Epstein/FBI

Dear Jim, 4/22/76

This relates to my various DOIA requests, both Nosenko/Epstein and JFK.

It does not address the accuracy of Epstein's writing, the reasonableness of his presumptions/ conclusions or the obvious other interpreations that range from as likely to much more likely than those he likes and uses. It does ~~xxx~~ ignore his games with words.

My one interest except where I made a contrary note is in what it reflects relating to compliance or non-compliance with my requests. I have not spelled them out because I think they will be apparent to you. The first, for example, says that Readers Digest approached him in 1976. This was after some of my original Nosenko requests if not in fact after all of them.

The exception is for your information, the false pretense that Oswald applied the date that Epstein does to his writing and more that the Commission did. Epstein is wrong, as a memo Paul Koch did shows clearly enough.

When Epstein is this dishonest or even just this wrong it is important to realize that maybe all he says about what was made available to him can be subject to the same questioning. However, I believe the only safe course is to believe that when he refers to information being made available to him it in fact was made available to him.

Another point in the underlining is to draw to your attention discrimination against me and others. Example: the Archives permitted his graphologist to make a microscopic examination of the originals of Oswald's writing. Generally they deny such examinations, even going to court to prevent them.

There is no doubt that Epstein received special consideration so I think it would be wrong to assume that any one of these indications of it can be assumed not to be accurate reflections of what was made available to him.

There is more here that relates to the CIA than to the FBI.

Interesting but possibly of no consequence is the wrong title for the book. If it is of significance then this should be considered with the atypical appearance of this article before the book and the series reights to Readers Digest (magazine) had been exploited. This will be true regardless of the time spread between writing and appearance of Psychology Today. The more this spread the more intresting.

It is my recollection that the book was scheduled and advertised for appearance last October and at a different price. So you have the unusual delay and then the unusual abandonment of all the promotional and exclusivity practises. While there is no text to indicate that the book was changed I believe this is the case. (Thus the footnotes are not footnotes and as notes are merely the kind of thing an editor might take out of the text.) If this is what happened then a probable explanation is the nature of information he received after he had the book largely or entirely written.

Best,