

Dear Jim,

78-0322

5/11/81

When we spoke on Friday and you asked about recent receipt of FBI records, while we both seemed to believe there had been records, we did not locate them, I did not find them where I'd usually put things that come when I'm not home. The latter is because she had put them near the copier to make copies for you. You have them, including the FBI's covering letter. So don't belabor Metcalfe over that. There is something else to beat him over he ears about. That is what I asked you to raise after Metcalfe relayed the FBI's offer and schedules - they are playing their usual dirty tricks and did misrepresent to the Court and to us.

Most of the stuff is news clippings and all or almost all of them are dated after my request. I'd not make a point of this now because maybe they'll give me some useful information dated after the requests. But to now most is not within the requests. Moreover, how much time does it take to process news clippings? What processing other than xeroxing is required? So why the long delays attributed to the need to use their most skilled people and the time required for processing? Neither is appropriately claimed with regard to what has been provided to date.

So I'd go back and again demand the time records of the people assigned to this case, making it explicit, we want them to prove the deliberateness of the deception of the Court and of us. This, obviously, is even more important with the newest health crisis I faced.

I'll write further after I can go over the newest batch, a thin one, that came Saturday. I'll be copying a few things from the previous batch, still on the machine. One of them reflects the fact that they knew where to search for records clearly within my requests, and didn't, and I'm sure we'll find, haven't and won't. The Garrison 80 file I identified to Shea is included among them. There also appears to be a critical section of the New Orleans files.

It is increasingly apparent that the FBI is off on another diversion, that it is providing a new bunch of crap so it can pretend that by the numbers it has complied when in fact it hasn't complied.

I think the thing to do is give Metcalfe hell for blindly and uncritically giving his word to the Court and us based on the FBI's word, which he has ample reason not to credit in this case alone. He owes himself and all others more than being a rubber stamp. Whether or not he provided it, please ask firmly for the kinds of production and processing records I asked you to ask for when he first made his proposal and if he is reluctant, tell him I attribute this to his certain knowledge that they will reflect that he did deceive and mislead and doesn't want the newest proof of it to be available. I do think it is past time for being firm with him. Or this will never end.

Hastily,