

add writing file

FBI-King Section 48 Serials 3901-3986, 90 docs, 197 pp. released

3918-9 FBI knew Ray could beat both MoPen and King raps. Bureau warned all shut up about this.

In this range of serials there are a number relating to Judge Casey's ruling in St. Louis and related matters x in which there is extensive masking, attributed to 5 and 7. The 5 seems improbable and it is more likely embarrassment is the real reason. Inc 3932

~~39~~ 3928 is an Atlanta serial withheld and referred to USPO (post office?)

Several sections deal with statements attributed to Edgar Eugene Bradley, made into separate file. Not relevant here if anywhere.

This section is still another proof that the FBI was getting nowhere.

Dear Jim, Today's conference with the nine at DJ

11/11/77

I'mn be making notes other than lawyers do and will send you a copy. Here I want to give you a few thoughts for any use you may be able to make, for what they may or may not mean to you, and in particular for any meeting we may have without the stonewalling FBI present. I think we are close to apoint at which the non-FBI part of the FBI will have to face this business, one way or another.

In part I believe the harmonics of your chord of what is good for them was not within their perception. There are several aspects of this I'll mention. They are not all.

On OPR if they are not careful they will be in this posture:

We have issued an OPR report. It exculpates the FBI. We will suppress any information that challenges or can challenge the OPR report, meaning the FBI and its "colution" to the King assassination. We say we are right, therefore we are right and we'll say exemptions are relevant whether or not they REALLY are so can't dispute our officially ordained truth.

They are afraid of the FBI and after the record in this case alone still repeat the FBI's cliches as unquestionable truth. One of these is its relations with other police departments and how releasing information obtained from them under what the FBI claims is a special privilege will ruin that relationship.

All police departments, local, state and international, have relations with the FBI. They can't do without these relationships. Nor can the FBI. If any of these other departments could get along without the FBI they would. They have deep resentments against the FBI and oddly for many of the same reasons we think the FBI is not functioning well. The FBI rushes in and wrecks cases for them to steal headlines and credit and grabs cases away from them for the same reason. It is arrogant with them. They get along because they have to get along.

In public they will rarely speak other than glowingly about the FBI or any director.

In private they say what I just said and more. Even the OPR report could not totally ignore this, on a different level- the FBI's refusal to trust the USA in Memphis and opted inappropriation jurisdiction in Birmingham.

There is a limit to how much we can tell them, as there is to how much we might expect them to be will to consider, leave alone believe. But I think that once the non-FBI part gets to ponder ~~what~~ any development that might seriously challenge the FBI's "solution" and the political consequences of it to any administration and any AG they may appreciate that in time we may be of help to them, may be other than an "enemy."

This time will never come with the FBI.

But there is a political reality the lawyers ought to wonder about, whether in the overall, in the long run, the FBI is not really their adversary, not us.

As a practical matter the FBI is always making what it obtains from local police available. It does in case after case in court, as one example. It would have had to in this case if it had gone to trial. They leaked virtually everything that did come out and I can, if I take the time, pin-point the stories and the FBI as source and when the FBI obtained what it leaked. They are really claiming that what they did not leak is what will hurt their relations with local police. Of course this is unreasonable and baseless. What they are holding back is what questions what they have not held back. It is not a question of the local police and relations with them. It is a question of the FBI and what can challenge its solution to this major case.

There is but a single point in all of this where they have a legitimate issue and I have no intention of forcing them or trying to force them past it, into where there is risk. At the same time I intend to do what I can to keep them from doing what they have been doing, misusing this against me and against disclosure. Their informer exemption is appropriate. Their claim to it often is not. This is one of the reasons I made an issue of the Morris Davis case, the one in which I recalled the wrong name, Bunt. There is no confidentiality there because of Davis himself and because the FBI turned him over to the House assassins who turned him over to Mark Lane.

There is a legitimate need to protect some prisoners. They have extended it to what is not legitimate. I respect the legitimate need and contest what is not right. They have

an exaggerated fear of what can happen to prisoners but at the same time they are not care- in interviewing them so other prisoners will not know. This is why I cited Buccelli and the MoPen guard lieutenant. More. HW