JFK Attorney pix

Dear Jim, 6/9/77 FBI's copy of one of my 10/27/75 FOIAs

Because this in on government-sized paper and was ~~folded~~ folded although you sent it to me flat I assume the FBI mailed it.

With the confusion in my FOIA files since Scott started to organize them I do not know if this is one I can8t find. I know the one referred to by Buckley is missing. At firstthe FBI denied I'd filed that one, personal files.

I suppose the line around the Silvershirt request means it was copied for that purpose.

You also get a few numbers on this, not entirely legible, indicative of not a close generation copy. Like after the stamps ST 112, qhich I've seen often in the King records, the stamp REC 62. What is written after this is what appears to be 67-115530- and in different writing 10250. I wonder is, with this having been stamped FOIA- GENERAL the 10250 is a sequential number.

First if I have not done it I think that now I should broaden my JFK request for everything not deposited in the National Archives before the amending the Act and for copies that eliminate some of the withholdings on previous copies. This should present no real problem at all on the records they have gone over, only a mechanical bit. While I think I did this I'm not certain. I did not limit it this was as I recall. I just asked for "all."

Now there is no search problem on the FBI HQ file. It is all together to begin with.

Where it is a simply request like this and with a request not 20 months old I'd think the FBI would be willing to proceed and clean up and look better. They should have no review problems because Hoover offered it all to the Warren Commission through Belmont, as I recall, with no restrictions and Hoover took an exceptionally good position in making all the Commission had available.

I don t want to make debating points against them. I just want compliance. Now with the load they have in Operation Onsalught they might want to clean up most of my requests. I think that if they want to they can.

On rereading this I think that without going broke I can make a gesture toward taking some pressure off of that unit, whether or not John. I think, given some of the heardheads we have encountered there, it might be worthwhile to discuss this informally with John if he can get a list of all the requests together. The gesture is for the analysts and professional help to have no or minimal involvement. The cost of duplicating movie film is not that great. I believe it cost only $10 for the dupe of the WDSU film, and this was commercial rate. I have it and the Martin film. Doyle offered to let me make a copy if I got out there. His is 8mm regular, as is Martin's, cheap to duplicate. The only question about costs on this sheet,is of the color pixx of the JFK clothing. Before saying I'll pay for all, even those I don t want, I'd like an idea of the cost. If it is not great I'll just tell John to do it all and save work for those on his level. On this one I'd like them to act fast because I regard it as relevant in CA75-226 and it sure would look bad for there to have been no action in 20 months, especially before the appeals court.

I don't know how these people work and I certainly have no right to tell them how to work. But I do believe that if they would get all my requests together, have a clerk make a list of them for them and for us, which would eliminate future problems, and have a copy they and we can go over at a mutually convenient time, I do think it could go pretty fast. From Howard's testimony in C.A.75-1996 it does not appear to be unreasonable to wonder if they do not have me at or near the top of some enemiew lists. He did testify to having gone through all these records three times without meeting any one of my requests. If they want to persist in this there is nothing we can do except take them to court. But if they do not want to persist, especially with the searches made subsequent to my requests, there does not seem to be an enormous jon here. Why not discuss it with John when you can?