the first and in this note that there was no missed shot. Moreover, it is not mentioned in the FBI's account of the shooting, that five-volume report ordered by LBJ, and the wounded man, Jim Tague, is not mentioned in it.

Three records stapled together relating to AG Clark's 3/2/67 statement to the press outside the Senate Judiciary hearing room after his confirmation testimony: you'd never guess from these self-serving notes that as of that time the FBI was reported to have been Clark's source. How else could he have learned? But the FBI did not, apparently, expect that he would say anything. And while DeLoach and the FBI were leaking their heads off, Hoover wanted Clark to have "no comment."

62-109060-5513: Andrews had told the FBI and testified to the Warren Commission that one "Clay Bertrand" had asked him to be Oswald's counsel.

Resumed 8/10/84

105-82555 NR 2/5/64, Hoover to his gang, I've called a few things to your attention in blue. On page 3, the old question, did Hoover actually know so little or is his comment about the FBI leaking nothing at all self-serving? The fact is that the FBI did the leaking, under DeLoach, and the rest should have known this.

I'm sending a Post story on Hoover and Hitler Germany as disclosed in records obtained by the Scientologists and what I got from them, from Carol Galle who then was working on FOIA for them at their Washington office. You should be able to get much more from them directly if you have the interest and time. When I located this I was looking for and did not find a record I got from the FBI reflecting Hitler's Xmas cards to a Portuguese Nazi.

Note that in the Nichols era 94 was being used as later by DeLoach, in this instance I wonder if 94-1 is Hoover, with the next classification the subject of the information, the last the serial.

MURKIN is the FBI's code name for Murder of King, HQ 44-38861. 2993 and 2994 reflect the public relations role of "Crime Records" and Hoover's involvement in the FBI's propaganda.

You may have 100-448006-93, marked as Page 92 of perhaps the O & C. I disclose it because the FBI knew very well that on this particular occasion the Memphis police took King to the Holiday Inn as a security measure and I have its records on this and because its other records disclosed to me establish that he always stayed at the Lorraine, as I recall on eight earlier occasions. Not only did this

nasty bit get used, the Memphis Commercial-Appeal had a nasty cartoon depicting a frightened King being led away, needing support, captioned "Chicken a la King."

62-109090-36, this from DeLoach under whom the leaking! Ditto for 1002.

There may be some duplication of the next five pages and perhaps a few more when I get to other files but I thought it best to take no chances

44-38861-4921: In the end the FBI gave the prosecution 29 volumes (numbered 25) and this is only what it wanted out, what it regarded as "suitable for dissemination." I got enormously more and much that the prosecution should have had and didn't. This is one of the FBI's means of control, controlling what it disseminates. In 5115 there is reflection of a further limitation, the FBI's view of the Department's "legitimate interest." The "fugitive" investigation contained most of the information about Ray and his travels. (Criminal/Vinson handled ^{on} the extradition. CRD was in charge of the civil rights case.)

44-38861-5819, how the FBI hogs credit: the RCMP "was only instrumental in the identification" of Ray. Actually, the FBI had nothing to do with the main thing, catching Ray, or the allegedly incriminating evidence, which was gathered by the Memphis police, with, despite the FBI, "evidentiary" help from the RCMP.

100-106670-4065, when they check to prove they didn't leak (for internal uses) they avoid "Crime Records" and conclude that they didn't leak what they had leaked.

44-38861-MR 6/10/68, how the FBI helped Frank write what it wanted him to write while creating internal records stating the exact opposite. The FBI didn't give him a thing directly. It merely nodded to the local prosecutors, who Frank told me met with him often. In fact he quotes undisclosed FBI reports verbatim in his book, "An American Death." ^(then)

44-38861-5503—they get copies in advance and are prepared. Here's how.

44-38861-1819: Although the FBI never believed there was a conspiracy in the King case, in order to assert jurisdiction under federal law it had to charge civil rights conspiracy. Because it did not trust the U.S. Attorney in Memphis it filed the charges in Birmingham, where Ray bought the alleged death rifle (something it never proved, that it was used), alleging conspiracy on the basis of someone saying that Ray was going deer hunting with his brother in Wisconsin. Literally this is the sole basis. Other charges also were filed at the same time, but this record gives only the one required for jurisdiction. Hoover must have spent most of his time in his later years reading and annotating the news ticker. Ray allegedly conspired with a living brother who was never charged (last page.).

5

Earlier I believe I told you that despite the title of the classification 80, "Laboratory Research Matters," its actual uses by the field offices include hiding such potentially embarrassing things as records on the press and propaganda.

When DeLoach notified the Dallas SAC by phone that Jim Bishop would be pulling in, the Dallas SAC and/or secretary ~~_____~~ knew immediately that the proper place for filing was in a new 80 file, written in on the bottom of the page by a clerk or SA and typed in on the top. It would ~~be~~ ^{become} 80-879. (89-43-7636, 7641, 7646)

Despite the self-serving "hands off" directive from DeLoach, according to Shanklin's memo, he clearly understood that FBIHQ wanted Bishop buttered up and he arranged for that. Shanklin also was ordered to limit himself to the non-controversial and to refer Bishop to DeLoach with regard to anything else.

From his own records (7641), even when Bishop asked about the non-controversial, what was already in the public domain, how they got the evidence from the Dallas police, before responding Shanklin phoned DeLoach to get his OK. And a week later, when he wrote another memo, Shanklin was careful to include the citations to the public domain, available at the Archives where not printed by the Warren Commission.

Despite DeLoach's caution against associating the FBI with Bishop, his first memo reflects the fact that the FBI actually not only got Bishop the suite JFK had used in Fort Worth but arranged for him not to be charged anything.

His third memo reports that "this book would be submitted to" DeLoach "prior to publication."

While the Hoover FBI did not like Bishop personally ("pushy") they did like his writing, which was always favorable to it. He was in the JFK assassination book about which he saw ~~Shanklin~~ Shanklin. So, the people under DeLoach wanted Bishop to do a book on the King assassination, which another of its favorites, "Leaders Digest," planned. He "would give proper credit to the outstanding work done by the FBI."

His "The Days of Martin Luther King, Jr.," was published by Putnam in 1971. It lists the FBI among his sources. That was before any FBI disclosures, which were later and involuntary, in my C.A. 75-1996, first records disclosed 11/75.

(44-38861-5653, duplicate in a 98 file, apparently)

I had these few xeroxes clipped to the notes, so I'm not going to try to insert them.

FILE (80-)

11/15/67

SAC J. GORDON SHANKLIN

~~JIM BISHOP~~
AUTHOR

On 11/14/67, Assistant to the Director, Mr. C. D. DE LOACH, telephonically advised that he had received a call from JIM BISHOP, who is an author and has written several books, one being "The Day Lincoln Died." He had called him from Miami, Florida. He stated that he was coming to Dallas and Ft. Worth, Texas, arriving on Nov. 17th. DE LOACH stated that BISHOP had always been friendly with the Bureau and is at the present time working on a book, "The Day Kennedy was shot." He stated that BISHOP is a very pushy sort of individual and was inquiring as to whether he could come by and talk to me and possibly have me take him around and introduce him to various people in Dallas and Ft. Worth. DE LOACH stated that he had told BISHOP that we could not and would not introduce him around, but that I would be glad to talk to him. He said that anything that BISHOP asked me about, if I readily knew it and it was not controversial, to go ahead and be helpful, but certainly not to go out of the way or appear to be sponsoring him by taking him around.

Mr. DE LOACH stated that BISHOP wanted to have a reservation made for Friday night in the Texas Hotel and he also wanted to see the suite that the late President KENNEDY and Mrs. KENNEDY occupied the night before he was shot in Dallas. He said that if this could be arranged without the FBI becoming involved or appearing to sponsor BISHOP, then to try to do so.

I informed Mr. DE LOACH that the management of the Hotel Texas had recently changed; that I had contact, however, with HOWARD W. JENNINGS, who is employed by PERRY - BASS, INC., which is the company that controls the SID RICHARDSON estate and that this estate also controls the hotel. I felt that I could make necessary arrangements through Mr. JENNINGS. I contacted JENNINGS and JENNINGS stated that what he would like to do would be just to call the manager and tell him to make

2 - Dallas
JGS:mfr
(2)

1280-
1289-43

89-43-7634

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
NOV 15 1967	
FBI-DALLAS	

DL #80-

the suite available on Friday night for Mr. and Mrs. BISHOP on a complimentary basis and show nothing but the fact it was complimentary. There would be no mention made of the FBI. The manager would not know where the request was coming from. I called Mr. DE LOACH back and he stated he could see nothing wrong with this. It is noted that JENNINGS stated he felt that by doing this, it would certainly put a good taste in BISHOP's mouth and possibly he would give Ft. Worth and Dallas a little better write-up. DE LOACH stated that very definitely BISHOP would contact me sometime Friday.

FILE (80-)

11/20/67

SAC J. GORDON SHANKLIN

JIM BISHOP
AUTHOR

On 11/20/67, Mr. BISHOP and his wife KELLY appeared at the office, and he discussed his book to be titled "The Day KENNEDY was shot", pointing out that he was actually just going to cover one day and that little things were primarily what he was looking for. He stated he was going to see a number of people in Dallas and primarily what he would like to have from me or DRAIN was exactly how and when we got the evidence from former Police Chief JESSE CHOCY, how was it transported to Washington, which airport, and how was it taken into the Laboratory.

I called Assistant to the Director, C. D. DE LOACH and he stated he could see no objection to giving him this information as long as he would not attribute it to coming directly from us in the book.

It is noted BISHOP and wife are staying in the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Room 1748 and 1750.

- Dallas

JGS:mfr
(2)

*1:80-new
1:14-43*

89-43-7841

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV 20 1967	
FBI-DALLAS	

1/21

FILE (80-879)

11/28/67

SAC J. GORDON SHANKLIN

~~JIM BISHOP~~
AUTHOR

On Monday, 11/20/67, Mr. JIM BISHOP and his wife KELLY appeared at the office and discussed with me the book he is going to write about the day President KENNEDY died. He was most appreciative of the accommodations he had had at the Hotel Texas, Ft. Worth, stating that the suite that the late President KENNEDY had used the night before his death had been made available to him gratis by the management.

80-879
12

He then furnished me with a list, which is attached, of various people that he stated he was going to try to see in Dallas. He stated he did want to talk to SA VINCENT E. DRAIN and me about what we did on the day of the assassination, with particular reference to the securing of the evidence from the Dallas Police Department by SA DRAIN, the time, how it was taken to Washington, and when it arrived in Washington.

On Nov. 22, 1967, Mr. BISHOP and his wife came back to the office and stated they had been having quite a bit of success with everyone they had contacted with the exception of the Dallas Police Department, who had told them they would not give them anything. Mr. BISHOP was furnished information concerning the evidence he requested, which was in pages 159, 160 and 161 of the report of SA ROBERT P. GEMBERLING dated 11/30/63 at Dallas, Texas, captioned "LEE HARVEY OSWALD, aka; ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, NOV. 22, 1963." The only other information which I furnished was: He wanted to know how I learned that President KENNEDY was shot, and I told him that I had an employee monitoring the police radio. He wanted to know then what I did with the information, and I told him I immediately furnished it to Mr. HOOVER. I also told him that upon receipt of information concerning KENNEDY's death being definitely determined, I furnished this information to Mr. HOOVER.

It is noted he stated that this book would be submitted to Assistant Director DE LOACH prior to publication.

On the morning of 11/24/67, BISHOP called and stated that he and his wife were returning to Florida. He was most appreciative of the assistance which he had received from the Dallas Office.

89-43-7646
SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
NOV 28 1967
FBI-DALLAS

2 Dallas (80-879) (80-973)

Mr. Tolson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. DeLoach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Mohr	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bishop	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Casper	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Callahan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Conrad	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Felt	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Gale	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Rosen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Sullivan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Tavel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Trotter	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tele. Room	<input type="checkbox"/>
Miss Holmes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Miss Gandy	<input type="checkbox"/>

March 20, 1969

Mr. Bishop:

RE: JAMES EARL RAY
ASSASSINATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING
BUREAU COOPERATION IN A BOOK

By informal memorandum dated March 11, 1969, Mr. DeLoach suggested that consideration be given to our cooperating with a friendly author, or with "The Reader's Digest," in the preparation of a book regarding the Martin Luther King murder case. With regard to this suggestion, the Director noted, "O.K."

With regard to this matter, "The Reader's Digest" has advised that it would greatly appreciate the opportunity to do a book on the Ray-King case with Bureau cooperation. If we approve, "The Reader's Digest" plans to contact Jim Bishop in an effort to place him under contract to write the book for them.

Jim Bishop is, of course, a very thorough and capable writer with whom we have had many contacts over the years. With the Director's approval, we worked with Bishop in connection with his latest published book, "The Day Kennedy Was Shot," which contains a number of favorable references to the FBI. The Director has written Bishop on several occasions concerning commendatory columns--including one in 1967 highly praising the Director as "the greatest law enforcement officer in all history."

Even though Bishop has been described in Bufiles as "somewhat pompous and a little overbearing at times," he nonetheless has both the name and ability to produce a book on the King case which would give proper credit to the outstanding work done by the FBI. Accordingly, it is recommended that approval be given to our cooperating with "The Reader's Digest" and Jim Bishop on this book.

Sincerely,

M.A.J.
M. A. Jones

- 1 - Mr. DeLoach
- 1 - Mr. Bishop
- 1 - Mr. Rosen
- 1 - C. L. McGowan

GWG:pls (7)

M.D. DeLoach
10/1
PR 3 1969

I think we should wait to see what move Ray makes to re-open his case. H.

6-33 *58561-565*

MAR 20 1969

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Of all the many cozy relationships the FBI has always had with the press - while usually with conservatives ranging to reactionaries but not excluding liberals - the records of which I have separate copies readily at hand are fullest with regard to Jeremiah O'Leary.

Did you know that, speaking of liberals, Morris Ernst had been Hoover's personal lawyer in some matter or matters until it served Hoover's purpose to cut him dead?

The very day of the assassination of JFK Assistant to the Director Belmont, who was supposedly in charge of investigations, had enough time to phone the Dallas SAC and to tell him that O'Leary was en route, would be in contact with Shanklin, and "is a close friend of the Bureau." That told Shanklin all he had to know. This is one of the very earliest in the massive Dallas assassination file, serial 24.

I call your attention to the notes. The instruction is not to index. It is to "make cards." The stamped form has provision for indexing directions. Ordinarily the FBI can retrieve what it needs from its indices. I therefore believe that these special cards are a kind of special tickler, in the broad sense political in nature. It also is possible that they were for the special index, outside the regular indices and preserved outside it, that the FBI has in special cases, where it wants to know what it may have let others know. It had such a special JFK assassination index in Dallas, but that special index was limited to the files sent to Washington for possible forwarding to the Commission. It does not include, for example, the Dallas police, except for entries incidental in other records, yet there was an enormous amount with the Dallas police. But that did not go to the Commission. So, if the FBI wanted to know what it had let the Commission know, it had this special index. There was also one in the King case that I did not get. In Dallas it was 40 linear feet of cards, more than two jammed file cabinets of notes.

Serial 716 reflects that in all that intensity of activity, Assistant Director DeLoach would not be too busy to take a call from O'Leary, in Dallas, if O'Leary asked for any info Dallas had not released.

Serial 76 or 760 of the Ruby Dallas file, 44-1054, reflects that FBIHQ sent Dallas, which prepared what was forwarded to the Commission, except for special things, like CD1, the FBI's five-volume report to the President (fifth is Ruby), a memorandum and a copy of an article on Ruby by O'Leary. Who would have had great difficulty getting any significant info other than from the FBI. But not in Dallas.

105-32555 NR 3/4/64, DeLoach to Mohr, reports O'Leary as a stoolpidgeon on a former colleague, something he knew would endear him to the FBI. Hoover loved it. So much that he added a note to "give O'Leary the release on Oswald & Ruby not being in FBI." (Which was not literally true of Ruby, who'd been a PCI.) Hoover was too gung ho! for the cooler heads, so Deke wrote Mohr again, urging that they not ignore their other friends who would get wider distribution, AP and UPI. Hoover OKed but told them to check with DJ info office.

The short release is, as I state above, untruthful because Ruby was a PCI. And while that was withheld from the Commission and the public, I doubt very much that anyone in the FBI would have dared keep Hoover in the dark.

As you probably know, FBIHQ approval is required for the field offices to try out and then formalize relationships with informers. But they nonetheless are informers during their probationary period of about six months usually.

The O'Leary story of five days before the FBI's report, CD1, reached the Commission, could have had only the FBI as its source. At that very time the FBI was both leaking heavily and denying that it had leaked anything and was going through the motions of investigating the alleged source(s) of the leaks. That very day the Deputy AG, Nicholas Katzenbach, told the Warren Commission in executive session that while the FBI denied the leaking and was claiming to investigate them, nobody else

could have done the leaking. Obviously, the content of the O'Leary story had to come from the FBI because it had not yet distributed any copies of its report.

I've not been able to resolve in my own mind whether the kind of note Hoover appended, here and so often, was self-serving, pretending he had no knowledge at all of the leaking, or if he was really kept in the dark (in his later years) by those closest to him and in day-to-day control. (A reporter friend who was the recipient of these FBI leaks believes that Hoover then knew. I don't know and haven't been able to make up my own mind.)

This leaking boxed the Warren Commission in, for your information, as they let down their hair in executive session 1/21/64 and told themselves. The leaks served to limit what the Commission could and could not do and formulated the national and international mind. If you were to examine CD1 you'd see that it is not on the assassination at all but is a diatribe against Oswald. It does not even include all the known wounds JFK sustained and has only two sentences on the assassination itself. I'll try to remember to locate and send what the reaction was when the then general counsel of DoD demurred and found the report thin and inadequate, later when he got a copy.

DeLoach et al had their way in the end because they arranged the release for after the Star had gone to press. (Afternoon paper) But just in time for the AP and UP wire to be included in the evening TV newscasts (Serial 2466)

Hoover reacted strongly to the mild criticism of the FBI in the Warren Report. The FBI immediately leaked what could embarrass the Commission to the Star, exclusively. Here Hoover wrote a thank-you letter to O'Leary 10/2/64. (The Report was released 9/27)

Serial 5133, 10/8/64, is the beginning of what I wrote you about earlier, that the FBI got the Dallas police chief to grovel and then after he did, broke off all relations, even training. DeLoach moved immediately, without regard to the truth of what Chief Curry had said, and got the Dallas SAC to get the police chief to apologize, which he had done. Now bear in mind that they all knew that Curry had been truthful, but that his truth was hurtful to the FBI. So, in addition to having Curry apologize they tapped their AP, UPI and O'Leary sources, O'Leary alone as an individual reporter (his paper reached the Congress, among others), all intended to box Curry in (see p.2)

With what the DeLoach memo spells out, note carefully the FBI's language in the attached proposed release -which really says the opposite, (raf 2)

62-109060-4264, O'Leary gave the FBI an advance copy of Leo Sauvage's book, then wrote his own book review. Of which Hoover noted, "Very well done by O'Leary."

Before I forget, I've not heard anything further in response to my efforts to get a copy of the Earl Golz story in the Dallas Morning News re Hoover breaking off all relations and the indications in my file are that I sent him the only set of duplicates I had when my copier wasn't working. So, I suggest that you'll get at least the minimum if you ask the Librarian at the Morning News for a copy from his morgue. Gary Mack was to send me a copy but he hasn't. He is a friend of Golz' and has a small newsletter.

The 1968 record relate to O'Leary's services to the FBI and its to him when Dr. King was assassinated. 44-38861 is the FBIHQ main file codenamed MURKIN. By the time this was disclosed to me the FBI was hiding all leads to the more sensitive DeLoach 94 files thus the obliteration of where the original is filed. Under DeLoach Tom Bishop was a chief leaker, including in the JFK case. I think but I'm not now sure that he was an assistant director. Here (5/3/68, 5/9) the proposal goes upward, to help O'Leary with an article for the "Leaders Digest on James Earl Ray. The proposal begins

by puffing itself, the Digest and O'Leary up. Tolson recommended against it and Hoover concurred. Bishop noted that DeLoach told the Digest "that no cooperation can be furnished." Ditto for O'Leary. I can imagine what DeLoach really told O'Leary from Bishop's 5/8 to him, reporting that O'Leary was doing a puff story on the FBI which emphasized its alleged secrecy and making of only three releases and would include only information O'Leary himself had dug up "from an assiduous study of newspaper and other news accounts from all over the country." (Picture of O'Leary with taped coverage of all the radio and TV stations!) Bishop was careful to note that they had given O'Leary only what was in their three formal releases. I'm also including the FBI's abstract on this.

After the passing of a little time and O'Leary's page-one story in the Star was out Jones renewed the proposal, Serial 3877. This is followed by emphasis on O'Leary's allegedly great original work and research and "his strong background on this case." So, Jones recommends that they give O'Leary the same cooperation they did in an earlier Digest piece on the ten most-wanted fugitives. Bishop was careful to go on record against this (having already done it), "No, we can't play favorites..." But Hoover noted, "OK."

What this next page, separated in my file of duplicates from ^{its} first page, has Jones reporting to Bishop is that they have revised O'Leary's ms. And that it be returned to DeLoach for him to give it (called "returned") to the Digest's Washington office. Bishop remains careful to note having some questions still.

The page marked 235 is the DJ Office of Professional Responsibility (ugh!) summary of section ~~47~~ 47 of the MURKIN file. It states that Hoover approved that O'Leary be "encouraged to do a story, using public information and with Bureau approval of the manuscript." Next is the first page of the story, from the FBI's copy, as it appeared in the Digest. Clearly FBI puffery.

The effect of this story on Ray and subsequent history is in the FBI's copy of Ray's letter to the judge after it appeared. Note that this copy was before the post-marking. All Ray's mail was intercepted and copied, even though the judge had ordered that this could not be done, except that his mail could be scanned to see that there was no escape plan. Ray tells the judge that if such prejudicial publicity "dont stop I mite as well waive the trial and come over and get sentenced." And that is what ultimately happened. To this day there has not been any trial and he has tried since to get one. The interception was by the sheriff, who delivered the interceptions to the DA, where the copying was done and distribution began.

Some of these records were in the JFK files, and when they were disclosed O'Leary was seriously embarrassed because his peers detected immediately that he had agreed to prior censorship. He claimed not to have agreed to pre-publishing editing privileges for the FBI but didn't deny it because "they gave me most of the information." As Ray had recognized, nothing else was possible.

They Ray did, he claimed under coercion, and that is obvious, enter a guilty plea, through Percy Foreman. He feared Foreman would throw the case before a jury, so as soon as he got to the jail to which he was transferred he wrote the judge withdrawing his plea. But the day after he entered his plea, Serial 5654, DeLoach was urging Tolson that they get a ~~man~~ "friendly, capable author of the Reader's Digest, and proceed with a book on this case." Tolson asked "Who do you suggest" and someone added the m to whom. ~~DeLoach~~ DeLoach was considering the Digest or Gerold Frank, and they liked him. Hoover gave his OK.

M.A. Jones reported 3/20/69 that the Digest was considering ^M having Jim Bishop do a book, but Hoover believed they should wait and see what moves Ray makes to open his case. By then Ray's letter(s) to the judge had been published. As I'm sure I told you earlier, they then did not work with the Digest and Bishop on a book and that the reports the FBI wanted published were leaked to Frank by the Memphis prosecutor, to

whom the FBI had provided 25 numbered volumes, some of several parts or sections. Frank wrote what the FBI wanted written, as did Bishop in a later book.

The House Select Committee on Assassinations reported in 1979 what the FBI did not like, that there was evidence of a conspiracy in the JFK assassination. You can decide for yourself about O'Leary, after the long history of which I've enclosed only part, that being all I saw in the files I have, from the AP's story from the New York Times and his which has a different thrust in the Star.

In the course of denying that he had been employed by the CIA in his 5/9/77 article O'Leary did admit receiving all sorts of special favors from it at HQ and throughout Latin America. (I think it is obvious that the CIA would not go to all this cost and trouble to help with stories it did not expect to approve so the denial of being a CIA employee is immaterial, except in a very limited and unlikely sense.) Actually, not being an employee of the FBI was better for the FBI, as the records show, because he seemed to have no connection, wrote what they wanted written, and in return for their help they got the ~~name~~ ^{name} to censor.)

O'Leary did provide information to the FBI. The CIA's records are not disclosed so what they say is not known. He got paid in kind, not cash, by the FBI. When the CIA was giving him information, he was getting help from it. He does not deny having given the CIA information and he denies almost everything else. This kind of help makes successful reporters. O'Leary has been employed by the government/White House since the Star folded.

* * * * *

This is the last of the records I recalled in which I thought you'd have interest. I'm sorry it has taken so long to prepare suggestions for you because you do not have knowledge of the assassinations and their investigations. But I do not know how much more raw material you can want if you plan to complete such a book in a year. With all else you do you'll not have much time. I don't envy you the schedule you've laid out for yourself but I do wish you the best of luck with it!

If you can think of anything else, let me know, please, and I'll do what I can.

If controlling event by leaks, like to O'Leary, and planting favorable/prejudicial articles, means anything in your plans, James H. Lesar, who handled most of the Ray case in court when we prevailed on habeas corpus and got an evidentiary hearing, is the best quotable source, I think. (His father is prestigious in the law, author of texts, law school dean, university president, etc.)

There were, undoubtedly, more significant controls asserted by the FBI through more reactionary components of the press and on a higher level, but my files do not include much, except the existence of friendly relations in some instances, like with ~~Harriet~~ Hearst, the Digest, etc. I think it is probable that many books have their origin in the FBI. Like Digest Washington editor John Barron's KGB. He says in his author's preface that Hoover "allowed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to answer many of our questions. Cartha DeLoach, then Assistant to the Director of the FBI, briefed us about significant KGB operations against the United States and permitted us to meet an important former Soviet agent, Karlo Tuomi. We were also able to talk to retired FBI agents involved in some of the cases narrated in the book." He then says that he got some help from the CIA. Bantam edition, page xiv. If you've read the book you know it had to come mostly from official sources and the rest from those opened by officials.

If you could get the 94 files you'd have the unimaginable!

It is now suppertime and I'll suspend, hoping to be able to read and correct tomorrow. If not, soon thereafter.

Best wishes,

Harold

8/31/84, while reading what I've written:

P.1 My reason for including the information on the FBI's leaking is because the name of the FBI's game, at least in political matters, is control, and by its leaking in the two major crimes of the JFK and King assassination, they did assert control and that was made possible by their leaking.

In your 8/27 you express an interest in the "Director is Always Right" file item relating to trees where there were none and to the entire stenographic transcript of Hoover's heavily-edited testimony. I must have mislaid or misfiled the tree business because it is not in any file I've checked and I've checked many. I thought I'd gotten it out to send you. And the entire file folder of his Commission testimony is missing. So, it will take a little time. I'll have to go back to the originals. This means the personal records on me and godknowswhere in the HQ records. Fortunately, I'd made a copy of Belmont's letter saying that the reporter made mistakes, apparently for a King book footnote, and that gives me the date. It is rather strange that no file number is indicated on it. That would greatly simplify search.

If I am not able to complete this by the first mail next week I may mail what I've got copied, to prevent any further accidents, and then will mail the rest when I can.

I'm inclined to believe that one of the many who have access to my records may have misfiled the testimony file. I'd prefer to not believe cribbed it because I do make copies for people. I have a clear recollection of it, as you'll understand when you see it.

Best wishes,

