

Dear Jim, re 1997/1729 Urlet 6/3/80 HW 6/4/80

As I work at clearing up various accumulations this morning I came to the enclosed, which I planned to send you for your (perhaps Bud's) copying and return because I'll be way behind on copying and because you can probably get better copies of this poor set of records. I do not recall when or how I got them. They appear to be Rockefeller Commission records. I had them marked for possible use if there were a 1729 remand.

One question or possibility you raise is of fraud. I believe these are pertinent in consideration of fraud.

On this, also after the district court record was closed, I established a separate file consisting of the CIA's prior disclosures of the identical information it swore in 1997 had to be withheld. This file may not be complete but it holds adequate samples. It was prepared by a student known as Dag. You met her. Her selections are from the CIA's own general JFK releases.

If you read this carefully you will see that to the CIA's knowledge it had King files it did not search and that it knew of at least those other sources to be searched that are included in the attached. Mentioned, rather.

Before coming to this material and before your letter I had thought of the possibility of filing a new request and perhaps ~~going~~ trying to get a couple of reporters to join me in the request, and to include in the new request an itemization of every component of which I have a record.

If we file for the 10th document it ought be with the possibility in mind that it is only a biography and if of their kind probably within an exemption except for what is reasonably segregable.

If we file a new suit and prevail one importance would be on your recovery of costs in the ended case. I think it should be a consideration in the investing of more time.

If there is a case of fraud within the legal meaning, that course is attractive to me because no system of justice can survive the abuses we've suffered and the Act has been negated by them.

A potentially important factor is the long-delayed Robinson decision. If he finds it for us he will in effect have found fraud. That would help.

But on the other side, is there any basis for regarding Smith as other than an automatic rubber stamp? Whatever the evidence?

I do believe that the CIA went to more trouble and ran more risks than ordinarily I would expect it to in this case. I therefore believe that it had a purpose other than its usual stonewalling. This leads to the belief that it has something to hide. In turn that makes more unusual the disappearance of its domestic operations records on King, from the district court files.

If we decide to go back on fraud and make a new request, will we run into what they tried to pull, inferring that we are not serious or have ulterior purposes?

I'll think about this more.

Best,