

While shaving a few minutes ago I heard a few more of the Nazi-like comments from LaPrade, part of the press treatment that quite remarkably leaves it to be believed that all the FBI's offenses were against terrorists. This seemed to me to fit with the nature of the excisions I found in the reprocessing of those 52 pages I read yesterday. So while this is not thought through this is what did come to mind. In haste because I have to get the affidavit for John read and then go get it notarized and mailed as soon as a notary will be available.

I'd raise the entire question in the context abused by the coverup artist, Shaheen, of public interest in the information.

What he is really saying is that there is no public interest in knowing which of the public's law officials were law violators and for whatever reason were willing to commit serious offenses against a great man like Dr. King for political reasons or merely to advance themselves.

Perhaps there is a privacy interest for criminals in the FBI. But there is the balancing test, is the public entitled to have a means of knowing? Or to take the LaPrade approach, he says he can't get classified records showing he was taking orders, like the good Nazi he is. So, let these people have the benefit of letting it be known that they did no more than take orders in preparing all those defamatory memo about King, planted bugs and things like that.

I've forgotten which of my affidavits - maybe the one Mil has almost finished retyping - shows that as ASAC in Milwaukee LaPrade was doing these things against King. Not just Weathermen.

When they start withholding these kinds of names on you they raise other questions. Maybe Gesell is the best judge before whom to raise them. One question is of the appropriateness of having an unindicted co-conspirator having anything to do with the processing of FOIA records. Yet Beckwith does more. He is in a supervisory capacity and he files affidavits. You have in the record in my affidavit more than enough to refer to in making this point. He lied and he knowingly sought to mislead the Court. Sieg Heil!

A little understated indignation about withholdings relating the incredibly evil things the FBI did would not be inappropriate when they now under cover of a noble purpose seek to misuse the Act to prevent more knowledge of what they have done ~~mix~~ from coming out.

A fair percentage of the withholdings fit this. I became aware as I read and I marked most at the earlier pages. (Which are all unnumbered.) It seems to me that in all the earlier records the pages were numbered.)

Also, last night I read the Chapter 17 we spoke about in the new federal book. There are new standards, supposedly, for declassifications after 10 years, including of Top Secret. It has been more than 10 years and as I noted earlier, regardless of the judge's inclination at any point, no legitimate national security investigation was established. If he is unwilling to consider this ask them to meet the burden of proof on it with a proper affidavit. That will give them problems and he may wonder about an accelerated appeal.

These King cases, for all their liabilities, may well be the best for taking initiatives relating to improper withholdings.

As I told you, abruptly in the Dallas records they started withholding virtually all FBI names while not withholding the truly defamatory about private people. It was at a very abrupt point and then became almost total. I believe that they either had a new decision of which we did not know or came to a policy decision during the processing and saw no need to reprocess what they had completed. The earlier Dallas records were processed in May. The rest in June. They bear no day dates, only by month.

If we do not confront this it will not end. Of course I have already appealed the entire thing, so that is covered.

LaPrade even looked like a Nazi on TV. I think the false issue he raises will have it fresh in all minds if you take this approach - do we have a Nazi system in which the Nazis have the right to withhold about themselves under FOIA? Does the fact that they have authority give them the right to abuse that authority under FOIA?