Dear Howard, 12/20/77

Yesterday we received some previously withheld King records of which Bill made the number of copies I asked. Then I thought we'd need a set for the examination of a classification expert. So, I've sent this to Dave with the request that after he read it he send them to you. I'll give him a set later.

Yesterday, with some helpful clippings, there were also copies of DJ and GSA letters to you responding to your FOIA requests. Only one of your letters was included. When Bill has the copying machine going we'll make copies for Jim because you do not indicate having sent copies to him.

JL may be interested in noting that Shea's 8/12/77 says he had the files in the office of the AG checked. There are such files, this means, contrary to representations made to me by phone by Linda Robinson.

If you are not satisfied, our experience indicates that the language "within the scope of your request" is a Shea machine for non-compliance. He rewrites the requests.

The 11/1/77 signed by Barbara Allen Babcock makes no mention of files the Civil Division should have from my litigation and requests and misleads you in La. v Shaw.

My 2569-70 should have involved Civil and did involve interpretation of the GSA-Marshall agreement. It also involved Marshall.

There will be pre-trial records in the Garrison fiasco, which would not have been a fiasco in the case in D.C. if with his unique genius he converted a real victory into one.

I think you know the story about the Civil lawyers and their concern over the suit. Irving Jaffe's son is the source of the account that had them all driving up to see Fisher, who gace them a pep talk. As I recall it, of that period Carl Eardley was No. 2 man and Irving Jaffe, his office mate, next to him or co-equal. Their files should be checked. So should those of David Anderson, who should also be asked. If the others are still around, they also should be asked about relevant files. Your letter does cover all records except those of the court.

Rhoads' 10/28/77 charges you search fees. I presume you have paid them. I think you should ask for a remission. First of all this search serves the public interest, witness the FBI's releases. Second of all, that search should have been made under my PA request as well as earlier FOIA requests. Either justifies remission. Each means they should not have charged you with the search fees.

Where he now finds no compelling reason for the original withholding I'd get on record why he withheld. This really says he should not have. Examination of the records I've seen makes it clear that extra-Act considerations are involved, not legitimate interpretations of the Act or even government policy.

The Le Carre quote is apt if from a novel. It states clearly and accurately how the press is manipulated. including in the present FBI releases.

Best,