

DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
PARISH OF ORLEANS  
STATE OF LOUISIANA  
2700 TULANE AVENUE  
NEW ORLEANS 70119



W. GARRISON  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

August 31, 1967

Mr. Bill Turner  
Ramparts Magazine  
San Francisco, California 94133

Dear Bill:

We very much appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending us memos containing possible leads. The Isaacs mentioned in the Winnipeg paper is more likely the same as a Harold Isaacs whose name the F.B.I. was indiscreet enough to mention in the title of a classified document (CD 1080). Nobody seems to know where Harold Isaacs lives now, but his parents "think" he is living "in or near Houston." It is interesting to note from the list of Basic Source materials in the National Archives that this information about Isaacs was made available to the F.B.I. by Oswald's mysterious cousin, Marilyn Murret who travelled around the world at the same time Oswald was in Russia, and also made a trip to Mexico at about the same time as Oswald.

You may not know that the New York Review were at one stage interested in an article about the classified documents in the Archives, but Bob Silvers recently told me that in view of the Popkin article they do not have any immediate interest.

I have recently been doing some careful research on the subject, including making a list of CE's either by accident or design included in the Warren Report but classified in the Archives, and I am wondering if Ramparts might be interested. I still think publishing the complete list would make the best impact, together with some comment, in particular about Oswald's income tax returns being classified. (Ruby's are in the classified-but-published category.) It is very difficult to speculate about the contents of many of these documents, as they are often merely titled "Oswald" or "Oswald's Activity in Mexico", but some speculation is possible. As Epstein has pointed out to me, some good logical points can be made, for example, (and I think this is excellent), the F.B.I. cannot maintain that the documents are classified for reasons of irrelevance to the Commission's conclusions because the Commission attempted to prove a

August 31, 1967

Bill Turner

relative, that there was no conspiracy. Every single report is relevant to that conclusion, since no one has any way of knowing that the next report written up won't contain evidence of a conspiracy. - Epstein seems to think that the new "Freedom of Information Act" is also relevant to these documents (signed July 4, 1966) since, he says, the burden of proof now lies with the government to prove that Federal documents classified for reasons of national security (the guidelines under which most documents are classified), do in fact pertain to national security. I have tried to fight my way through the legal jargon of this Act, but have, however, failed to come up with this interpretation in my far from expert view.

Let me know what you think about the article suggestion anyway, and once again, very many thanks for your help.

Best Wishes,

TOM BETHELL

EB:sk