

Add of 10/19/77 to John Hartingh.

On the chance what a mail tomorrow morning will reach you on Friday and because my tomorrow's time will be more limited by two medical appointments this added note on compliance. I write it in haste because as you know the matter of the Louw pictures is a separate issue right now before the judge. The FBI has moved for summary judgement. I asked separately for all relevant records last year and received nothing in return. It is now clear not only that I do not have all relevant records but that they are not in the MFO records that refer to them.

I have now gone through the 7 volumes of 44-1987 and the 3 of SubD, interviews. In the first at Serial 530 NY was asked to interview Louw about what he knew about the crime - prior to the date the FBI represents it first received prints of his pictures. From that point to the end of that file there is no report from NY on this or for that matter from any of the other FOs asked to interview those who lived within their territories and who were registered at the Lorraine. The Louw record to which I referred in the earlier postscript of today does not in any sense respond to the MFO's request of NY. This makes the NY FO records much more material in the matter now before the court. At least I think it does. If we cannot have this missing material promptly, before the judge decides, will you please inform Jim, to whom I'm sending a carbon of this is the same mail? If it is now provided, please send Jim a duplicate of what you send me because time is now a consideration with decision pending.

Also missing is material I know exists. Example, the manifest of cab driver James McCraw. MFO obtained it. I also do not have the records of obtaining it.

44-1987-737 relates to the Ray family, beginning with Jerry. There is withholding attributed to (b)(7)(C) & (D). I dispute this, as I do the withholding of the previously released name of Jerry's Camden lady friend who was also an informer. I dispute this not only because it is clearly outside withholding under the 5/5/77 guidelines but come on, now, is there anything really not known about any of the Rays? While there is clear internal evidence that some of these files were processed at an earlier time than others, none was processed until after the 5/5/77 statement and what kind of review do they get?

At the end of the first set of files on your list there is the equivalent breakdown, so I presume this is true of all FOs. In this case it lists Sub H as lab reports. Although it may well be that there is extensive if not total duplication I think I'd rather pay the extra cost now and get a copy of all of Sub H because of the disagreement that exists. It should present no problem in processing because there would seem to be nothing subject to any withholding and I've already been assured repeatedly, including under oath, that I have all of it.