

Dear Jim, New, inclusive JFK requests beginning today 7/29/79

You will remember that when we conferred with Metcalfe the day Oberdorfer recused himself one of Metcalfe's question was what other requests would I be making. My response then was that this depended on the FBI and how it complied with the requests I'd made. I told him that non-compliances, including improper withholdings from what was provided and failure to search and comply from relevant files, would require that I file other requests and that it is likely that Miami would be one of the first.

More than a year has passed. I've read uncountable thousands of pages, filed innumerable appeals almost all of which have been ignored, and Metcalfe has presided over violations of agreements, which means that FBI counsel is not going to effectuate FBI compliance with either the requests of the Act.

Under these circumstances and many others I have no choice but to seek withheld information by other means.

I have drafted what I regard as an all-inclusive request. I am sending it to FBIHQ, Miami and New York. If they stonewall I'll be forced to file others. If they do not stonewall and play the same kinds of non-compliance tricks they have from the first I'll be required to file still others, hoping, of course, that there may be a means of obtaining the withheld information as a result.

I am keeping the original and attaching copies to letters to these offices. I will be able to add to the original if you think of anything that should be added.

Al suggested that I send this request to all offices but I'd rather not file any more than the FBI and/or Shea's inactivity require. (I am not sending courtesy copies to Shea.)

Correct me if I am wrong in my belief that response to my request for expedited processing also should be within the 10 days of the Act, which is to say that when they tell me within 10 days that they need more time they address this request.

Any delays on anything will tell me that I'll have to file additional requests to get the withheld information with reasonable promptness. In each case I'll select offices where I have reason to believe there are particular records not provided to now from other files. My initial selections are on this basis.

I'll wait until about the middle of next month for responses.

In addition to the many other abuses there is a new one - the FBI Stonewalls me on my requests going back to 1/1/68 and while continuing to withhold from me makes the same and other relevant information available to Blakey and Billings, who are floating proposals for an inside book in return for what is described as a substantial advance. (This was forecast by Blakey himself to Rawls in the Times 7/19/79 story headed "Counsel in Assassination Study Brightened Panel's Reputation" in these words:

"Mr. Blakey said that he would respond to such criticisms (as Belin's) 'at an appropriate time and in an appropriate place and at an appropriate length.'"

When the committee has not existed for more than a half year the only ^{poss} responsibility, especially in terms of length, is a book.

As you read this request please note that I have undertaken to eliminate the non-compliance from the claim to previously processed by including all copies, whether or not allegedly previously processed, without using this exact formulation.

Best,