Dear Howard (cc JL), 1/8/76

Thanks for your mailing of the 5th. I'll share the clips and letters with JL.

Glad you gave the correction to Turner. Be interested in his "explanation." They do all these kinds of things to stonewall. In Civil Rights the most blatant perjury we have in 1996, and by one of their supposed clean-up lawyers, the one on the SWP case supposed prosecution. Wanna make any guesses? I mean about prosecutions.

Your request of Archives of 12/7 in part duplicate some of mine. There are several I've just not gotten around to asking for but of which I knew. So I am aware of their interrelationship. Having asked for all the records, including very long ago and repeatedly of the CIA, where I've exhausted my administrative remedies, if you want to file for this I'd rather you do it. You probably have all my letters.

In connection with the clothing pix of 70-2569, of which my carbon enclosed, in talking to Jim about this he says that once administrative remedies have been exhausted any requester can join in a complaint and be co-complainant of plaintiff. If you can see any advantage in this for us let us know. I mean let Jim and me know if you see any advantage in your filing with me jointly-but down there and you pro se and for me. Otherwise if you want to file, and I think it is a good one to file, and want to do it alone, go ahead. If and when you do be careful to read the precise wording of the claimed exemptions. And remember that Rhoads is chairman of the Inter-Agency committee on declassifications. The CIA has no law-enforcement purposes in Mexico and the Commission had none so how come they can calim (7)(D)? In this connection or "disclose the identity of a confidential source..."? In no sense applicable. If the Mexico cops were in on it that is public, as is the fact of the electronic surveillance, so there is no "disclosure" possible. I am sure the same thing is true of the claim to A and is probably true with respect to B.

If she has filled your request I'd appreciate copies and will compare them with those I have of some, particularly CD 1359.

Now in your 2. you should remember they did the same thing with me, referred to the CIA, and have ignored my protest. CIA is stonewalling and has on both of my earlier requests. So is FBI on a duplicating and very old one. If you really want to go ahead and sue I think you have a de facto denial and should appeal now. On the search you asked for, unless you receive a list and the exemptions claimed on each, absent a denial of the existence of other records, I'd ask for an itemization, document with exemption claimed for each. They have a new business of delaying and lumping the claims.

Your 4., your Item 9, the transcript, there has been no response to my request. I have informal info that they have told the press the CIA merely showed this to the Commission and took it back. Here I think E.O.11652 can do them in because it has been 10 years and the contents are out. Do you consider that you are specific enough in asking for any relevant staff papers? I presume you know that CD631 does relate to the transcript? I have been so informed.

I hope your folks are watching the Bulletin. They will be carrying stories and by a reporter who seems to be a good one to me, Stuart Dibson. Probably not him alone. They may also use wire copy. My own feeling is that Sprague may not be as secure as all reports have it. I'll go over the clips and inform if any comment seems in order.

Thanks and best,