

1996 USSF/Catlin

Dear Jim, re FBI/DJ Withholdings relating to surveillance and classifications 4/12/78

While resting from exertion and still wanting to get some work done on the consultancy I decided to check some sources, which did not require dictating, and to have these sources available for citation.

The source I used in this case is the Church Report Vol. III and in connection with what I recall telling John Martin and am sure I wrote him. The pages are attached.

What I was looking for and did find is not, however, the reason for my sending you these pages now. Rather is it for use in court cases, as with GSD withholdings. (It also relates to the unidentified Serial in the OPR appendix, I think 5654.)

You will find that classification was used improperly, that TOP SECRET classification was used on memoranda for the sole purpose of hiding FBI illegal activities against Dr. King. In this case buggings.

If they had by any chance become legal with the authorization of the AG, it is clear he did not authorize them.

It also is clear throughout this part of the report that there was no basis for the "national security" claim and that it was, rather, used for political purposes. These are spelled out by the FBI in terms of its concept of Dr. King's private life and its determination to destroy him and his leadership.

You heard me tell John that I know the FBI used other than FBI agents for conducting some of its surveillances. Here that also is explicit, with descriptions of the people they used. And, of course, citations to FBI files, as is true of the entire Church report.

It thus becomes a simple matter for the FBI to bug and tap and not have the acts listed in its logs of its own "authorized" bugging and tapping.

The Church report is also explicit on the end of "authorization" long before the time reflected in Serial 5654 and the overheard conversation of Arbenathy and Coretta. Yet that record is explicit, the information, if it can be called that, was the result of a wire-tap. In fact authorization had been asked and refused at that time. But there is, nonetheless, the fruit of that tap.

These items are also useful in my FO requests, in 1996 in connection with the surveillance items, on classification and its legitimacy and as a general characterization of the attitude toward compliance and toward the court.

Hastily,