

Dear Jim,

11/14/85

What Ghumir sent you is interesting. I didn't know that Canada has passed any kind of act. I suppose they still have the official secrets act. About a decade ago some broadcast journalists there were interested in duplicating something like our FOIA and then were in touch with me but I'd heard nothing since.

As you'll see, I heard from Fitzgibbon today for the first time in months and I've replied at length.

I do not recall seeing either of the records Hanftel copied for me. I presume both are from ticklers. The first is the only one with what can be taken as filing notations and if it is that, I can only wonder what 9524-441 can mean. I also wonder why there was commendation to all those divisions for only one day of work prior to 12/5/63, the first regular working day after the JFK assassination.

The Hoover 6/20/68 memo on his conversation with Ramsay Clark also is of some interest, as it might also be to you in the litigation because of the spurious claims to exemption, which Green ought recall are entirely unjustified and include what was made public domain in G.A. 75-1996. Why in the world would they spend time and money to withhold Art Hanes' name on page 1? Or anything about him? In context I can't see any legitimate bl claim on this page. But Hoover comments, forgetting his own record, that "Hanes made statements against MLK"

Page 2, graf 3: Hoover could see Ray's money as coming from a bank robbery but when exhaustive efforts failed to connect him with any, how he could he or Clark fail to wonder whether Ray's money was coming from someone or some group, i.e., about evidence of a conspiracy?

When they talk about "Ray's extradition, Hoover didn't let even the AG know that it was imminent, perhaps already started.

You might want to look at what was to have been withheld on p.3, including by classifications, for the litigation. It never qualified and it was all disclosed to me by 1978 and probably earlier. (reviewed 5/28/82, not for you) In context on this next page I can't see any justifiable 7D and suspect it is something that might be embarrassing to the FBI, from Hoover. And on 5 they withhold the disclosed and in the papers names of FBI agents. Also disclosed in 1996. And if in the next graf Hoover said only what he represents, rather than reflecting Ray's astuteness in getting those Canadian names (four rather than these three), could any investigator overlook the probability that Ray did not do it and would not have been able to, i.e., conspiracy? In the next graf, conspiracy again, there is nothing in the FBI records reflecting that Ray knew King was to speak in Memphis when he started out.

Nothing really exciting. I'll file this in my conspiracy folder of my working file if you write me about it, so please remind me.

I'm also surprised that in all this time Hanftel has found so little that could interest me. Please fill him in on what I'm interested in as "new evidence" so he can recognize what I might be able to use. Have you thought about suggesting to Bud that he send Bob up to see what I have and how it is arranged? I can meet the bus and deliver him to it and he can spend that 1 1/4 hrs reading, so he won't lose much time. He might also want to read this new Nosenko stuff, little as it is of real value, because it does have some current values.

If you have in short form what I need to know to stick to the rules in filing an appeal would you please remember it. I've written you about this and we spoke about it when I was down to see the surgeon. Also for a petition cert. I want to be able to think about these things and to at least begin drafting what I visualize as a fairly short appeal. But I want to be within the rules. I will limit myself to the judgement and to procuring it by the undenied felonies. Please thank Bob for me. Best,