

11/15/90- Jim, re: Wellford v Hardin-

175- 4, records: direct comparison in letters, emoms accidentally seen waa mis-  
filed in Archives in which Archives gets SS to rephrase what they have written  
about my requests. We should remember this for waa in court on clothing suit.

Axelrad-seems to be a FOI specialist, figuring in other suits also. I think  
in La v Shaw, too, and Nichols'.

176 Note this persistent dependence upon Tuchinsky, here said misplaced, as with us.

177 Nertarop's first paragraph on Tuchinsky is worth remembering because of the  
limitation it imposes on interpretation of significance, which is other than DJ's/

Did they not also cite the reversed Bristol-Myers on us?

178 The Bristol-Myers interpretation of law-enforcement exemption is very narrow,  
bestowing it to only -emphasis - "premature discovery", i.e., not even discovery  
where there is nothing before a court.

II (4) Here is a parallel, in arguing before Gessell, to ask that all negotiations  
on the letter agreement and memo transfer be produced in camera. Here, in addition,  
the Clark memo on what a plaintiff can know should be invoked.

179-no blanket on interagency relevant to Arch-SS corres; letter-agreement, memo  
transfer arguments.

And, although it is under "interagency", there is this that is so relevant in  
spectro, I'm surprised you didn't mark it:

"Purely scientific, factual reports and scientific studies cannot be  
cloaked in secrecy by an exemption..." and here it goes into the intent of the  
exemption, the real intent.

*Give Bal separate notation of 179 Scientific Studies  
& fact use papers*