Dear Dave, 9/13/79

FER paper makes a fascinating study. It is always self-serving, the first law being the protection of the Bureau, and its fidelity to fact if not its heresty must unfortunately always be questioned. (Caisadense distortions and unreal interpretations are more common than outright lies.) The riddles will never be solved, undoubtedly one of the original intenitions, because too many securingly reasonable interpretations are possible and the great mass of the paper complicates this while also being a maps of denial of access. Who can find anything in more than 100,000 pages, or be sure there is not a contradictory records?

One of the nore factheting questions to we is the meaning to be given to the notes

Off and on for years I've heard questions asked about how much in control he was at the time of the JFK assassination - meaning compared with the control he exercised before than. More recently an former agent suggested to me that by then the "palace go rd" had tuken over.

There is an unreality to some of these notes and they always appear to be self-serving, yet there is also the suggestion that the old man might not have known otherwise. Certainly all the paper created, the special formulations employed could have led him to believe that his notes reflect, yet it is not easy to believe.

Lately I've been reading the Commission file (62-109090) from the beginning. I'm in the eigth section. There are more of his notes per page in these sections than in the many others I've read as I've worked my way through the records.

actual control doover was that I call this to your attention.

It is almost as though all the records were created to form his mind. But there is a difference between this being the purpose and the effect.

Comprehension is impossible without subject expertise. Those without detailed factual knowledge are certain to be sisled by this great volume of bureaucratic paper and what it says.

descriptions of Warren are as his enemy, of Warren and the Commission being out to get the FBI, which could hardly be farther from the truth. He extered all sorts of things to avoid this, or what he enticipated that wasn't there.

Yet it seems impossible that in his compaints about the FEI taking what he called a narrow view of Commission requests he was not aware of the FEI's pruposes in taking narrow views - not to disclose what a correct interpretation of Commission requests would have required on led to. (An example is the FEI's omission of Hosty from its betyping of the Commissional addressbook.)

The palitical manipulations are important and clear enough although probably far from complete. The use of the right extreme in the Conress is apparent, as are the relationships. So is the forming of the conclusions the Consission could or would reach prior to its beginnings, the manipulations to prevent Warren Olney from being general counsel and gotting mankin in - the FMI and hoover liked him based on past experiences with him.

Whenever anything was written about any request from the Commission that anyone a in the FoI hierarchy wight have had a question about or that could be taken as criticism the record always began with an account of the praise Rankin heaped on the FMI for its great work. It that record seashed hoover... and of course, with what it know of his and the FMI the Commission would likely have taken this kind of approach. But it was never questioned in any record. ... Recrything the FMI did was right and everyone also was wrong or its enemy. The parameter also is clear enough. ... This hasty note intended only as a gride to a faccinating publies all the pieces of which will never be put in place.