

Dear Jim,

2/21/77

The 1996 pix xeroxes of which you obtained last week are not those your thought.

I'll have another examination when I get the glossys, which will have legends on the back that are more legible. If you pick these pix up please examine them for this and please be certain that they have sequential numbers.

However, these pictures are I think evidence of Wiseman's deliberateness in his false swearing I believe is perjury. They are not the only proof and my disposition is to accumulate more before doing anything about it. Or trying to.

I was able to separate these mixed up but very clear xeroxes into two sets neither complete. The numbering of those taken 4/5 begins with 31, for example. There are some numbers indicating identification and sequence on the other set, which is of only 16.

Each set is in two files, regardless of the negatives being in Memphis. One is the HQ file we are in, 44-38861. It is serial 6112 X in that. The other is from I believe a Memphis F.O. number, 44-~~1987~~1987. In that it is serial 1A-26.

Each is accompanied by letters, those of 4/4 (3-62) T.H.S. and the others what looks like K eMe, with the M written like the capital, with ~~spaces~~ sharp points and no spacing.

The 4/4 pictures were taken after dark. I'm sure this applies to all of them, even the interior ones. I'll not go into the reasoning relating to those that show no outside but I tell you this is true of all exterior shots.

By that time there was no press reporter interested in taking these kinds of shots in this number. You can be sure they shot as fast as possible and got the pictures out that fast.

You included serial 146 with this. Is this your idea or did they give it to you with the pictures? I believe this is the FBI's own pix ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>of</sup> those of the Memphis police. If those of the locals then one set is missing. They provided three sets. There is another Memphis report covering the other police pictures and as I recall still another referring to the FBI's own, with the photographer(s) masked.

If you can find references fast I'd appreciate them. Otherwise I'll read my notes on the earlier sections in which these were referred to. I'm sorry I did not set up a separate file, as I have today.

There is some mystery, like why is there so large a self-standing capital H in so many pictures in so many places. There is also some evidentiary value. This is why they were withheld and may explain why others are still missing.

The author of this report in the form of an airtel is a little too cute. He sends the pictures "for the information of the Bureau" without giving their source. (Had the acronym Murkin been selected by 4/7? I thought later but I guess not.) What the hell kind of evidence is this, sourcesless, not one to testify to it?

Let us wait until we get to serial ~~61~~ 6112 if necessary, as I think it will not be, to put it before Green. I'd rather delay because it is hardly possible the FBI did not acquire any newspix and I do not want them pretending it is top secret when they come to it. Or inserting a sheet saying that serial was missed.

Best,

Dear Jim, re DJ Supplement in 75-1996

3/3/77

With this I will be giving you a draft of an affidavit in response by me. It is about 4,000 words long. I got up to do it at 5 and had the draft completed by 9, not too bad when I'm exactly a month from my 64th birthday.

It is now after 12 and I've not had time to look at it.

I do hope to before I give it to you tomorrow.

Whether or not I can what follows is unchanged.

We really are past the point where we can continue to strive for either legal or literary perfection in these papers we file and farthur past the point where you do the retyping.

Edit this and I'll get it retyped or I'll pay Mary or Karen to do it. The important things are getting what has to be done and taking as little time for them as possible. If you agree that this has to be done then please try to limit yourself to

- relevance, pertinence
- accuracy
- comprehensibility
- necessary and unnecessary
- omissions

All of this you can do by hand and in little time, even if you want to shift the order around. I have structure it so that what I want x in and you say not is at the end and can be x-ed out easily. I do want it also in case we go up on appeal on this. It then may be a crucial consideration. I believe it is relevant to non-compliance.

X I also want Green to again have to face the omnipresent perjury regardless of how she reacts to forcing it on her. Now it is even more arrogant of both Dugan and the Department and FBI to swear falsely to her. If there is any reaction to this your stontaneous response to Pratt on that was perfect. Repeat it. If it is accepted this time I'll go further and announce and hold a press conference to repeat the charges where there is no insanity - and dare suit.

If she ignores this it will be in the record and it is not subject to refutation. Were there to be the attempt I'd force the issue further with attachments I have omitted on purpose. Then, with a couple of days of work, I'd have overwhelming proof.

Would you have to do any more than file a short Opposition, a page or less, with this affidavit? I think not.

I do suggest that you consider the possibility that Robinson's outburst last week may reflect the temper of the judges and that the time is over-ripe for confrontation of deliberate false swearings and deliberate withholdings and other stonewallings in these cases because the judges are overwhelmed and overworked by them. If anyone else had the disposition to make such an issue, whether it be the Naders or the Marks and Halperin types, I do not believe anyone is in the position I am in to make an un-availible case.

I also want this in the record in relative short form for the friends of FOIA/PA in the Congress.

Please, once, do it my way. I have been able to live with this compromise and I'm sure not only that you can but with less pressure if you do. So take the first step now and get it over with.

Hastily,

False swearing related to rather than in C.A. 375-1996

RW 6/27/77

I do not intend the attached extra copies of Serials 2877 and 2879 for use Thursday. Not that if you want to you cannot.

This is a new aspect of FBI false swearing.

With Hitt the SAC and able to claim no personal knowledge, this is not new. Nor is hearsay affidavits.

Garner was a drunk.

My earlier notes show what did happen.

An agent or agents under cover rented Room 2 from Garner. When it was known that Garner would not be interrupting they took the hinges off the adjoining room and stole what was in it.

There is never a time the FBI can't find an agent who will produce precisely the affidavit required of him.

If he cares about what is good for him.