

Dear Paul (JL, HR),

12/14/77

Hasty comment on your 12/10/77 on the 4000+ pages and the press coverage while I read it. This may account for any misinterpretation. I do not recall if I sent you the WkPost stories the first day, so I'll enclose a set in the event I did not..

Some time ago I wrote Bud and I think you saying that I would apply for a remission of all costs in getting these records and that if I did they'd be available to all in DC for copying. Meaning for having the copying done there commercially. Nobody has responded. Jim has filed this application - did prior to the release. The time for response has expired so Jim is about to file. He may accompany this with an effort to obtain a temporary injunction that would include the remission of costs decision and my having a set of the records at the same time they are available to the press - so I can service it, as to a rather unexpected degree I was able to on this first go-round. This would not get around the FBI having another super-spectacular PR event but it would enable me to find and comment on any record if these are as they usually are arranged.

I know I sent you a copy of the story in the local paper. To it and to others I pointed out that the FBI's reason for not complying with two dozen or more of my requests was to be able to pull this kind of disinformation/misinformation stunt. I said it was a good think done in a bad way.

The Post veered away from any smoking-gun quest and from any search for actual evidence, with a little encouragement and I think good judgement. It was a situation in which the best of reporters with the best of intentions could not be certain there was not an unseen contradictory record. I believe that as a result the attention to the actualities of the "investigation" and the personnel of the agencies does contribute to public knowledge and information.

I think I was able to moderate AF's Pedro Charles nonsense. I know I influenced Lardner on this. As he started to tell me the story I interrupted to tell him it was Pedro Charles, non-secret and the subject of one of my ignored FOIA requests. Ditto with him and the Post on the leaking of the GMI report, Hoover/Katz./Warren.

I think I got the same form letter. I also had a request that included what you sent me of those 597 pages. The FBI has not responded to my complaint. It will not. I did not learn until after the protest that this had been released to you in response to your requests. It was given to AP and to WINS all-news radio in NYC just before the release, with the Post getting its copy the Friday prior to 12/7 of 12/2. Lardner learned on his inquiry at DJ that it was released to you, as you had not told me at the time. It might have been helpful if you had because Jim could have made use of it as I could in the four higher-level DJ conferences we had with the FBI in which discrimination and stonewalling were issues.

On early reporting: while a briefing is possible, and there was an earlier unsolicited opinion from Gamberling some time ago, I think the explanation is that those who bought copies had them for use the moment of release. Otherwise they'd not have been able to use their copies. I know that Lardner was on the phone fairly early in the day and from the Post, not DJ, as were two other reporters. (The Sinclair final quote is not entirely in context but there is nothing sinister, just what happens when a reporter has to contract. True also of the local story.)

Pedro Charles: in addition to what you say and quote of Scott there are other proofs that Hoover knew before he wrote his memo. His investigation of LHO, for example, established LHO had not been in Miami. I was not able, to the best of my knowledge, to get what I told reporters used on this - that Hoover knew better when he wrote his comment. I believe this is true of other of his memos and notations of comment.

Army Intelligence: No use arranged as yet aside from what you know about. I'll use today in a broadcast to San Antonio which may lead to some local reactions from some of personal knowledge. I'm hoping, though the odds are not good.

To all I pointed out that this was a mass no reporter or combination of reporters could digest. All agreed. Some made the same complaint. But I know of no uses by any large paper.

On the Anderson 12/1 column: At least one of my mailings must not have reached you. I was responsible for that, their source being my files of which I sent Les W. a copy. The alleged destruction of records was of all JFK assassination records. What you were told

about the finding of no relevant records in the 112 INCT Group files is what I was told years ago in more detail. The phone number you give must be at Fort George Meade, where Army Intelligence and other speakeries are housed, with NSA and others.

On the Post Gointelpro story, I wrote Jacobs without response.

On the FBI's worksheets, you call it an inventory, I have filed an FOIA request for them and for any other relevant record, such as an inventory. If I get it will all be available. It will also include claimed exemptions for each withholding, including by obliteration. Withhold these records protects unjustifiable withholdings.

There are major problems with your good idea of getting all the records on the critics. I've finally obtained partial compliance from the FBI after earlier and more partial compliance from the CIA. The fabrications are transparent to me and I can pinpoint the sources that are corrupted into thencevolent. Really debased, vicious stuff. Any release of what Hoover gave Martin Watson for LBJ would have had consequences. It would never be possible to catch up with the evil, so many minds would be influenced. I've invoked my rights under PA. With "ane the stuff is very bad, of a personal nature. From reporters to second hand from the Clay Shaw defense I've known for years with regard to just about everyone something like this is certain to be true, that whether or not accurately and almost always in twisted form there will be the genuinely defamatory. Under the Acts the FBI cannot release such information. The best you can hope for is a lane making partial and angled use of incomplete records. The only possible uses are of this kind. They need not always be as dishonest as Lane's. But each individual alone can make the use. in, for example, has made partial use of the records I've obtained, obliterating the worst of the defamations.

If you receive a ything from the Army in response to your 10/31/77 FOI request please let me know because my earlier ones include anything responsive to it. They have given me nothing and claimed to have nothing.

The few pages I mailed you this mornin g were sent to me by Gardner. I'd asked him to be alert to anything that might be relevant in the spectro/AAA suit, on appeal now. I explained that this would include anything medical or ballistics in content. I expect there is much more in these released pages, including Sibert-O'Seill "communications." Their word but not the usual FBI terminology. Rather the word about what HQ had received from them prior to the well-known report. There should be other interviews with doctors.

I'm sorry people were not able to get together on these records because we could have ~~****~~ bought a set reserving the right to recover (and in the past I have in part), meanwhile having a set from which less costly copies could have been made, greatly reducing the cost per copy/page. As I've said I believe I have th best chance of obtaining a remission of charges.

I'm not in any hurry to obtain copies for myself right now. I would not have time to look at them. My only purpose was to make it possible for others, especially those who want copies but cannot pay for them at 10¢ a page.

Hastily,

Harold