

Dear Jim,

OPR REPORT

2/20/77

As my letter to Tom shows this is perhaps the most totally and deliberately dishonest thing yet. In this it provides unprecedented possibilities for what I call intellectual jobs.

I plan to use it as I plan to use what I'd asked of Dick, making my getting that done even more urgent. Do you know anyone else who can do it sooner?

To save time I plan to xerox these pages I may use. I have marked them up. I'll then use them in the rough draft. This will save such typing time.

While as you say it is obvious they intend doing a job on the Lane-Gregory operation and the Select Committee they have held back very much on this. I do anticipate that when the book is out the Department will do much more and that it will mean an even stronger encapsulation of the FBI.

There are so many angles and importances I cannot begin to enumerate them all here. One is what we were denied on discovery, what the sheriff's radio logs show about timing. It confirms my 20000 1971 investigation, that Channing had made his broadcast ~~within the minutes~~. Separately it pretends Bellabite was first. It also lists Louwens and all the relevant police and their statements.

You call it the Task Force Report. Don't go for their switch. It is the OPR report from which they have expunged Shabazz's name and its. Do not let them pretend it is anything else, not at least in anything you say. This authorship makes it even more vulnerable.

This is perhaps the boldest of all the naydisinformation operations. I suggest one of the considerations is the consequences of not running the inherent risk.

You'll be able to judge better after reading it and seeing what I put together but I find myself wondering if it opens and legal doors.

What they say and do not say about Jerry is worthy of some thought. They do not ask why the FBI did not do anything about Jerry's known crime (which we might broadcast with their framing John) and they do make a deal of James and John refusing to be interviewed without saying they asked Jerry and he refused, too. Yet we know they were in touch with him. I believe this hangs on what I've believed all along, they left Jerry out to watch him. There is in this some proof of it, proof that they did have him under some surveillance. I may write him. They refer to letters without referring to all that are known, which also is interesting. They refer to one informant on him only.

There was no delay in issuance of this report from sanitizing time. That is restricted to the appendix and there is very little. They also use names in the text that have been obliterated from the reports provided in 1996.

Hardly,