

Dear Dave,

9/17/84

The main thing I had in mind in sending you the hasty draft of what I plan for the first chapter of *The King Conspiracies* was to get your opinion about beginning that way. You have done much more than that, and it is helpful and I appreciate your taking the time. But what I sent is only a sketch of what I plan to do. I do plan some of if not all of the things you suggest.

As you will have gathered, I've been busy and interrupted often. I've now put JL in a position to do what has never been done to the CIA in an FOIA case in court, and I can only wonder if he has it in him. Or perhaps get it out of himself, do it. He has the ability, no doubt at all.

And I'm trying to get a little exercise, have a little fun of the few kinds still available, and ditto for enjoyment. But for the past several days I've given the outdoor work up and been at the desk. There is still a little of the baseball season left and I sit and take the games in with Lil. Noe once a week the Redskins games instead of the daily baseball games. A little of public TV, the great nature stuff on occasion, sometimes *Masterpiece Theater*.

I've sent Theoharis a large package, have a little more for him and some searching to do to locate what he wants, my subject copies (Hoover's WC testimony editing) having disappeared.

What is one problem I faced in the draft, particularly re the B'ham indictment and not trusting the USA at Memphis: I could not locate the copies I'd made and filed. Ditto for the advance threat file, which I recall retrieving and copying for JL in the recent past, and that I can't blame on some of the careless girls I had working from time to time. So, I wanted first to get it on paper in more than outline form, see how it felt, and then flesh it out. I may do some of that as I can, imperfectly, before setting out to do it in more or less final form. I feel much better if I have the books started, even though I did whitewash out of order, the easiest/fastest chapters first.

I plan doing some of the things you suggest separately, in a preface and an introduction. There will be an account of the litigation and my personal investigations in them, before Ch 1. And something about Frameupo so I can refer back to it instead of duplicating it.

I'm far from finished what will be a long chapter and I've got to remember to get a pocket-sized pad to take me with me during morning therapy. This morning I thought of still another type of illustration, the ordered and executed perjury of the Atlanta SAC swearing that there had not been any blake-bag job on Ray to bracket with the report to him on it and then to trace how the loot was hand-delivered to the Lab. Also the FBI's self-description on unlawfulness and constitutional rights, the memos on wiretapping the Rays, then the proof. There will be details enough, and what is in the back of my mind is making this a Part 1 instead of a chapter one, a Part 1 on the FBI Nobody Knows. Any thoughts on that? It will be an indictment of the FBI of a kind I do not recall ever having heard was ever done, in its own words and documents.

The main thing is that you like beginning that way, with the book on the King assassination. That is the question I had. But it will be a book on the FBI also, with perhaps a little on the CIA and what it did to King.

What I have in the back of my mind and will not initiate now is asking Rae to come back and dig up the documents and citations, after the draft is completed. She may or may not have decided by then what she will do with her life, after her career as mother to her entire family is over, and I don't think that will be until after her grandparents are dead. She is having problems, didn't respond to my last couple

of letters, some time ago, and I do not want to even appear to intrude.

9/18. It's been a little hectic, with Lil struggling to get the affidavit retyped on a lousy loaner typewriter while her's languishes in the repair shop for months. I was interrupted last night and then thought of writing Lardner, so I did that and

other things instead of resuming. A few more comments while Lil is making the copies I'll be mailing at the p.o. when she's done.

I agree entirely about the map of the area and have something even better in mind, without having decided whether a map also would be useful. I've official area photos, from the FBI. I've a copy of its work for its mockup, a picture of its mockup which I have special use for, and I'd also thought that I might want to make a tracing of the city map separately. The detail at the firehouse is quite important, and I have my own pix of some of it, including JL standing alongside the wall with his arm up to indicate the height. I've my own picture of the flophouse corridor, too. But so you can understand, there is possible use for a map of more than the immediate area, not just the close vicinity.

There will be much on FBI files, where again you are quite right. Inevitably some will be in the intro. but I may also have a separate chapter on them and how they are used to hide by inappropriate file classification, the magnitude of the operation against King, etc. Perhaps as a separate appendix. But at the beginning I plan at least a general description of the FBI's relevant files, HQ and field office, the special index and what it indexed, etc.

When I clean up and can get back to this I'll probably write you further. But I do not want to forget to thank you and I'm glad you feel that this is a good way to begin. So be it!

Best to all,

Dear Harold

Enclosed are my random thoughts + annotations on your c.I.

Everyplace I sat down I found a different colored pen! Kide!

I think you build the basic idea quite excellently.

I would like to do this again on Chapter I if you would put it down in another draft.

Dave

Re Chapter I King book typescript.

One technical difficulty in reading the pages is the repeated use of "it" and "that" within the text, especially when referring to the FBI.

Also, on a couple of occasions I got lost (temporarily) running up against double negatives which are not typical in the type of reading I usually do and my mind has to adjust. ~~xxx~~ I think you ought to eliminate every one of them.

Also, if possible the names of persons, places and things ought to go into the text wherever possible in order to build authenticity and credentials for the savvy of the author. When Ray goes into the store in Birmingham give its name, street address, size, and what not. Your FOIA lawsuit ought to be pegged pretty distinctly within the text too, more so than you are doing. Give its dates, number, formal citation ~~number~~, <sup>W.V. FBI?</sup>--all this enhances the aura of scholarship to the readers who think in those terms. Some times ~~xxxxxx~~ in referring to the case you use asides to make important points about lying and other things. These interrupt the flow of the text and also are so important they ought to stand by themselves in a sentence or two.

The FBI remains as "it" throughout the text. I wish ~~mm~~ you could (and probably you gave it thought and rejected it) give the full names and titles of the FBI agents or officials when they crop up--who filed the ~~mm~~ conspiracy charges, who wrote the Memphis DA was untrustworthy, etc. who in the bureaucracy accepted it or ordered it.

You will have to explain what a FBI file is. I know this is a dumb sounding thing, but people do not know. A phrase or a short sentence.

Throughout you have too many "was" constructions; it is very different from WHITEWASH I.

On the main point: I think the way you opened up the chapter and built it up to the end is excellent and works quite well. I suppose I would try to add spice and stamp of authenticity from your files with a phrase or word in quotes with an occasional complete reference to a typical document, (not just the reproduction).

On the cover the ass subjects I feel you ought to add a preliminary sentence or two to your illustrations. I had to search for the meaning, ie., to make clear what was being covered and why the FBI agent had to do it.

The text breaks into natural subsections. Did you consider sub-heddings ~~whi~~ within the text? Examples below:

The FBI Campaigns Against King

FBI Foreknowledge of the Crime

The Conspiracy Fallacy

The Bureau Wrests Control of the Case From Locals

The Byzantine Nature of Control

While it is obvious from the text you have done the research in original documents etc. and have consulted all kinds of things, I truly feel you ought to have a chapter note detailing the main sources for the main points within the chapter. This could be a page or a paragraph. Thus; the main source for the London extradition proceedings are to be found in XYZ; the Hanes/ Hugie conflict with justice appears in CVB; the inventory to the FBI field files is entitled MNX and its finding number is 123. etc.

As I see it you require a sketh map of the Lorraine Hotel murder scene.( not the rooming house area) and a brief map putting in Birmingham, Memphis, D.C., among others. For photographs you will need a good ones of Hoover, Carla D., Willaam Cole, Hanes, Huie. Would the FBI give you photos? Would the publicity office of D of J give one of Cole?

? = means I am not certain of the fact.  
? = a possible alternative phrase, etc.  
A = can you add to the text at this point  
Chapter 1

X = obscurity in text for me as a reader (altho I can figure out your meaning). Add a phrase or so to clarify

April 4, 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., leaned  
At 6:01 p.m., as he was leaning over the black metal railing of the Lorraine Motel, chatting with associates gathered in the parking lot below, a single 30-06 bullet smashed into his face, running around the second story, so to clarify  
? Martin Luther King, Jr. He died instantaneously.

That was in "emphis, Tennessee.

[Two weeks to the day later,] [James Earl Ray, a petty criminal with no history of any violent crimes and an escapee from the Missouri State Penitentiary,] was [charged] by [the Federal Bureau of Investigation] [with that killing.]

That was in Birmingham, Alabama. Not Memphis, where the crime was committed. Birmingham, where no crime was committed.

Why Birmingham, where no crime was committed, and not Memphis, where the "black Messiah," the black Nobel laureate, man of peace, of nonviolence, was assassinated?

[At the time] this [troubled] [the press] [little] for everyone was relieved that, after two weeks, the FBI seemed to be getting somewhere.

At the time, too, the FBI had its reasons, although it ~~was~~ carefully kept them secret, even from the attorney general himself -- ~~and~~ even though he is, supposedly, over the FBI, which is but one of many parts of the Department of Justice.

The FBI's reason, kept secret for years, is buried in more than 60,000 pages of tight guarded Bureau records, obtained in one of the longest of all the many Freedom of Information lawsuits filed in the Federal District Court of Washington, D.C.

The FBI's reason, as stated in records ~~is~~ never expected to be seen by anyone, is that the United States Attorney in Memphis was not to be trusted.

The chief prosecutor for the area, the man responsible for all federal cases within the jurisdiction of that federal court, the man selected by the President and the Department of Justice, whose appointment had to be and had been approved by the Congress, was untruthworthy -- to the FBI.

The FBI ~~which~~ was extraordinarily careful not to let anyone else know, not the Attorney General and not the President and not the people through the press, that it regarded the Memphis United States Attorney as ~~utterly~~ unworthy of trust, not to be entrusted with the prosecution in this most costly and most terrible of crimes. Its real reason, carefully kept out of its records, will become apparent.

Under federal law murder, ordinarily, is not a federal crime. The assassination of King could, however, be a federal crime under the civil rights act, but only if it was the end product of a conspiracy to deprive King of his civil rights by assassinating him.

Without alleging ~~that there had been~~ a conspiracy when ~~there~~ not a shred of

Is this a case of...?

?

?

must give his name

X for not trusting the D.A.?

of any type or on what or what?

A Right here can you quote a pertinent document which would carry the point?

Ought you to add - that was not the...

X finance or social or moral

A. ought you to add a quote from the federal law - a phrase or two words even to enhance - indirectly - your knowledge of sources?

~~that~~

<sup>accepted for</sup> proof of any conspiracy, the FBI <sup>lacked</sup> had no jurisdiction. ~~It~~ would have been legal ~~for it~~ to provide (some services to local authorities) but then ~~it~~ <sup>the Bureau</sup> would not have had control of the case, and control is the name of the FBI's game (in political cases.)

In this case, because the FBI had waged a bitter and incredible indecent and illeg~~al~~ illegal campaign against King, ~~it had~~ even greater need for control ~~drove the Bureau.~~  
A 7 4 It had planted defamatory stories about him in the press, J. Edgar Hoover, longtime FBI director, had characterized him as the greatest liar in the country, it had wiretapped his home, his office, his <sup>South</sup>er Christian Leadership Conference offices, his hotel rooms when he travelled and spoke, and it even bugged his home and office ~~without authorization and without seeking authorization.~~ <sup>all</sup> ~~without~~ <sup>even bothering to</sup> ~~seeking~~ authorization.

It had sought the attorney egeneral's approval for some wiretapping by virtually blackmailing ~~the later to be assassinated~~ Robert F. Kennedy with the complete fabrication that King was dominated by Communists. But ~~it~~ <sup>Hoover and his assistants</sup> didn't even bother to ~~ask him~~ <sup>the President's brother</sup> to agree to its bugging.

The extent of ~~its~~ <sup>FBI's</sup> operations against King and the astounding amount of <sup>public</sup> tax money spent in this <sup>unrestrained</sup> campaign that became an FBI vendetta, remained secret until the fifth year of my FOIA lawsuit, ~~was in its fifth year.~~ Then, ~~after an assortment of FBI lies to her over a period of months did not mislead her,~~ Federal District Court Judge June L. Green compelled ~~it to disclose to me~~ <sup>to disclose to me</sup> the FBI's records which reflect the unprecedented effort of a federal agency, the FBI, to ruin a preacher it did not like and whose views were anathema to it.

<sup>are these the files?</sup> An inventory only - and an entirely incomplete inventory at that - of merely the listing of the files of the FBI's 59 field offices, runs to 402 pages. And this is but a listing of the enormous collection of records of the FBI's spying and other persecutions of the martyred King. <sup>one file listay could be an inch thick or several feet thick!!</sup>

[This listing inventory] was contrived by [FBI He headquarters] [to appear to be complete] ~~but it wasn't.~~ <sup>an illusion, a simulation</sup> Control being the name of the FBI's game, it gave the appearance of completeness while assuring incompleteness by FBIHQ's directives to the field offices.

The inst utions to the field offices, without mention of the FBI's multitudinous reels of tapes of its spying on King, was intended to order the field offices not to include them and not a single field office did include any of them. Not a single reel when in fact there was so many reels of tapes that, according to the sworn testimony of a former FBI special agent who had personal knowledge, in Atlanta alone the electronic spying operation yielded so much tape the FBI rented ~~an apartment~~ <sup>an apartment</sup> which also kept the entire thing secret from those not directly involved in its efforts to ruin King

Add a phrase or sentence to serve as transition

a good adjective  
A number of FOIA suit

are these the files?

Expand a bit

not clear at all take out negatives

this word stands out in a reader's minds Can you not use a phrase or add a sentence to show how you know it intended?

what is this to a reader?

this is an example of it not of the above paragraph?

then and possess more an enormous public relations component active in playing the press.

Only a week before he was assassinated, the FBI had pulled one of the dirtiest of its <sup>many</sup> vicious tricks on King. The FBI plants stories and leaks all the time and then lies and claims innocence. I was able to reconstruct its machinery for this through FOIA litigation, <sup>the validity of my statements on</sup> and it is beyond question. The particular nastiness of the <sup>many weeks</sup> week days before the assassination followed violence in Memphis, violence from which the Memphis police removed King to a distant hotel for safety. Knowing this, that neither King nor anyone in his party had selected that white-owned hotel, the FBI planted stories that portrayed him as a coward and as a fourflusher for not staying at the black-owned, <sup>ing</sup> Lorraine. And it did this knowing full well, as its own records state explicitly, King had always stayed at the Lorraine, on at least eight occasions to the FBI's knowledge.

The FBI had other and secret reasons for asserting and keeping control of the case. <sup>Bureau agents</sup> It had had King under intermittent surveillance as he travelled to Memphis, yet he had been assassinated. And much more serious and until now secret, it had been warned in advance that he would be assassinated!

And <sup>the FBI</sup> it didn't even warn him or any of his associates. This, too, the FBI kept secret and when I learned about it, <sup>their agents, lawyers, and ...</sup> lied persistently to Judge Green to withhold those records in that lawsuit. Through its counsel, William Cole, of the Justice Department's Civil Division, <sup>the FBI</sup> it stoutly maintained, in its words, that the entire file was "utterly irrelevant." Even though the file itself was titled as a "threat" against <sup>King!</sup>

If citizens lie and the lie is material and under oath, that <sup>lies is</sup> is the felony of perjury. When Department of Justice lawyers lie to federal courts, that ~~they~~ lie is ignored and their <sup>better word?</sup> excesses are regarded as merely diligent practise of the adversary system of justice.

In order to keep its advance knowledge that King would be assassinated secret <sup>hide the truth of</sup> even if it were required to search for records relating to the crime, the Memphis FBI, after filing the first records in this existing file, merely established a new file and pretended that all its records were in this new file.

So, the FBI had many reasons for keeping control of the case. <sup>And control turned on a charge of</sup> And it had to alleged a civil-rights conspiracy, <sup>with that the FBI could</sup> to assert jurisdiction which <sup>and thus</sup> could give it control.

Add quote from A plant in FBI files story - to the uninitiated whole means 99% this sounds like hypothesis without a document reference via quote or citation

fundamental? maybe add name of hotel

this is particularly awkward I think 3 or 4 sentences ought to do



But ~~the~~ <sup>FBI</sup> had no evidence of any conspiracy at all. Absolutely none.

And in order to obtain approval for its <sup>rogue</sup> conspiracy charge it had to ~~have the~~ <sup>in the Birmingham district</sup> ~~approval of the~~ "this approval in the jurisdiction in which it filed those charges" <sup>away</sup>

It knew very well that it could not get away with that in Memphis; therefore it did not dare try. This is what it did not trust the United States Attorney over, <sup>not anything at all untrustworthy in his record.</sup>

Ray had bought a rifle in Birmingham. [the week before King was assassinated.] There were several witnesses to this purchase. Another customer in that store <sup>with Ray that day later</sup> told

the FBI what Ray had said, when he returned the smaller caliber rifle back for a .30-06 Remington Gamemaster pump gun that he was going to hunt deer in Wisconsin with an unnamed brother. The FBI seized upon this, the ~~single~~ report that Ray said he planned to hunt deer - in Wisconsin - to allege a conspiracy to assassinate King!

Incredible as this may seem, it is no less incredible that the FBI persisted from the outset that Ray was a lone assassin - that there never was any conspiracy at all!

But it got away with its baseless charge in Birmingham, kept clear of the "untrustworthy" United States Attorney in Memphis, and was able to control the case.

Actually, <sup>the Bureau</sup> it has entered the case immediately, without authorization from the general attorney, authorization it claimed to have but was unable to produce in my FOIA suit. The records establishing that it did enter the case immediately were originally filed in that allegedly "irrelevant" Memphis file <sup>which attorney</sup> Cole lied to Judge Green <sup>in order</sup> to keep out of my hands. <sup>the</sup> file of ~~its~~ its advance warning that Dr. King would be killed when he returned to Memphis.

? In political matters and when faced with embarrassment over its inept deeds, reconstructions and <sup>of FBI activities</sup> Nothing is too Byzantine for the FBI, which is Byzantine in political matters and when it fears embarrassment. <sup>the</sup> Its first law is "cover the Bureau's ass." The second, as former special agents have told me, is "cover your own ass."

For example, Robert G. Jensen, special agent in charge of the FBI's Memphis field office, covered his own ass with several memos <sup>lodged in that secret</sup> to file I finally got.

X this must be explained earlier on or it must be clarified a bit. What does "get away with" mean? get away with what?

proof, make etc. detail

add how that Ray returned at time etc. to keep really established

X can this be re written the latter part is another

declaration of duty the FBI becomes pygmalion.

Then for two months of its most massive manhunt, the FBI never got close to Ray. In fact, it had nothing at all to do with his capture. He blundered into the hands of Scotland Yard in England.

Getting Ray back to the United States to be tried required extradicting him. This, too, got Byzantine.

The extradition treaty is explicit, political crimes are not extradictable.

The FBI had alleged assassinating Dr. King was a civil rights conspiracy, a political crime, and in this it had the ex post facto approval of the Department of Justice.

Therefore, having escaped to England, Ray was not extradictable.

But the FBI had to have him and have him stand trial, as did the rest of the government and the country.

So, the Department of Justice merely lied to the British court, which welcomed ~~the~~ <sup>Ray</sup> lying and would have ordered Ray extradicted under any circumstances, treaty or no treaty, and assured the British court that Ray's was not in any sense a political crime. *→ move this here and make a separate sentence*

But just to make sure that Ray was extradicted, the Department of Justice included an additional charge that became still another violation of the extradition treaty. The treaty requires that the man extradicted be tried only on the charge for which he is extradicted. The Department of Justice added the charge that Ray was an escapee, an extradictable charge.

He was not, however, extradicted on that charge. But if he had been, he could not legally have been tried for assassinating Dr. King!

The London court accepted the Department's obvious lie that assassinating Dr. King was not a political crime and Ray was extradicted.

If all of this were not complication enough, ~~were not the violent raping of law and treaty obligation~~, it got even more complicated, <sup>even</sup> more of an abuse of our system of justice, as it would have been of any system of justice, ~~what a mess~~

*Can you give name of the court? Even at street address?*

*Two long a sentence*

*A highly*  
1 successful and wealthy writer, William Bradford Huie, of Hartselle, Alabama, contracted with Ray's lawyer for the exclusive rights to Ray's story, <sup>Huie</sup> which he interpreted <sup>"rights"</sup> to mean as a confession <sup>of guilty given</sup> exclusively to him, <sup>Ray's</sup> lawyer <sup>badly</sup> contracted to place <sup>the interests of a professional writer's</sup> rights above <sup>his client's</sup> ~~rights~~.

This Lawyer, Arthur Hanes, Sr., has quit the FBI because he found it too liberal. He was mayor of Birmingham, Alabama, when its police chief turned dogs trained to be vicious and firehoses on black demonstrating peacefully. Hanes also represented racists, like the Klansmen charged with killing the Michigan housewife and mother, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, when she was part of the freedom marches in the south.

So tight was the FBI's control it knew the content of Ray's communications with his lawyers (after Ray was extradicted to Memphis.) It had copies of his letters to the trial judge before they entered the mails. For nine months Ray was not able ~~to~~ even to urinate or wash in private. He was, as the <sup>of Justice</sup> Department itself arranged, under 24-hour closed-circuit television surveillance, with an accompanying sound system which picked up ever sound he made, even when he slept.

*Doesn't the FBI investigate? Ought it to add a sentence to make more solid*

The FBI's control extended even to the investigation, although the charge on which Ray was to have been tried was a state charge and was to have been in the local courts. The details of this are a major part of this book.

Extra space, go back and amplify and document.

Any honest book on the King assassination necessarily is also a book on the FBI, an FBI few Americans know and understand. While this understanding can come from the FBI's own records here published and analyzed for the first time, because so few Americans have had occasion to know the real FBI in the self-portraiture of its own records, which so few Americans have ever seen and I alone have seen in the form in which they appear in this book, I begin with its own political control and domination of both the investigation and of what people could know and believe. *must allow*

*Does this mean general public - now? then?*

SAC must be spelled out for the general reader

Although no FBI record I have seen <sup>places</sup> records the precise moment <sup>of</sup> by whom Memphis SAC Jensen was informed that King had been shot, he learned <sup>of it</sup> only minutes (at most) after it happened. He immediately P phoned FBIHQ. It, in turn, was back to him rapidly.

If the FBI's records are to be trusted, there was no FBI SA at the scene of the crime, despite its receipt of a real threat and despite the responsibilities that are its because of the civil rights act.

when was this question in the Ray case?

When Jensen <sup>1.</sup> was <sup>2.</sup> questioned <sup>3.</sup> by <sup>4.</sup> the Memphis prosecutor both were concerned that details <sup>of what</sup> ~~should~~ not be on the record. Jensen was not asked and he did not testify <sup>they avoided touching on</sup> to the source of his first knowledge that King had been shot. He then placed the time at 6:05. He also <sup>Jensen</sup> ~~did not testify~~ <sup>find the fact</sup> that FBIHQ had ordered him to take control of the case. He testified merely that after he informed FBIHQ he sent his own agents out at 6:30. (Frameup 140)

name

X

<sup>as</sup> Indefinite and evasive <sup>as it was</sup> as it was, Jensen's testimony also was untruthful. It <sup>telling of the shooting</sup> is not he who received the phone call, <sup>is clear on this</sup> according to his own contemporaneous cover-my-ass memo to "FILE 100-4105" <sup>got called on the news</sup> but one of a pair of special agents he had engaged <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ spy <sup>not law enforcement matters</sup> on black activities, <sup>not law enforcement matters</sup>

(Use in facsimile)

this triple negative throws me

Note that the information received by the ~~FBI~~ Memphis FBI office <sup>said</sup> was only ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> "KING had reportedly been shot." Not that he had been killed, not even that there was no doubt about his having been shot. Note also that of all the FBIHQ divisions Jensen could have called, <sup>to relay the news</sup> he phoned ~~the~~ domestic intelligence division, the <sup>same</sup> division <sup>directed to</sup> that had persecuted and spied on King.

Jensen's next cover-my-ass memo  <sup>dug out of</sup> to the same file indicates that he did not hear from FBIHQ until after he had sent his agents out on the case, at 6:35:

(Use in facsimile)

Of all the FBI officials who might have phoned Jensen, it was Cartha DeLoach, who ~~was~~ headed the Orwellian-titled "Crimes Records Division" but who actually was

What is the significance of this?

Hoover's chief propagandist and lobbyist. DeLoach presided over the multitudinous leaks it invariably denied leaking. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ The FBI's campaign against King under him was of unprecedented extent and viciousness.

DeLoach appears to have lied to Jensen in ordering him to tell the press "that we are investigating at the specific request of the Attorney General." There is no such request from Attorney General Ramsey Clark, the FBI was not able to produce any such requ record when a search was made for it in ~~the~~ my FOIA suit, and when, much later, the FBI first heard from anyone in the Justice Department it heard from the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division.

And this when it did not know that King was dead or even the extent of his injuries.

After the FBI realized it had to hide its forewarning it established a new main file to hide that fact. <sup>new file came into being</sup> But before then, ~~designated~~ Jensen, ~~designated~~ before the secretary <sup>his memos</sup> typed his memos, ~~that~~ designated filing in 100-4405. In the FBI's file classification system, 100 is a "subversive" file, "\*\*\* Subversive Matter (individuals); internal security (organizations); Domestic Security Investigations." The FBI's attitude is reflected that a threat to kill King, even after the attempt, was filed under King as an alleged subvernive.

this is  
hardly  
read