

0692 affidavit of Salliann Dougherty 1/10/78

I am the plaintiff in 75-1996, which includes records of the CRD relating to the assassination of Dr. King, its official investigation and certain other related political matters and their investigation; that I have received such papers from the CRD, piecemeal as they were dribbled out and parts originally withheld later were released.

That these records regularly withhold what is well-known as public domain. That it is apparent those who have processed these records are not familiar with the extensive literature in the field and are not familiar with the Department's extensive files of newspaper ~~clippings~~ clippings on the subject.

These people either are ignorant and not in a position to know whether what they are withholding is known or they are misusing the exemptions to withhold, not uncommonly to withhold what could be embarrassing to the government.

It is not true that she has even located "all Division documents responsive to such requests" because I personally had to call to her attention where some not within her Division had been moved and that I did this on November 11, 1977. Friday

With the bottom of p. 5 I'd ask what law was being enforced. This wretched stuff was collected for political reasons having nothing to do with a law. King was never accused of being a spy. Same as I've said before about "disclosing" what she calls "investigative techniques and procedures." All of these, on King, are public.

In Par 10 she says the documents in Item 2 were "classified by the FBI." She does not state when they were classified. The Preusse affidavit refers to classifications after the date of the requests and even of the appeal. As I recall all of those to which P. attested follow the request in being classified. She here refers to him as reviewer, again giving no date.

The last paragraph is detached into meaningless and confusion. She says that as a result of the review some documents were declassified. But the Preusse affidavit is clear that of those he lists none were classified before the review. It can't be both ways.

Here she unbags a cat at the very bottom, exactly what I kept suggesting, that b1 is used "since disclosure thereof would reveal the most sensitive of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's national security informants in certain organizations."

In toto this is false under FOIA standards. She lets it out because she is a college educated ignoramus. The Preusses, who are more adept at misuse of the Act, avoided giving any reason for the b1 withholding.

First of all these were not "national security informants." They were political operatives engaged in a Counterpro operations not concerned with national security but with improper disruption.

I have been give many hundreds of such pages by the FBI in which it withheld that would could identify informants.

She does not here swear that none of the withheld is reasonable segregable. ~~this~~ This means that the withholding is improper and for other purposes. Among these, from my knowledge of the matter, high in the list would be to continue to hide the details of the evil things the FBI did to Dr. King, in which it has been protected by the Department, including, to my knowledge from review of the records, by the CRD.

Par 11: I doubt it is possible for any of the info to qualify for TOP SECRET.

14: the material then released, continued to withhold the public domain, as with Levison as the same example. (I don't want to tell them of others.)

I'd ask what basis she has for knowing what is public domain and cite her record of withholding the public domain.

Exhibit C can't be true, that nothing written was given to the OPR team. Not even on travelling, who to interview, who would meet them where, etc? (Item 5)

It is becoming increasing clear that CRD was more extreme than even the FBI, as with not dismissing the phoney Birmingham charge and claiming there had been no conspiracy while insisting it had "prosecutive interest."
It might be good to use this letter and the Horn memo on withhold then find an excuse.