

Ug - porvina

Dear Jim, on virtue, purity and overdue diligence in DJ 1/25/77

When you phoned earlier today and mentioned this after discussing the williams status I did not believe any part of the tale. I still do not.

Allow for the hardheadedness of buranquales all you will. It will does not stack.

Since last April in that office, regardless of what you have done, I have written:
the DAG, Tyler;
his FOIA honcho Shea, more than once;
Shahsen at the least.

Aside from what you have done, and I'm inclined to believe you have done more than the necessary to attract their interest and attention, under oath and subject to his retaliation I have called Tyler a liar and just about all the others perjurers.

This with a case in court, not just correspondence.

Dugan did tell Green that he supplies them with transcripts.

I think it is a bit much that by the time there is a call to you they have 20 or more cases of my FOIA requests not responded to and know about my PA request on myself and some of what they say it turns up. Only now? Hell, aside from a voluminous correspondence I went into this under oath in court more than 4 months ago.

New administration? Sure, but I am sure I've made a few references to this to them.

I am also confident that the correspondent works its way up. This means it begins with those who do not go automatically when administrations change. Survival. And let today, after all these years, we have new names.

Also relevant is our discussion of future filings, on the phone.

You told him we'd meet with him? Fine. Only instead of in a week or two let us set it for when he says he has complied. I mean he has admitted more than 30 arrears cases. Let us give him at least a day a case. We are not like them. We are tolerant, understanding, maybe even human. So give the man all the time, within reason, that he says he needs to comply with that of which he knows. I'd rather meet with him when he can hand us what he can tell us are the overdue records. When he can tell us he has and they have exercised due diligence and in good if not the best of faith. Then we'll tick off non-compliance - after the office of the second man in the Department has put his effort on it.

Does he want more than 2 weeks? 3? 4? Agree, with the understanding that when we go there he has everything for us. And gives us a shit as saying it. That we'll want. If he does not want to let it be in writing. I do not think he'll want that any more.

Enough time to be fair and reasonable, not that a day isn't with their past. But not enough time for them to nestle in with the new administration. The top guys will go. We have to complete this before the hacks can feel secure, when they'll do the same dirty things on which they have survived. Do not underestimate the possibilities. Survival is a very strong drive.

We are not hardy types. So as a tentative deadline let us say by Ash Wednesday. That gives these goodfaith types about a month.

I think you want something in writing to say that the letter you wrote the DAG nine months and a half ago reached him today. I'm not experienced in either a wheelchair or crutches but on either from where you mailed it the time for me would not have exceeded an hour.

I wish I could remember the letter with the very broad hint of this. Oh, well, let us be patient and see what/evantuates. We'll want to be able to record what is not provided and before we go there we'll want the subjects in writing.

By then we'll be able to smell spring. Can't be too many for me. Best,