

Wilson  
Gene ~~XXXX~~ Affidavit in Civil Action 77-1997, May 26, 1978.

Paragraph 2 itemizes the different parts of my request. My reading is that there has not been full compliance with each of these items. With regard to 2a., for example, there is one of the domestic intelligence records which refers to a leak of what the source had given to the CIA only and there is no other reference to that leak.

With regard to item b., all records pertaining to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the records of this nature provided can't possibly begin to be all of them. They can't be all with regard to Mexico and with regard to Portugal, in particular. I doubt if they are all with regard to England and I am certain they are not all with regard to headquarters. I think in this connection we are going to have to learn what files they searched.

With regard to c., records pertaining to James Earl Ray, it seems improbable that there are these few, especially with regard to these foreign countries, with Ray more than with headquarters.

d. is all records on any alleged or suspected accomplice or associate in the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and I'm really not in a position to evaluate this. However, I do think that, especially with regard to allegations of Ray having met people abroad, there could very well have been more than was provided. Again, it would depend on what is sought and, in fact, if anything is sought from the various stations.

e. is all collections of published materials on the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; I skip over that temporarily, at least. I do this because of one of the enclosures.

f., all analyses and things of that sort on or in any way pertaining to published materials on the assassination of Dr. King, and the part I want to emphasize, "or the authors of said materials". Now as of the time of compliance they had files on Mark Lane and on me at the very least. I'd be surprised if they don't have files on Bill Huie. There is one report that Huie worked for them when he

was in Denver. Or of Gerold Frank or McMillan or Jim Bishop.

Relative to this they have never complied fully with my Privacy Act request. But this request is not limited to the authors in connection with those books. However, the CIA under my Privacy request did give me a record relating to FRAME-UP where I made a mistake by quoting a newspaper story and they did not provide it in this case so, without doubt, there is a record that they haven't provided here.

g. refers to the kinds of records sought.

Par. 9 admits that by letter of July 21, 1977, I appealed their determinations with regard to withholdings from the records they said they had found and requested a fee waiver. They say in Par. 10 that on August 2, they acknowledged the appeal and that <sup>(Par. 11)</sup> on March 20, 1978, they advised that they would waive the search fee but not copying charges. What they do not say is that by this time almost two years had elapsed. My request was of June 11, 1976. It was not until the letter of April 26, 1977, that they informed me of 286 documents of which 243 were to be released. The waiver of search fees was the following March 20, 1978. On March 23 they advised that there was to be the additional release of 488 pages but they weren't even mailed for another two months.

1 He represents in Par. 13 that only because I filed a complaint in November of 1977 they began a new search. And lo! apparently for the first time, they consulted the records of the Office of Security where they found 28 documents. They found 3 documents originating with the components of the Directorate of Science and Technology and 342 documents originating with the components of the Directorate of Operations. This is in toto.

They haven't found a single one of the many documents referred to them by the FBI as documents that originated with the CIA. To this point, at least, there has been no reference to it.

In Par. 15 he says that in the course of the search, a number of documents which originated with other agencies were retrieved and have been referred. He does not say when they were referred. He does say that they haven't yet complied and he

says,  
"The originating agencies will respond directly to plaintiff". Now this means that it was only recently that they referred these documents around. I have received one, by the way, from the Agency for International Communications.

And lo! there are 64 documents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Now, Jim, I think this is an important point. It's been way over a year since the FBI referred some documents to the CIA and now they find that they have to get the FBI's clearance on documents in their files? This is a whipsaw. But in either ~~MEMOR~~ event, whether it begins with the FBI or begins with the CIA, they are very late.

Attachment A is your request of June 11, 1976. There are some notes that cast substantial doubt on the integrity of his affidavit. In the righthand margin opposite the FOIA request the offices referred to begin with the Office of Security where they now claim they for the first time found records. Others are OOO, CRS like in Central Research Service with a question mark after it, and OGC, like in Office of General Counsel with a question mark after it. This is Exhibit A to his affidavit.

A look at Exhibit G, his letter of April 26, 1977, confirms my recollection that what they gave me initially consisted of only newspaper and wire service accounts. However, they do provide 25 UPI wire items. This is the third item. They should have provided many more. Many more stories appeared on the UPI wire. They also give AP and Reuters wires without anything new since then and in such quantity that they couldn't be complete as of then. He then lists some documents which he says are released. The numbers coincide with some of the numbers we just received.

The marginal notations on Exhibit H, which is their copy of my letter of July 21, 1977, are partly omitted in xeroxing. I think we ought to get a complete copy because they are partly omitted on both sides. However, up at the top there is an incorrect notation, "Doesn't he owe us money?" The answer is "No."

My first sentence refers to an old request I made and they put a note on that,

"Log this as a new request." I was reminding them that they hadn't notified me that they were to have these records available for me.

I also asked for all records relating to my requests and appeals including their sequential relationships to other requests under both Acts as this relates to compliance with other requests. I have had no response. That was July 21 of last year.

In their Exhibit I, their letter of August 2, they misinterpret this and say, "It is a request for an analysis of your own correspondence." It is not any such thing. It is a request for what I needed to try and get compliance because they had not complied with requests and they had not even responded to requests and appeals.

Next, the order in which these were given to me is what is headed, NEW PAGE