

91. I have copies of many thousands of pages of FBI records that have always been readily available at the National Archives. I have not seen a single one of these records that was made available on the orders of Director Hoover that eliminated the name of a single source or any one that withheld the symbol of an informant. It was not until after the enactment of FOIA, much more after the 1974 amendments became effective, that I began to receive FBI records with these kinds of withholdings.

92. Until after the Act was amended I do not recall the withholding of a single FBI name. Then it became general practice. I also do not know of a single report of any harm befalling any of the many hundreds of FBI agents whose names were not withheld.

93. Another form of source withholding in this instant cause is misrepresented by the Department in affidavits and by counsel. What is sought is the withholding of what can provide independent assessment of the OPR report and the disclosure of evidence that can tend to undermine, if not in fact disprove, the official explanation of the King assassination. This particular source is police reports, from Atlanta and from Memphis. In neither case is there any Departmental evidence showing that the content of the reports is not public domain. In fact, some of the content of what is withheld together with some of the actual pages of what is withheld was disclosed to me by the FBI in C.A. 75-1996. There is little likelihood that any substantial information in the Memphis police reports is not public knowledge, largely because it was made public by Memphis authorities.

94. From extensive prior experience with FBI avoidance of first-person affidavits and from prior personal experience with SA Horace P. Beckwith in FOIA matters, my attention was immediately attracted to his providing of an affidavit attesting to a search in this instant cause that he did not make. In the past it has been my consistent experience with the FBI that one of its means of withholding what might otherwise not be withheld is by the tactic of having an agent without personal knowledge execute the affidavit attesting to the search. My prior experience in all cases is that careful checking of nonfirst-person affidavits shows they represent what would be false swearing if executed by one of firsthand knowledge.

95. My attention to SA Beckwith's affidavit was further attracted by typical FBI semantics commonly used to provide a cover for secondhand and dubious statements to justify withholding under (b)(7)(D). In SA Beckwith's affidavit one formulation is, "I specifically requested a review of the material furnished the

FBI by the Atlanta, Georgia, Police Department. I was informed that 29 pages were received ... These documents are included in the FBI file on the assassination of Dr. King and are specifically located in Atlanta file number 44-2336, Serial 1215." (Paragraph 2, emphasis added) Mr. Beckwith does not state that he knows what "material" was "furnished" by the Atlanta police department. If he was "informed that 29 pages were received," he does not state that no more than 29 pages were furnished.

97. My attention was further attracted to these formulations because, as SA Beckwith should have known, these records should also be "specifically located" in my own files as a result of C.A. 75-1996 and under stipulations sought by the FBI in that case. These stipulations required that I be provided with copies of all nonexempt FBI Atlanta field office MURKIN records not already provided from FBIHQ files. SA Beckwith provided a nonfirst-person affidavit regarding compliance with these stipulations.

98. Still without claim to first-person knowledge, SA Beckwith states, "I was informed" that "the police department transmitted these documents to the FBI in confidence for investigative assistance during the investigation of Dr. King's assassination." (Paragraph 2)

99. The language of footnote 17 (Memorandum, page 12, citing footnote 21 of the Motion, page 17), together with the avoidance of any description of the content of these 29 pages, led me to make the careful check that was possible in this case. While I do not have most of the records withheld from Mr. Lesar in this instant cause, what SA Beckwith refers to clearly is required to have been provided to me in C.A. 75-1996.

100. My first discovery is that "the" King assassination file in Atlanta is not 44-2336. It is 44-2386. While this might be attributed to human error, SA Beckwith's other misstatements are not easily explained as human error.

101. Serial 1215 is in Volume 9 of the Atlanta FBI records. The FOIA processing worksheets for Serial 1215 and a check of the Serial itself, both provided to me in C.A. 75-1996, do not reflect that this Serial is of the 29 pages, although it is. These worksheets also represent that no part of Serial 1215 was withheld from me.

102. It also is apparent to me from checking my own files that SA Beckwith could have provided a different and a first-person affidavit relating to the Atlanta police department records from his own personal knowledge of FOIA procedures of the

FBI and from his personal involvement in C.A. 75-1996. All field office records provided to me in C.A. 75-1996 were sent to FBIHQ where they were processed. FBIHQ has copies of what it processed for me. The records I cite in the immediately following paragraphs are all records that exist within SA Beckwith's FOIA unit. They are not only as he and the Motion and the Memorandum represent, in the Atlanta Field Office.

103. "Not Recorded" Atlanta Serial of which two copies were sent to FBIHQ is particularly relevant. The copy attached as Exhibit 12 was provided to me under the stipulations in C.A. 75-1996. This August 4, 1976, "Airtel" from the SAC, Atlanta, to FBIHQ reports the providing of copies of all volumes of its MURKIN file only, "namely Atlanta 44-2386," to members of the OPR task force. It enclosed "five copies of an LHM plus one xerox of 29 pages of material" from the Atlanta police. "During this review," the Atlanta SAC reported, "Task Force Member James Walker ... requested a Xerox copy of two serials in this file, namely 44-2386-1214 and 1215, which consisted of 29 pages of material ... relative to people who in the past had threatened the life of MARTIN LUTHER KING. A Xerox copy of this material was furnished to Mr. WALKER." (Other records relevant to the King assassination are not included in MURKIN.)

104. The Letterhead Memorandum attached to this "Airtel" reflects only a limited Task Force inquiry in Atlanta. It does not reflect a serious effort by the Task Force to meet the obligations seemingly imposed upon it by the Attorney General. This can provide motive for some of the withholdings in this instant cause. Atlanta was one of the areas of most active investigation in the King assassination because of the presence of James Earl Ray in that city and because he abandoned an automobile there. Atlanta also is the city in which Dr. King lived and where his office and church were located.

105. The 29 pages are of two Serials, not the single Serial represented by SA Beckwith.

106. The worksheets are a list of the records provided together with all claims to any exemptions. The relevant worksheet page is attached as Exhibit 13. It shows that each of these Serials, as provided to me, is of but a single page and that each of the Serials was provided to me without any withholding. The obliterated entry under "Exemptions used" after Serial 1215 may indicate that at one point a claim to exemption had been made. This is borne out by markings I see on Serial 1215. These markings indicate that prior to review all the names, together with all the

information following them, were obliterated. Serial 1215, as provided to me rather than as described by SA Beckwith, is attached as Exhibit 14. Serial 1214 as provided to me and as described in the worksheet is attached as Exhibit 15. Serial 1212 (attached as Exhibit 16) establishes the origin of Serial 1215 and provides identification of the person who signed it. (The worksheets do not account for Serial 1213. It was not provided to me.)

107. Whatever explains the factual inaccuracy in SA Beckwith's affidavit it is beyond question that:

29 pages of Atlanta police records are involved; the OPR had copies of these records as well as of any notes Mr. Walker may have made; after searches in both Atlanta and FBIHQ, although several sets of duplicate copies of these 29 pages are in the FBI's files at both places, not 29 but 2 pages only were provided to me; and the FBI, despite the stipulations and its assurances to the court in C.A. 75-1996, withheld 27 of these 29 pages and then provided a worksheet falsely representing that between them Serials 1214 and 1215 total only two pages rather than 29.

108. These facts raise substantial questions of FBI honesty and of FBI intentions relating to compliance and noncompliance.

109. Serials 1214 and 1215 as provided to me are information furnished by the Atlanta police. Serial 1212 establishes the identification of the police sergeant who signed Serial 1215. This is precisely the information represented in the Memorandum and the attached affidavits as requiring withholding from Mr. Lesar, yet it was not withheld from me. Mr. Metcalfe's representations (at page 14) are:

"... release of this information would seriously inhibit the FBI's relationship with its confidential sources and with other law enforcement personnel."
(Emphasis in original)

"Accordingly, defendant respectfully urges that the Court should allow defendant to preserve the confidentiality of these local law enforcement records."¹⁷ (Emphasis added)

110. If Mr. Metcalfe was led into these representations to this Court by his trust in what he was told by the FBI, they nonetheless are representations the falsity of which was known to the FBI when it misled Mr. Metcalfe, if it misled him.

111. The plain and simple truth is that this is not the only case in which the FBI has provided me with information from local police. It knows better than its representations on this matter. The Department also knows better because the Department was involved in the release of other such records from other local police. These other local police records relate to the King assassination, to the assassination of President Kennedy and to ancillary investigations in both cases. The FBI reading room, the National Archives and the Library of Congress all make publicly available records provided by local police.

112. Specifically with regard to Serial 1215 and generally with regard to

similar records of local police, the "confidentiality" alleged by the Department does not exist. SA Beckwith's representation (at page 2), "provided in confidence with the clear understanding that the FBI would insure their confidentiality," is not a truthful representation. Both quotations represent what within my FOIA experience is a new effort to withhold what under the 1974 amendments to the Act should not be withheld. This is not to state that there never is any such confidentiality. It is to state that in this particular instance and many others like it there is not and there never was the confidentiality represented to this Court.

113. Mr. Metcalfe and SA Beckwith both were involved in my C.A. 75-1996, together with a number of other FBI agents and Civil Division lawyers. In C.A. 75-1996 I was provided with hundreds of pages of local police reports. I was also provided with many pages of records from other local authorities, like prisons, departments of corrections and sheriffs. The FBI's stipulations in C.A. 75-1996 provided for giving me hundreds of pages of Memphis Police Department records.

114. Examination of Serial 1215 as provided to me also bears heavily on the fidelity of representations made to this Court in this instant cause on privacy. All those whose names are provided are alleged to have threatened Dr. King. This is also true of many other pages of FBI records provided to me.

115. The May 10, 1978, affidavit of James F. Walker makes no reference to these Atlanta Police Department records. Exhibit 12 identifies Mr. Walker as the member of the OPR staff who obtained copies of those records from the FBI Atlanta Field Office.

116. Although my suit for King assassination records was filed before the OPR reinvestigation was established and prior to the August 4, 1976, "airtel" by the Atlanta SAC (Exhibit 12), neither the Walker affidavit nor the "airtel" forwarding these 29 pages to FBIHQ alleges any restrictions on them or any confidentiality attaching to them.

117. Mr. Walker does repeat the self-serving statements of the affidavit of Mr. Stanton with regard to the Memphis police department records.

118. Mr. Walker's representation of the OPR's mission (in Paragraph 1) is "... review of Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation files relative to Dr. King." A "review" of "files relative to Dr. King" is not the announced purpose of the OPR's review. This phrasing omits half of the OPR's task and understates the other half to avoid the inherent and explicit criticisms of the