

Dear Jim, Folsom/OFR 12/15/76 to Ray

12/20/76

In my view this whole thing is a despicable trick that is more likely based upon knowledge from surveillance than hope or the taking of a chance.

If they want Jimmy, "through your attorney," to "consent to an interview," they do it by asking the attorney to write Jimmy, not by writing him themselves with a copy to the attorney.

Folsom's letter is limited to the charge from Levi to the OFR, "reviewing the FBI's investigation of " that assassination.

What in the hell does Jimmy know about that - or can he?

If they were at all serious they would ask you or me. We have investigated the so-called FBI investigation. Jimmy has not us and to their knowledge could not.

But if they were insane and really believe Jimmy could shed light and that it would be right and proper to ask him, this certainly was far much earlier, not now, when they are done - I also predict in trouble - and have no time to follow any leads they might get.

If all they want is Jimmy's "statement" of his "participation, or lack of participation," they have had that available to them in his testimony and have not asked for it if their investigation even disclosed its existence before you told them. That they persist in this after you told them is more than enough to establish that this is one of the dirtier of their dirty tricks.

They surely had no worry about access to the transcripts when the head of OFR was the clerk of the judge who sat on the hearing of which Jimmy's testimony was part.

But when there was an evidentiary hearing and the FBI did all the investigating, how could they possibly they possibly investigate the FBI's investigation without going over these transcripts? And that early on?

This is so raw I take it as desperation.

Best,