

Mr. Tom Susman, Counsel  
Administrative Practises Subcommittee  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C.

2/20/77

Dear Tom,

I have just finished reading and marking up what has been retitled the "Report of the Department of Justice Task Force to Review the Martin Luther King, Jr. Security and Assassinations Investigations."

It is a work of the most conspicuous and deliberate dishonesty, another official effort to further protect malefactors and endanger popular leaders, or in the words of some of my titles, a whitewash and a coverup.

I will be writing about it. I write you for your information and if you see fit for that of the Senator.

What is hidden is that this is a job by the misnamed Office of Processional Responsibility. With the authorship hidden the report praises that Office "as an effective means for intra-departmental policing of the Bureau." (P. 147) It is in fact an agency for preventing policing by pretending it. I know that I am responsible for publicizing the serious conflicts of interest and other OPR abuses. I think Jim Lesar also did in court. OPR engaged in such practises as taking physical possession of records called for in my FOIA action and refusing to provide them and in refusing even to acknowledge receipt of charges of deliberate perjury by an FBI FOIA agent. This perjury relates directly to the report, which omits any reference to the essential evidence of the crime about which there was this repeated perjury compounded by lies about it in court by the AUSA. The agent swore to a search of the index in which this evidence is listed and swore that it does not exist. One example is pictures of the scene of the crime. Aside from odds and ends I have one batch of 107 and one of 47 and I can itemize others from these those indexes.

The dishonesty is so total that in my long experience there is nothing comparable. I have records essential and ignored and totally opposite what the report says. My present plan is to bracket the language of the report with these records.

Of the other existing records ~~it ignores~~ while quoting openly biased and angled books as dependable sources <sup>ignores</sup> is the one and only time there was any testing of evidence in open court and under oath, the two weeks of evidentiary hearings in Memphis in October 1974. One would never know from this volume that there was one. Or that Ray testified in it. This is even lied about by saying the last statement by "Ray available is an earlier one to a reporter.

I could go on and on with specifics.

As I have told you I have no confidence in the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Quite aside from what has been in public controversy it has a very bad record, has engaged in propaganda and not investigation and begins with preconceptions that happen also to be opposed by the burden of the evidence. Whatever its chances of survival are my belief is that its end would be the lesser evil.

If there is anyone whose obligations are oversight, administrative practises or constitutional rights or anything else, before too long I hope to have this all put together, with thousands of documents with which to back it up, precisely those records supposedly included in this "review." If I do not believe Congressional use would be without hazard I do believe it would meet one of the more urgent national needs.

Sincerely,