

Conn/P up/bb

Dear Quinn,

2/23/79

I've just returned from a short trip slightly and in no sense seriously injured and with a need to move around less and more carefully to avoid any irritation of a slight scalding and subsequent irritation by walking. And my old typewriter, repaired, I hope, to get used to again.

You may be interested in this Canadian newsaccount of a lone speech at Kingston, Ontario. My source, at a different college, at Belleville, Ontario, did not identify the paper or date. In today's mail.

As I try to catch up on an accumulation that goes back to your 1/12 testimony I decided to make prompt response to the enclosed from Bresson and to use a carbon, as I state, for the appeal. I do not intend ~~///~~ to take any initiatives re Webster's FOIA testimony but if I'm asked that will be different.

I spoke at Monmouth, Ill. with a rather surprising development. Oliver Patterson and Susan Wadsworth were in the audience. I did not arrange it. They told me the privacy waiver to which I refer was in the mail but it did not get here today. Here is how it came about. I think on my own I'd detected some of this and ~~mentioned~~ <sup>mentioned</sup> it to you. Withheld records.

The reason he phoned was to ask where the copies I'd promised were. The Post-Dispatch had forgotten to mail them. They've apologized and said they'll go out today.

So asked Ed where I was. When she told him he said he'd look at the atlas and drive there if not too far. When she told me this I told her it was a couple of hundred miles and the weather was no bad, the snow so deep, the roads in such terrible shape he would not be that crazy. And I did not recognize him in the audience because of my cataracts. He said nothing at all until about the end, after the time for the end, but the kids were interested and kept questioning me. After I responded to a question about Jerry Ray he said that I apparently did not recognize him but he also knew Jerry Ray and he could attest that .....

The FBI is withholding more than I indicate to Bresson and not accidentally. The potential for embarrassment is great, as any careful reading of what is disclosed reveals. I do not expect the <sup>A</sup>-D to perceive this and I have not flagged it or anything else. I've responded to questions, not tried to influence the story.

But I am telling you that they have dedicated themselves to making a liar of you and themselves. They claim the need to withhold Patterson's symbol and file numbers and then make disclosure, which can lead to no harm in/ any event. They claim they never disclose actual identities and did this with the House as assins despite having Patterson's written expression of contrary desire. (I'll have to suggest to him that he depose Bresson on exactly how the disclosed symbol could hurt and how the FBI preserved identifications by disclosure after specific contrary request.)

Apparently some St. Louis SAs were having some fun over the Patterson-Wadsworth business, made xeroxes and took them from the office and showed them around. This is not an exceptional as the FBI would have you believe. I've had the children of some come up to me and tell me about social gatherings of SAs in their homes and of what was then displayed. In the past this included illicit copies of the Zapruder film. The daughter of one who lives in Prince Georges County really hates her father, so I've not let anyone know any details, including Jim. I'd hate to have a child with that opinion of me. In any event, Wadsworth knows something about what is in SL FO on her, it is Ray/King related and she asked me to get it and I offered her copies when I do.

I would like to hear from you with regard to the memo on your 1/12 testimony. We will have to do something soon. I've been overly occupied with other matters and Jim is overdue on some but we'll soon have to and I will want to move forward.

Jim has an affidavit I think you should see and DJ ought to pay attention to on some rational level above zealotry in excess of adversary pursuit. It is fairly well illuminated with copies of underlying records disclosing what is withheld from the worksheets under national security claim sworn to thereafter as necessary by an SA named Bradley Benson. Would the Department like such contemporary illustrations for the new FBI Director's coming FOIA testimony? Or to have me attach the relevant paragraphs and attachments to every affidavit in which I ~~may~~ oppose national security claim? Or is everyone there crazy with fear of the FBI regardless of how irrational and perjurious it is? There really was no need for any of those withholdings. They were not even checked against the underlying records. Assuming there is such a thing as an SA who believes the fact of foreign-police cooperation is still secret. Remember, worksheets and the fact only, not the content, not copies of their records. Which have been provided in any event when the FBI wanted use of them.

Despite your testimony and in records I've received since it there has been extensive use of b2. I've been reading the Jordan decision. If you have not.

When I can I'll read the little unread of the Patterson papers, go over my notes and file an appeal. However, I think it would be better if the FBI pretends it can be reasonable and within normal limits something close to honest and decent that are up without my having to go into more than I have with Bresson. If they keep putting me to more work I guess I'll have to take time for bestowing more rewards on them. It may not be impossible and we have maxims about virtue and rewards.

Best wishes,