

Status call, 75-1996, 3/7/78

Suggestions for 3/6/78

Instead of having this another cut-and-dried proceeding in which we nod heads and say what is meaningless I propose we say that they have used the dodge of getting me to give them notes on my notes that if then complied with will not mean compliance to avoid any other compliance, even where they know that we know what they are withholding.

The four sections of Sub G from Memphis are enough of an example.

They did not deliver them on time. I caught these as missing when I finally got a list of what was supposed to be in the MFO. I had to raise real hell to get that. It was the package too large for me to handle, delivered when I was at Milton, Wisc.

When we met with them the morning of the meeting in Schaffer's office these four were still missing. They promised to mail them, all that was required being xeroxing. I've reminded them a number of times. They are now about a half year late and still have not done this simple xeroxing job.

This is an example. There are other cases.

It is to avoid this that Lynne told the judge my letters are incomprehensible. I have not had a single letter from the FBI asking what I meant in any one letter. They have not complied where I have pointed out to them what they were withholding or that the withholding was improper. With a Ray release, for example, they withheld on Ray on the claim of Privacy.

They have not replaced a single page from which now admittedly there was improper withholding.

They promised a review of the worst of the withholdings, after they got rid of that "Harvard liberal" Govee. This was to have been at the end of the processing of the FBI HQ Murkin files. It has never happened.

Instead they disbanded the team working on these records. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~  
~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~

They promised me compliance with the political part once the inventory required by Judge Smith's decision was completed. I have received not a single paper under this, not even those already public, which are the ones I asked for first so I could write about them. These relate to the contriving of a story about King staying at a white-owned motel, etc., surrounding the 3/28/68 violence. But I have proof that they have already reviewed those records and provided copies to other requesters. (Don't give particulars unless you have to. I'll be coming to this in my dictating but probably not by tomorrow early a.m.) It is to the King family and to Levison and Wachtel, with the Tafts of the DJ seeing to it that they got some records.)

No word yet on the providing of copies of the prosecutorial files without the excisions now admitted to be unjustified and so recognized at the time they were made.

I think it will be telling to tell the judge that from the time of our first meeting with Schaffer to now I have not received a page on this from the FBI HQ and nothing ~~except~~ except what I got 3/4 for NO FO via HQ, which is nothing about the case, only about how they provided some only of their records to HQ for processing.

This whole case represents an FBI technique for preventing writing the FBI does not want by misuse of FOIA, by keeping me tied up so I cannot write, having no time for it.

On NO FO: I'll have a marked copy plus the copy for you. Chuck Matthews drew up an affidavit for all the FOs to use in which he has directions for non-compliance built in. If he does not direct a non-first-person affidavit of compliance he points to it and authorizes if not asks for it. He specifies only some of the files "main files," for searching. He limits the Sub sections to Ias. And we have no stipulations list of the FO files. Hastily,