8/30/80

Dear Jin,

Herewith the newest of the appeals from the FBI's revocation of the fee waiver as it pertains to my King political request but also including information pertinent in the cases in court because of the sweeping nature of the FBI's action and the pertinence of what I include to the FBI's spurious representations.

As you will see, I am trying to press Shes to a decision. As you know, I/am adverse decision to any further delays. Until there is a decision I must continue to provide what contests the FBI's action.

Regardless of the outcome of the hospital check on Tuesday I have much less time now because I must spend more of it in walking and other physical exertion. (I've already attained ufnagle's walking goal, but it takes time.)

You have sent me no copynof the letter I asked you to write to Cole so I presume that once again you have not done this and are full-steem ahead on the same kinds of errors that have enabled the wasting of so much of our time. If you do not have some reason you have not advanced for not doing this and then do not do it I'll let you is make handle 226 entirely on your own. I'll/ package up the large volume of copies of records I've made in articleation of the remand and send them to you. (Where you find only one copy I've already given you those records.)

Unless you have some good reason for not doing it I would like this appeal and its attachments in the case record and before Green promptly, so that when she has time before she goes into trial on the Alexander case (according to the radio its been delayed) she can be aware of the fact timt the FEI has cancelled the fee waiver in the case before her. That is what their letter says and I don't want to hear again any opinion that they didn't really mean it. If they say that, find, If they say it they undermine themselves, they back down, and if they don't say it we want her decision. Of course I mean to include a copy of their letter, which you have. I think 7/1/20. This also will put them on the defensive again and indefensibly, whatever their exposte facto claim may be, if any. I becomes physicus that if they say they don't mean what they say there is a question about everything they say, something that should not be left to the expected perception of the court and clerk. It also is obvious that they are playing dirty tricks, and she is beginning to get a glimmer of that. There are other reasons for which I do not take time.

In the back of my mind is the notion to file smit against breason, Buckley, Shaa, cole and others for failing to perform official duties. It may bring much of this permisting nonsense to a head. It also could be of considerable value in protecting the Act, although I do not think that the private bureaucrats who are fumbling around ineffectually will be able to see or even consider it.

Whatever else accounts for assigning Cole to the 226 remend, it is obvious that his gifts, telents and willingness as a liker is an important factor. There is only one way to cope with that and that is to pull him up short and hard with each lie or misrepresentation. Throughout the long history of 1996 I've asked you was repeatedly to do this, partocularly after Civil Division took it over. Failure to do it accounts for the long history. Even though each time we did it to a degree the judge reacted properly and against them. Be prepared for it because if you don't do it I'll consider that any time I spend on that case now is wasted so I won't spend any on it.

If you go over what I've been sending Shea on the King political request, which includes more FEI misrepresentation of the pertinent record, as in 1996 and appropriate to it. I'm preparing to push that even more, As you will see, this by-passes the FEI's mamufactured reason for cancelling the fee waiver. I think you would be well advised to ask him, for 1996 and 226, what I have, for copies of all pertinent records and any authorization. You know very well that this was not approved where there is authorate or it would have been cited. Hestily,