

Dear Jim,

9/28/81

In today's mail, without anything else and without any marks being added, I got from Jimmy the Dallas Lee Atlanta Journal story I sent you after I got it from Jerry.

I don't know why he sent it and I'm not going to try and plumb his mind. I suppose it is part of his mythology about me and the FBI. If so my enclosed letter to him is not one that will comfort his illusions.

The more I read of Garrow's book the more I find myself questioning what he was really seeing. I can dismiss some as attributable to haste, but not all and not really considering the extent of his notes.

For example, I find no reference to the extent of the espionage and campaign against King, none at all, and no mention of what I made available to him, that 400-page inventory of field office records.

While I tell Jimmy it is much understated, it is, in fact, much more than that. For example, I've just finished the chapter in which he goes into the CIA's guy, who he identifies as Jay Richard Kennedy, I think the husband of Lovison's first wife. He goes out of his way to explain away the CIA's effort to switch Kennedy over to the FBI and at no point even indicates that for the CIA this was an entirely illegal and potentially very dangerous thing. That is not mere understatement. It is deliberate covering up.

How could he have received from the agencies what it (properly) withheld from me? Why should they have favored him so? With the names and with information I did not get even with excisions?

Another aspect, if you want to do anything about it or want me to, is going back to the CIA and asking for what is withheld. Now that we can prove it withheld and I presume also lied to the Court, do we want to do anything about that? Even ask for an explanation?

Would it have any effect on the fees we did not get returned, as further bad faith evidence and unintended support of my ignored and accurate allegations?

Except for added details and the identifications of informants, in itself a surprising thing, there really is nothing new in the book and thus no real problem for the spooks and spookeries. With his approach, there is at least a basis for a quid pro quo suspicion. Or the expectation of this kind of what amounts to favorable treatment, for him alone.

Of course it may all be what is the hallmark of modern scholarship.

Best,