

11/15/70- Jim, re: Wellford v Hardin -
175- 4, records: direct comparison in letters, emails accidentally seen when mis-
filed in Archives in which Archives gets SS to rephrase what they have written
about my requests. We should remember this for when in court on clothing suit.

176 note this persistent dependence upon Tucinsky, here said misplaced, as with us.
177 Torturo's first paragraph on Tucinsky is worth remembering because of the
limitation it imposes on interpretation of significance, which is other than DJ's/
178 The Bristol-Myers interpretation of law-enforcement exemption is very narrow,
bestowing it to only -emphasis- "premature discovery", i.e., not even discovery
where there is nothing before a court.

179- no blanket on interagency relevant to Arch-SS corres; letter-agreement, memo
transfer arguments.

175- 4, records: direct comparison in letters, emails accidentally seen when mis-
filed in Archives in which Archives gets SS to rephrase what they have written
about my requests. We should remember this for when in court on clothing suit.

176 note this persistent dependence upon Tucinsky, here said misplaced, as with us.
177 Torturo's first paragraph on Tucinsky is worth remembering because of the
limitation it imposes on interpretation of significance, which is other than DJ's/
178 The Bristol-Myers interpretation of law-enforcement exemption is very narrow,
bestowing it to only -emphasis- "premature discovery", i.e., not even discovery
where there is nothing before a court.

179- no blanket on interagency relevant to Arch-SS corres; letter-agreement, memo
transfer arguments.

And, although it is under "interagency", there is this that is so relevant in
spectro, I'm surprised you didn't mark it:
"Purely scientific, factual reports and scientific studies cannot be
cloaked in secrecy by an exemption..." and here it goes into the intent of the
exemption, the real intent.