

Field Office Inventories of King Records - Savannah

The brief argues, without citing any source because no such authority can be cited, that the inventories of the field offices of their records pertaining to Dr. King, his family and associates - and what the brief manages not to report - their assassination records are not pertinent and of no value. Both statements are untrue.

On several occasions ~~the~~ FBIHQ directed the field offices to provide such inventories, for the internal investigation by the Office of Professional Responsibility. In addition to the assassination records, MURKIN, all of which were to have been provided and are sworn to have been provided, these inventories were to have included all records pertaining to what the FBI did to Dr. King. One of the importances of these inventories is that they disclose how the FBI can pretend to make a thorough search and manage not to include what exists, is known to exist, and is pertinent.

The technique by which FBIHQ arranges this, without have to tell the field offices what to omit, is by specifying what they are to include. Thus, although it was well known that Dr. King was bugged and wiretapped extensively and that these were taped. not a single tape was inventoried by any of the 59 field offices.

The Savannah inventory disclosed where and how those tapes were hidden. (The brief ignores this and states merely and self-servingly that what was disclosed was "of slight and peripheral significance.")

All 59 field offices provided their inventories, and that file totals 404 pages - of inventory only, covering an unimaginably large volumes of pages of records -without the verbatim transcripts of the conversation bugged and wiretapped. The extent of the FBI's operation against Dr. King, covered by the subterfuge that he was under Communist influence, is enormous and had never been indicated before.

Of all these inventories, only one was filed as MURKIN, where at least a duplicate copy belongs because each and every one is a MURKIN record.

The one inventory filed correctly, in FBIHQ MURKIN, is that of the Chicago field office. When I read it I asked the FBI for the inventories of the other offices. I was lied to. I was told, as the case record reflects without contradiction, that it was a one-shot, pertaining to the Chicago office only. It took another five years for them to be disclosed. Without their disclosure, among other things, the actual extent of the MURKIN records would be unknown and undisclosed. The inventories also disclosed other pertinent records relating to threats against Dr. King, one misrepresented in the brief as of the day he left for Memphis, when there was a threat to bomb the plane. It was not included in the MURKIN files, which does contain other threats, because it was established as a separate file. The MURKIN file, in fact, holds many such threats and they were part of the MURKIN investigation.

The FBI followed the identical misfiling practices with the inventories pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy. With regard to one that, like Chicago's was filed correctly and disclosed, the FBI hid its records pertaining to wiretapping and bugging by withholding them under a spurious (b)(2) claim.

The Savannah inventory, which also was pertinent because it ~~listed~~ had to do with record pertaining to J.B. Stoner, who is included in my request, disclosed that the tapes of electronic surveillances are filed, of all things, as "66. Administrative Matters." This one thing is of considerable importance to the country, which had no way of identifying the location of such tapes and is anything but "of slight and peripheral significance," the language of the brief.

When in the JDK case the FBI was forced to disclose what it had withheld under that (b)(2) claim, knowing full well that it had nothing to do with personnel matters, it was then disclosed that the 66 file number is what was withheld under that claim.

No 66 classification records were provided in this litigation and no search of them is claimed to have been made, despite the fact that there are two surveillance items of the request and pertinence in other ways.

files) to be released to plaintiff, these items were not turned over until the court's order. The Savannah Field Office was not one of the offices included in the search, pursuant to the Stipulation. The three internal Savannah memos ordered released were of slight and peripheral significance (see 2nd affidavit of John Phillips, R. 187, pp. 8-9).

*file
around
fact*

(7) "CIA Documents."

On January 28, 1981, the Court denied plaintiff's motion for documents referred to the CIA. The explanation for this is contained in the Department's memorandum of January 26, 1981 (R. 187 and exhibits). The Department explained that nine of ten of the CIA documents had already been dealt with in one of plaintiff's lawsuits against the CIA. The tenth document--which apparently had also been requested in the other litigation--concerned an individual whose name bore a resemblance to James Earl Ray. The document was eventually released by CIA. It is clear that this one item was not the source of any "page-one story" in the L.A. Times as indicated by plaintiff on paragraph 58 of his October 26 affidavit, cited by the court. A look at the item clearly demonstrates that it was, like the others, insignificant.¹⁶

*check
this*

(8) The Court's Sua Sponte Order For A Renewed Search For A Taxicab Manifest.

¹⁶ Of course, the CIA was not a defendant in this case and thus could not be compelled to produce documents by the court.

*Stipulation (ab 45)
Approved
CIA*

(3)