Dear Jim, O'Neill action on appeal; My appeal to CIA/Wilson 8/7/76

As you will see O'Neill lists the 1/21 transcript as relating to Nosenko. This is mind-blowing, a mistake or I think what we once decided.

We considered this and I believe dismissed it on the ground that session was the month prior to the Nosenko defection.

As I recall we thendecided that those 10 pages might include discussion of other defecters.

This still seems to me to be more likely than that Nosenko had been CIA all the time and these people would know or talk about it.

If this is a mistake it is an important mistake. They withhold it on the basis of error?

I will have to go over the enclosures with care. A superficial reading indicates there never was any basis for withholding. But with the Coleman-Slawson memo it means I'll have to compare each released section with the context as well as isolating it and analyzing it alone.

The came to me separated by paper clips. When I copy for you I'll staple.

There is only a single declassification record, by Johnson on a single page of this stack. Does not E.O.11652 require a formal declassification of each classified page? One page does not have its "SECRET" mark even lined through.

That one pagex was declassified in February . I received it August 7. I'm sure other pages were released long ago. It has taken them seven months to act.

Of all the exemptions claims only (b)(1) is attributed to CIA and then not with the citation of authority but "at the request of" Wilson.

On page 2 they separate three pages of the Coleman-Slawson memo for (b)(6). I do not see how this can apply, especially not after some of the recent decisions. A ~~transcript~~ memo of this nature is neither a "personnel" nor a "medical" file and there is no "clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy" I can visualise except in the new contraption Judge Green has ridiculed, a claim to this for employees acting in their official capacities.

I'll be making an initial response to O'Neill. I'll probably have to write him again after I can compare this and previous letters and isolate the prior withholdings. In fact I'm going to ask him to provide this.

I'm sending HR a copy of O'Neill 's letter for any suggestions he may make if he has time. He may be able to retrieve my earlier correspondence easier than I now can.

Hastily,