

JL - re Dallas FO files HW 7/2/78

In 42 hours and 20 minutes I've gone over the actual # 89 sections of the records provided. The other sections are clippings, except for one of citizens' letters. Or they have not provided any of their Subs, either.

I'm not giving Quin any more than he needs. Not from distrust because I believe he is honest. Rather not to make the 1996 mistake of thinking they can be honest when you give the FBI proofs. The 2x4 is now perhaps long enough but just in case I'll not whittle either end without need.

I did not take time to make notes. I used up all my paperclips instead, indicating copies for Lil, who has hardly begun the copying job. (Out of order I have a copy of the poorest original of a TT itemizing five, not three files and specifying the existence of the inventory I mention. Also something that may be of help to that bad Zebra in NY in the Brading case. I've not yet read it but it represents his acknowledgement of the Pinnacle book of three years earlier and includes his having a meeting in DC with the FBI.)

I am not just assuming from ^{an} emphasis that they have many other Subs. I have citation of one I remember in which they hide my friend Paul's name and let it out that neither the writer nor the addressee of the letter he gave them knows it. I was no exception. He is 1A275.

As usual most is nut stuff and their diligent pursuit of statistics by pursuing it. The clippings are probably valuable. I've not looked at them. I presume they are in rough chronological order and of the Dallas and Fort Worth papers only. There are some promising leads not resolved in these records.

On (non)compliance we have very string stuff. It can be interpreted that during the processing they decided on new stonewalling of me or new assaults on the Act through special interpretations because I am one they prefer to stonewall. I think we are strong on this about another Pratt.

Our procedure will be as usual, Lil will make the copies I've indicated and then I'll keep the originals as I've received them. Each Section is already in an individual file folder. They came with worksheets in each Section so we'll duplicate them and have a separate set of worksheets, which will mean more or less of an inventory of what I've gotten and will get. We have already established a separate file of worksheets for the two releases but because I got them by the suit filed they were not with the records and have not been duplicated.

I've made notes of extra copies for possible use in fighting/litigating and will establish a separate file of such copies as I review all the copies when Lil gets the copying job completed. (Competition with retyping the 1996 affidavit, exhibits already copied.)

I may file other appeals with Shea if I see something special as I make this review but as of now I have no plans for any. You may make some legal approaches but I've accomplished my initial purpose and may have done enough for the follow-up. My appeal is filed, recognized and regarded as "protective." I've been told and will get a letter on it. I think I've armed the Shea office enough. I'll probably send a few illustrations later. One of my other purposes was to make it more unlikely that Civil will want to fight this out as they fought it the way the FBI wanted in 1996. I don't want us wasted that way again. (This is one of the reasons I've asked Paul, to whom I want to give copies, to keep it all quiet until the case itself is over.) Another is to give them pause before they complete the processing of the remaining admitted records the same bad way. Still another is not to have to fight to get the files I know they are not searching. (Here I've also asked Paul to give me any numbers he can recall. I've noted some but in the stacks and confusions of paper don't recall where I put them.) Then I'm reserving what may well be the major fight - the separate file by subject I'm sure they have, or for the index cards I know they have, or both. I have the description and the dimensions of the index. These can be extra-

ordinarily valuable. I don't want to move for them until we can resolve all possible on the other issues, particularly the withholding of names. Making copies of these for people like Paul will be a tremendous job if and when I get them but I will want to try to work something out.

In turn this gets to another problem, an old one - how and where can I get help. If I can see any means of making any uses of this stuff, as I can, and be paid for it I'll put what I may get paid aside for paying an assistant. These, as you know, are my plans for what I'll get from the consultancy. In going over what I have just received, in addition to the Mexico intercept (of which I've learned a bit more) I've spotted a couple of other possible items. I'll know before long if they can be used this way.

Another reason for holding off on the index is because they are likely to fight harder on it. It can lead to proofs of all kinds of other non-compliances and they'll be aware of this. It will cite all the files not searched, for example, all the duplicate filings.

If I take Metcalfe at your evaluation I believe this is the better course for that reason. He'll have to learn his own way and this way I can help him learn the right way, not the obdurate adversarial way. If he and Civil can come to see that they have a loser and a time-waster they may not be as obstructionist just to waste us. By this I mean is they see they also waste themselves. Until they can recognize that there is a balancing need they have, between being adversaries because the FBI wants this and reasonable compliance, which is what I want.

The stuff on Bishop is great for 1996. I do not exaggerate it in the letter to Shea. I think I'll add it to the 1996 affidavit, with a couple of other records not yet in on the other writers item. Until you have time to read the affidavit you have there is less rush in Bill's retyping of the new one and this can give me more time while she can spend more time on the large copying job she has just started.

I'm keeping Paul, as informed as I can. I'm making a duplicate set of worksheets that I'll lend him if he agrees to what I want. The cost of mail and of copying out there is much less than copying here. Unless he'd prefer the copying to be done commercially in DC and then mailed to him. The worksheets will make quite a stack. There are more than 10,000 ~~writing~~ entries. And this is but one of the three admitted files. (There is a Marina file almost as bulky.)

Bulky reminds me, Metcalfe put you on or was put on by the FBI. I received none of the usual FBI Bulky's, no separate file on evidence or exhibits. Not a single record of the kind we know they have on lab work, etc., only an occasion reference to fingerprints, a few on the Tippit pistol but nothing like what we know they have in the 00s in such cases. The reasons would appear to begin with the spectro case. They don't want to arm us for that, as you may want to hint to Metcalfe when you ask him about the bulkys he referred to.

I'm a bit more tired from a bit less sleep. I've been having to get up about 4 to get this done and the rain is reducing my exercise outside. Treating the fungus and walking in the sandal-type slip-ons in the house to let all the air possible reach the fungus slow me down, as do putting stockings and shoes on when I go out and taking them off when I come in. All are little time-wasters that accumulate from so many repetitions. Happily I complete the initial review in time to relax with a pre-planned evening with friends who have moved here from my home town. Tommie was going to come yesterday but that is postponed until next Sunday now. ...Someone I know is working on a Jaworski story. I expect him this week. Several calls from him yesterday.

Best,