

ES

Pages of Warren Commission Executive Sessions released by Archives 2/15/78 HW 2/22/78

The Deutrich letter forwarding these pages to Jim Lesar does not identify the pages, does not relate the pages and the dates of the sessions, but claims exemptions (b)(5) & (6) for what remains withheld.

My hasty guess is that pages 3-9 are of the 12/5/63 session; pp. 20, 21 and 29 are of the 12/6/63 session and pp. 43-58 are of 12/16/63. I may be wrong in this. It was earlier in the day when I read these.

There is nothing in anything I<sup>n</sup> read to justify the news accounts based on or pursuant to the FBI's releases, that inside the Commission executive sessions there was strong opposition to the Olney appointment. In fact, there was universal approval of him as executive officer, when it was proposed that this function be separate from that of general counsel.

Nor was there any opposition of the nature described in the news accounts. The sole opposition seemed to be and was stated to be that he had had close FBI connections as Chief of the Criminal Division. There was the expressed concern that there should not be anyone who had had such connections as general counsel.

Of course the selection of Rankin ignored similar considerations.

And it is possible that the kind of opposition described developed later and that the expression of it was not in executive session. Ford having reported the consideration of Olney to DeLoach could have triggered it.

P. 3 has an interesting illustration of classification practise, need and pretense: merely to hide the known fact that FBIS was part of CIA.

There is no single adverse reflection on Olney on any page. I also see no reflection on the others who some members considered and whose names are removed. They hide the name of one who if he is alive would now be 88. 74 then. (7)

Boggs protest an "outrageous" leak, attributed to the FBI. CD1? Russell attributed.

Preconception of Oswald's guilt top 43. Bottom, brackets mark what had been removed on Olney. That he was not a relative of Warrens did not fall within any exemption.

Russell expressed his resentment over LBJ's trick in putting him on the Commission. Warren, too. (53)

Much within brackets on 57 not within exemptions.

Warren's word picture of Olney probably explains the opposition that developed to him and that which existed in the FBI against him. Real straight-arrow type, who gave up riches for public service. Olney II, the father, could not persuade III to join what was then the largest firm in the State of California. Father got Warren to talk son into it. Son returned to Warren, then DA or State AG, the Monday after the father died. Such an independent person could not be trusted by the departments, agencies and Fords.

I have not compared this version with the earlier pages released after I ~~started~~ starter suing. I'm assuming that the missing material and what is visible within brackets is what had been withheld, and what is bracketed is what is restored of what had been withheld. All frivolous. All needless and pointless. Reflects mindset opposed to openness in government, not only excessive secrecy. So far as I can determine nothing that remains withheld can be withheld under the AG's policy statement of 5/5/77. And nobody would be hurt by disclosing the withheld names.