

Dear Paul, The Excess/Olney

2/23/78

It has become apparent to me that the dumping (FBI's word) of Warren Olney was not part of the "deliberative process" of the Commission but was rather a "process" of the executive agencies in the successful effort to control the Warren Commission.

Last night when Jim and I spoke I mentioned to him that the bracketing for suggested excisions, visible in the replacement pages of the first three sessions that I have mailed you, show that what was removed originally does not fall within any exemption. We got to talking and I then said that there was not a single adverse comment on Olney. He reminded me of what I had not forgotten, your Olney memo, but I had forgotten the specifics of the content. In the light of the newly available information from what Jim says it was remarkably accurate and foresighted.

In looking for it to read it this morning I can't find it. I thought you sent me a copy in 1975. In your 12/19/77 I find reference to your "separate notes" of 4/26/75, so I suppose that is the date of it.

I'd appreciate a copy for myself and one for the doctoral candidate, Nancy, together with any annotations you can add over what is in the 12/19/77 memo, a copy of which I'll send her.

Your REW may be Wannall. Remember I suggested a long time ago that someone make book on all the names and titles and functions. Too much for me. And I can't remember all, either.

Lattinbach's role in this and so much more of which this is typical is despicable. He goes to the 12/9/63 executive session and tells the Commission stories about the FBI (which happened to be true) and then tells the FBI stories about the Commission to be able to control the Commission with the help of the FBI. I suspect that he had something to do with Marshall's decision to let Lattinbach in for the propaganda ploy of the autopsy materials because when Ned Crosby and I had a falling out over all of that nasty business you may recall Ned went to see K and Marshall, K. being on the same Afro-American Institute as Ned. Yes, it had been CIA.

Ned took very strong exception to the chapter ~~///~~ Hades Not Camelot in Post Mortem. I look back on it now and although I was alone in that position then wonder how I could have understated it so much!

It will not be possible for me to make any kind of study or analysis of this behind-the-scenes dirtyworks. It would be very helpful for Jim to have before oral arguments before the appeals court. He thinks there will be an opportunity for further briefing, which would not be far off if true. It would be even more useful there. If there is anything you can add I can't think of a more important use in the present. If you have time, which I doubt.

But if and when you come across anything or think of anything relevant of get in touch with Olney and he adds anything, please let me know. I will pass it on to Nancy, who may find some use for it in her thesis. I am hopeful that her thesis can also be a book. This kind of manipulation of a Presidential Commission and of the Chief Justice is a pretty Byzantine thing.

I don't have to be told - I can guess that as Chief of the Criminal Division Olney was not a Hoover stooge and did not approve what the FBI did that should not be approved. Naturally such a person could not be trusted to be chief counsel of the Commission.

In retrospect, with him having these excellent credentials, too bad he did not become executive director.

Best,