

JL: Thanks for what Floyd brought today.

Re: CD 1347, the covering letter was not included and there appears to be no legitimate basis for the withholding of any of these pages that would not preclude the release of all that had been ~~xxx~~ released.

There may be legal niceties lost upon me, but why should Hoover first and then all others perpetuate suppression of non-secret evidence on the far right while never withholding anything on, say, the PFOC?

For your information, the adding of these pages still leaves the FBI not having reported an enormous amount that was public about Milster et al. In Scup I had less than all, probably reduced in F-U.

As I remember it, the FBI withheld about the last 200 pages of CD 7 making the same mistake, not editing the index. The pattern is of protection of the far right. The names in the index indicate this ~~xxx~~ pattern.

One reading of the Virginia decision in Bud's case against the CIA confirms that he has less courage than a crippled mether hen and that it provides leads for us to follow in the descriptions and identifications of the documents withhold.

I think you should get a copy of Robert ^{W.} Young's affidavit because I think
a) the CIA will not deliver to me and
b) it is not unlikely I am mentioned in the listed documents inspected if camera,

Nos. 36,37,40,44,45, 47-9 and 57.

I don't think we need more basis that what will stick if alleged as "information and belief," that I am not named in some of the documents he got. (Don't forget Baile/Ray potential.) We know that I am in some of his files and they have not given this to me. Having given it to him do their legs start with feet to stand on? Having denied me what they gave him may raise questions of another sort, but I think immediately important is a) proof of bad faith or frivolity and b) proof that their claims in withholding from me have to be spurious.

Until the time for appeal has expire we of course do not really know if we'll get any more.

The list in this decision also indicates what should have been given me, like computer printouts, and wasn't.

47-9 may be promising because of the reason for entire withholdings "the CIA had an interest in such individuals." This could and should have included me.

57: I have "no relation with plaintiff."

If we come to the 3rd graf on p. 4 with my why not ask a) for deletions of names and/or b) asking that those named be asked to waive claimed "privacy."

I could make easy guesses on some of the names that would mean little or nothing to most judges and are not privacy invasions, like us, Sprague, Turner, Garrison, Flamonde, Smith, and so many others.

Now in the papers supplied Bud these standards were violated repeatedly. So, why should the CIA have sought immunity in these inst nees?

A reading of this confirms my belief that when Bud is at bat he swings with less vigor than a basket case.

Best, HW