

Came across as I worked down the stack. If dupe don't return. Boy was I right!
This was exactly their game and I was able to frustrate it! H 1/11/76

Dear Jim,

10/30/75

Your call about the FBI's belated, verbal and I think unusual response to my King/Ray FOIA request caught me at a bad time, as you know. It comes at a time that in itself sponsors questions. And at the same time I have to consider the possibility that atypically someone on the Department of Justice may have been reasonably honest.

What I can now do is limited. I do not know how much, what or if any limitations the doctor will change or limit when I next see him. And this is quite an old request for them to be phoning you and demanding an immediate response. My original written request went without response. I raised this, or you did, in our meeting with Bresson in the spring so he'd have time to learn and be ready. We then went through all the other steps over so long a time and now they want me to rush?

It is not reasonable and in my present situation I cannot and will not do it.

The only reason for rush now that I can think of is that they want to use the coming TV specials for more of their propaganda and use me as the excuse for leaking or for giving others what they have refused me. I will not be party to this and will not collaborate in any more of these federal dirty-works.

There are problems of principle I must consider. I do not want to make snap judgments on them. One is the question of my rights, separate from all else, under the law. Another is can there be any compromising of Jimmy's rights. (The only reason I can think of for their wanting his release in a rush is to give it to someone else with that as their excuse. The hell with this. If they want to leak it after refusing it to me, let them do it on their own, now with me as their excuse.)

Nothing you mentioned as their having mentioned to you is new and I see no use for it by others except as propaganda with visuals. There may, of course, be much more. There should be. So, reference to what is not new is in itself suspect when there is reference to nothing else.

If there is a real question of Jimmy's rights and his permissions should be sought then I think you can not do this adequately by a letter. Moreover, there has never been privacy in his defense mail and discussion of it with the existing surveillance is not in his interest, I believe. Especially would this be wrong if he has questions to ask and you have responses to make to his questions. All being copied by the State at least.

The people who are in charge of this in the Department have a very bad record for integrity. They are the ones who led Kleindienst to tell us they did not have what I sought in C.A. 718-70; then that the court records were under the investigatory file exemption; then they ignored the directive of a federal judge; and then, but not all, this judge was given a perjurious affidavit.

None of this inspired trust now. So, I want time when I am well enough to think this through. I want proper conditions under which there is a prospect of private and adequate discussion with Jimmy on the chance they are not up to another of their to now unended tricks, and I do not want to be in the position where there is any chance they can be using me as an excuse for making public in a propaganda spectacular what they have stonewalled me on for so long.

When I feel better, when I can type with less discomfort, when I've had time to think this through, I'll write you further.

Best,