

Dear Jim, Re attached 16 pp on Civil Rights records of 7/16, etc. HW 7/19/76

It has taken me more than 25 hours to go over and make notes on the first 31 of the 32 documents Turner conveyed with his letter of the 16th. I have yet to do this with the 32d, the letter to Canale with a list of the categories, the Ray chronology, etc. and I do not expect to be able to get to that until after you leave tomorrow. I have not had a chance to check and separate what I have done. I'll do that first thing in the morning, before the mail so I can go over the interrogatories you have mailed if they come in time.

Considering the number of totally blank pages and the great amounts also masked besides the total voids this represent an extraordinary amount of work. As you will see when you have a chance to read what I've done while I have, as I went through, noted a few other matters, this is virtually entirely addressed to compliance, meaning ~~masking~~ picking up what I could on non-compliance and unjustified masking.

You will find at one point when you read a non-lawyer's interpretation of the language and purpose and intent of the cited exemptions that in virtually all if not in fact every case is fraudulent and I would like to believe, when in belated response to a directive of the court, contemptuous.

While you are finishing up the interrogatories in 1448 I'll finish this up. I expect a treasure trove in the attachments to the Canale letter. I'm so confident I'm close to over-confident.

Without it- and I think it is certain to help what will follow - there is enough in what I went over today to lay a perjury rap on Wiseman and in what we got before enough to assign motive: orders. I want to put all of those together. I am serious about putting it up to Green to keep taking this offensive treatment with his infinite patience. I'd much rather lose and go on to what can advance this whole matter than keep ~~being~~ being bled of the time I do not have and the emotions I cannot spare. Besides, if she rules against us what do we lose? I know Wiseman can claim he did not swear on first-person. Ending that trickery once and for all would be a plus in itself.

When we have the lawyer and of the Civil Rights Division to boot nailed hard and fast on knowing they are withholding, whether or not as I believe engaging in spurious citations of the law as it does not exist, it is solid and it is not the kind of thing anyone in his right mind would dare appeal.

You will find that I have spotted the beginning of the Adams trick/diversion in Civil Rights, not FBI. (This is not to say FBI did not put them up to it. We don't know.) I've laid enough out in what I've written. I can amplify the Intaders part from Church hearings and report. And your attaching Les' stories was brilliant. What he really called Civil Rights for is in the stories but not Murphey's outside contact report! After the Complaint and the Amended Complaint to which Turner said they were responding!

The judge thinks the FBI has something to hide and is hiding it? Let her know they are not alone! It will also give her a chance to do something about the abuse of her and other judges if she can bring herself to rise to that.

We are now 19 days past the last status call and the order has not yet issued. On your really first-rate motion of 6/30 she did rule, with a verbal order, and Dugan did say he had ordered a transcript and would talk to his clients. On the rest the order is not as clear but I think Dugan was to file something first. Considering how little he has ever filed of what he was supposed to we may find another status call when snowdrifts prevent my getting there.

So let me put together what you can draw from. I do not think your motion has to be complicated or time-consuming. I think the substantiation can be. I think we have a doozer on contempt address to Kelley now and I'll lay that out. He ought not sign all letters! I think we are now in a position to demand that he appear and testify. And admit under oath that he lied in a case before a federal court, not just in a public statement. We can if we go that way call Pottinger and I would suggest Horn and Gallagher. Let Gallagher, among other things, testify to a domestic-intelligence operation that has no purpose other than spying on those who disagree with them - one of whom by name and two in fact happen to have been Ray's counsel - and with the case a) under appeal and b) with no federal involvement. Supposedly, that is.

I am not saying I want to go to an immediate evidentiary hearing. I am saying that we are already loaded for it, overloaded, with much more than would be necessary in most cases. And I am saying that instead of asking for depositions or interrogatories, let us give them, including the judge, a choice. Tell them if they do not completely comply without any more of this stonewalling after we supply the proof we invoke the doctrine of the appeals court in cases of this national importance and will move for one and then say we would intend to call at least these people. You do that and they'll have trouble getting to the bathroom in time. Add Murphy and Turner, besides FBI people.

I know you have no doubt that without knowing the words they masked I can tick a lot of it off and from my files be more specific. If I testify only to the trickery of Adams before the church committee they'll be looking for more people to fire and there is no chance Dugan can trip me up on any of this.

We can put the hat on "ilty and Wiseman now. Do I have to tell you about Frazier and Gallagher? can you imagine what the impact would be if you first asked Frazier to look at (unidentified) picture of the tiny fragments from the JFK car, all badly deformed, where he said he could make positive identification, and then show him our pictures of which he said identification was impossible? Do you for a minute think Herb is the only one who would say as he did? What he told me as we left bubba's office is that he wished most of his samples were that good. Much stronger than his understated testimony.

There now, with this minimal compliance, is no question on fact and particularly fact on the deliberateness of non-compliance which has been sworn to by some and represented on his professional honor(?) by Dugan. Fun, man, and a field day for you, Perry Mason, if j.g. still.

We've even got Levi fudging incredibly. Real Hoover gobledgook, and we can have some real good, clean fun with Pottinger and Hornburgh (yeah, need him, too. And Tyler, Shea, Volney Brown.) Man, we'll empty DJ and with a solid, legit. reason for each one.

So, with this for a backstop position, let us move with some vigor when you can for contempt, sanctions, etc.

We can now involve the DAG's office and Civil.

We've had no response from Criminal or OPR. Not just non-compliance. Contempt.

The only real problem we have is time. I'm proposing one way of addressing it very directly and legitimately spectacularly.

When you can I think you want to file a Motion to Produce. I'd limit it to a few things, though. Like their correspondence with Time, Inc et al going back to 4/4/68 and on King only, with Outside Contact forms. (If they don't produce them and don't produce letters what do you think the judge will think with my Time correspondence?) And all the indexes. The judge will only have to glance at them. I mean if they produce only what we can prove, what they gave Canale and he returned, proof of which we have, and the one document I've not gone over. And their Memphis Cointelpro files, for which there is an amply and un-refuted record. We need no more to blow this whole thing. Even if this is an election year and Republicans own most of the media.

As you know for two months now I've been groping for ways to move us off dead ~~center~~ center. We now have new ways. The only question is do we use them? If you do not have much preparation for ~~the~~ 75-226 on the 28th we can do some before then. I do not think it will hurt in that case! Besides, you can have a great time giving excerpts from the remand to Green. It says precisely what she has been saying. Only we have to get her to do something other than merely say. Be us!

Best,