Dear Jim, 7/19/83

Some time ago I told you that a columnist, Tom Tiede, had spoken to me at length about what I understood was to be a commemorative magazine article. It is in today's local paper, enclosed. Although I'm sure he made notes, with the passing of time his recollection dimmed and he is wrong on a couple of attributions, not in quotes. And, obviously, not what I said. And these errors just happen to be the kind the FBI could enjoy passing around.

Obviously, I do not belelieve t at the significant withheld information is in the Archives. I'm not suing it, am I? I believe and from the first have believed that the significant withheld info is in the executive agencies.

He does not quote me on the autopsy material because I expressed a different view than he appears to have wanted.

My suits are not for classified information, as he says. As you know. There is a difference between proper classification and improper withholding.

I did not say that there was a conspiracy that "may have involved U.S. government coplicity" and I certainly did not say that "the FBI was pincipally involved" in this. Where I said it broke the law was restricted to FOIA cases. The example with which he follows makes it clear that I was not talking about FBI involvement in the crime itself, the example of its phonying evidence about the tie and shirt collar.

As you know, I would not and did not say that there was a hole in the tie itself. It is and I have always referred to it as a nick.

I guess it just os not possib;e to avoid this kind of journalistic inaccuracy, particularly when the columnist appears to have his own view to espouse through others he uses as sources.

Where he errs is where I have a long and consistent record of saying the same thing for years and it is not at all what he says I said.

With regard to the Anderson column, they may be holding something that is essentially undated or they may have decided against it. I don't know. Les considered it a lead item or the major one of that day.

Best,