

CONFERENCE 11/18/77 - talking paper

I. FBI noncompliance by pretense and subterfuge - and plain stonewalling.

- A. First meeting I specified what was being withheld from first records provided, asked that they be replaced, and to this day they have not been. As a generality this remains true, I have continued to specify the improper withholding and the FBI ignores it. If in all these more than 44,000 pages there has been any replacement after I have specified improper withholdings, I do not recall it and it would have to be minor.
1. In early October, when I obtained a list of the MFO records supposedly provided, I discovered some sections had not been. I wrote without acknowledgment. I took this up with Ralph Harp last Friday. He said they would replace these sections. Only xeroxing was required. I have not received them.
 2. Another example is I was to have had the reprocessed index cards in time to go over them before today's meeting. It didn't happen. And I have had no message about them since that meeting.
- B. To perpetuate these kinds of false pretenses and subterfuges, the FBI pretends there are no indexes. Whether or not there are in FBIHQ, there are in the FOs. First it pretended there are no indexes of any kind, including the FOs, then it fell silent when I proved from FO records that the FOs do indeed have indexes. As recently as the 11/11/77 meeting the FBI pretended there are no indexes.
- C. It has pretended and continues to pretend that the requests are limited to FBIHQ and that compliance is possible from FBIHQ. We have stated all along that the requests are not addressed to FBIHQ alone, that compliance is knowingly impossible from it alone, that most of the relevant records are in the various FOs, and then we proved it with the testimony of the FBI's own witness, SA Howard, in 9/76. The proportion of records, HQ vs. field, is about 3,500 to more than 200,000 from the statement of AG Levi. When I have specified the FOs with relevant records, there is no search of them. Examples:
1. On crime scene pictures, NYC on Low/Life pictures; St. Louis and Baltimore on those of Josephine Colfield
 2. Other suspects, two examples: with "Bill Harris," WFO and Alexandria, with J. C. Hardin, Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans and Memphis, at least
 3. 3. Surveillances - all specified to FBI after claim of nothing in any records:
 - a. pretense means by FBI only
 - b. pretense all is in log in FBIHQ

The log shows those approved only. The FBI has been engaging in electronic surveillance since supposed controls were imposed and not asking for permission until surveillance was productive.

There is also the period prior to these supposed controls, when I believe it was not required to have such records.

The FBI has been the beneficiary of tapping and bugging by others, including local police. (An example on which withholding continues since I specified the names is the Milteer/Somerset story. This was done by the Miami police/prosecutor, arranged by Somerset, who was their and the FBI's informer. The results were given to the FBI. It did not even give them to the Warren Commission although this incident was one of the causes of the cancellation of the Miami motorcade just prior to the JFK assassination. Not only does this withholding continue, compliance with such items requires search of the relevant FO files, which has not been done. In this case at the least those involved are in Georgia, Florida, Tennessee and Washington.

3 - continued. It has picked me up in surveillance of others. I have specific knowledge of it from the government. It has had coverage of phones I have used.

There was such surveillance of James Earl Ray and Percy Foreman, at the least, and not only in Memphis. Files I have received show the FBI was given results.

A direct tap on my phone was unwittingly disclosed by a dead short, after the filing of administrative appeals in this case and coinciding with other FOIA cases. Tapper unidentified.

James Earl Ray was also under overt electronic surveillance designed by the Bureau of prisons.

4. The "Tramp" picture/Mexico City sketch: The FBI has not searched the Baltimore field office to a residency of which I gave the pictures in 1968. Pictures still not returned to me. I have specified other FOs that have to be searched to comply with this item. No response after many months. Nor after I cited relevant records by Serial Number indicating existence of other records.
 5. CTIA. By inadvertence the FBI has disclosed FO files not searched. (I believe it also has CTIA files from other agencies and that other components of DJ also have CTIA files.)
 6. Headquarters directs interviews, investigations but no results from FOs, as with New Orleans, Raul Esquivel, a contractor or industrialist, and the "Industrial Canal area." This also involves incomplete N.O. compliance on Recile and Roussel, who became suspects after Louis Lomax stories appeared. This also involves withholdings of the public domain, from my book to the phone book. It continues months after I called it to the FBI's attention, with copies of my writing and of the phone book.
- D. At the beginning I also wrote to illustrate improper withholdings virtually by return mail. Thus in each case identification with the specific Volumes or Sections was specific, virtually automatic. Finally, in June I was promised that some of these would be reprocessed on the completion of the processing of the FBIHQ files. This was not done. Then I was told the absence of Serial numbers made identification impossible. I was not told this all along; it was a means of attempted explanation of doing nothing about the specific illustrations I continued to provide. Then, when I was told Serials are necessary, I provided Serials only to have an absolute and unexplained stonewalling follow. (Earlier I had provided some Serials, but that made no difference.)
- E. I made copies of records and used them at two meetings in June, so there was no question of proper identification by the FBI. It nonetheless has done nothing about those illustrations, either.
- F. I have provided many illustrations of the unjustified withholding of pictures under privacy claims. This claim was made even for pictures of the Rays. There since has not been compliance. It includes other suspects.