

Dear Jim,

Archives/CA7501448

7/25/76

After you phoned and later when I got to thinking it appeared that the Archives 1968 letter you found is significant in ways that include this case. However, I'm not entirely sure I understood and it is possible that for that period I might find more such letters if I know the subject.

If that 1968 letter constitutes a promise to send me all as it becomes available ~~that~~ then it is something I've forgotten. All of that nature I recall has to do with specific requests, as on medical/autopsy.

Some years ago Howard did a very methodical, careful and lucid card index of my Archives correspondence. I've forgotten where it cuts off. Probably about three years ago. But to there is ~~it~~ is the best job possible.

If I know the subject I can give you every citation to the cutoff point. It may be under more than one subject.

The purpose was to check the correspondence by subject.

I presume this has to do with the suggested added interrogatories for Rhoads.

After reading the Shea affidavit in 76-432 I believe the interrogatories in 1448 are more important and I'll explain why as I did not by phone.

In the course of boasting how over-worked and how careful they are Shea actually said that on appeal he over-ruled the FBI and others below the DAG's review office. In itself this is a fantastic self-indictment, that in more than half the cases review shows the decisions on compliance to have been that wrong. Here, of course, is also an absolutely fantastic percentage of their FOIA costs in time and money - and compliance.

However, there just is no way a review office can know what is and is not public. Take as an example the B'ham telegram you'll find mentioned in the new 1996 affidavit. Unless the people in Shea's office are particularly sharp and honest they might well assume that those names should have been masked for privacy. In fact they are all published, extensively, and all are in other records I obtained in 718-70.

So you have a system where what should not be withheld is more than half the time and even then the reviewing authority has no way of knowing if added withholding, which need not be masking only, is also unjustified.

In what I did re CIA after you were here there is very much of that and it is all attributable to Briggs. While what is relevant before Robinson is CIA and Briggs and, of course, Archives, what I'm telling you is the position of the Justice Department in these political cases. And the reality in those cases.

In this sense, of its being government policy and Briggs' honesty and intent, do you think that if only as a reviewer he did not see the record they gave me showing they deliberately withheld from Warner what the searchers knew to be relevant? Or that he really looked at those of my military records I finally got and did not they had to be incomplete? Or that the first time around he did not know they could not be withheld? Or that somehow I left OSS and their records do not show it? Well, this is indicative of the kind of person he is. But then he gets a Bud record that mentions me. He apparently did not review that one or forgot. So he masks all except my name on me, after not ~~giving~~ giving it to me at all earlier when they have already released the entire document.

If we have any problem with Robinson I think we'll want to make the case that there is a special policy on me. We have seven cases in court and a number just short to cite, all one way. With memo of transfer it is a beaut. They intercept, suppress after that long history and then fall far short and then don't send me on that acknowledged standing and accepted request what they have since given Howard, who gave it to me. He may still want to use it first. This will make more sense of the record you've put together in the transcripts matter/handling. Best,

C