

Spice, 1 - Marine; 2 - exw

5/29/69

Dear Paul,

Your welcome mailing of the 28th arrived today. I'm particularly glad to get the data on the Freedom of Information Act and will read it tonight, preparatory to writing letters, of which I'll send copies.

As soon as I saw that enormous job of "ins" on the phone numbers I checked out those on Oswald when shot. I was satisfied at least two had to be Abt, and they were. Nor am I surprised at his having the police number, for that could be to give to others, to reach him. But that he had the Daily Worker number and there is no reference to this in the Report, which was so anxious to pin a phony "red" label on him is surprising.

What can this mean? One of the obvious possibilities is that, when he had the use of the phone he got it from the information operator. Somewhere I believe I have a copy of that slip of paper, or, perhaps I made notes on it from CD 87, which is my recollection of the source, when I went through it in the Spring of 66. If I don't have the original, I must ask for it. (I've asked my Senator, who is a timid friend) to ask the Archiver why then cannot respond to proper inquiries until after two months passes.) I want to be satisfied that it exists. Then, that it is in his handwriting.

One of the things that has interested me since you sent the McManis report is the absence of any slip of paper with his number and name. Helms, I believe, testified he gave this or had it given to Oswald. But behind Fritz there is never a written record (authority, Henry Wedel). It is unlikely Helms would have thrown such a name and number away, if he got it. The record of the police does not inspire confidence in the Fritz version. It is more likely, I think, that they wanted O to be without counsel so they might get him to talk. The first thing a good lawyer would have done, you can be sure, is to latch the Oswald lip, on anything. And the DPD knew it.

So, if anyone has any ideas why O had the Worker number on him when killed, I'd like to hear them.

Congratulations on passing the exams. Just let me know when to say "doctor".

Fascinating also how the Commission lawyers asked questions only so they would not be answered. There is half an answer in CD978(CE1961): Thornley, as usual, was wrong on the withdrawal of O's clearance (which places him at La Torre almost to the time Oswald left, may I add) or worse than wrong. The one thing he could not have been is right. From my own experience, when a discharge is pending, that is practise, no assignment. On the security clearance, that is not answered, not in any way. It is avoided. And it should have been in the covering letter, for a direct answer required little time or space. A direct answer is possible. But it is all evasions, if you read CE1961 carefully. Do not get it for me, but if you have gotten a copy, I plan to use it and would appreciate it. Otherwise, when I get to that, I'll get a copy for facsimile use. This also removes all Commission (lawyer) innocence on the subject. They knew Thornley was wrong (yet Liebelor quoted him) and they knew they had no answer, and at least Donovan and Thornley indicated a minimum secret clearance. Very Helpful. If any of you come across any more of this, please let me know.

Hoover's letter of 11/8/63 to State, I presume, is part of the deBrueys report. Is it not interesting, that the stamped date by the Passport Office is 11/22? The fifth day after receipt, that it took 10 days to go that

far inside State, that in the absence of any evidence it existed there in-
ferred a "New Orleans Division" of FPCO? That the FBI was also reading
something else, listing this under Registration Act-Cuba, as its "character".
I'll have to read this carefully, but the synopsis disguises the earlier
FBI investigation.

This copy apparently was supplied by the State Department. You
may have told me but I do not recall, did a copy come from the FBI?

Gotta stop for a while.

Many thanks. Congratulations. Have a nice holiday.

Best,