December 10, 1969

Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr:
Fensterwald, Bevan and Ohlhausen
927 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Dear Mr. Fensterwald:
I have been asked to reply to your letter to the Sécretary of State, dated November: 26,1969 , requesting certain documents in connection with the extradition of Mr. James Ear 1 Ray.

Affidavits submitted to a foreign court in support of a request for extradition become part of the records of that court. Mr. Ray himself, however, made a similar request some time ago, and the Department was able to have the affidavits returned to the United States by British authorities. Since the affidavits were originated by the Department of Justice, we asked that Department's views on their release to Mr. Ray. The Deputy Attorney General advised us that the affidavits were considered to be investigative files of his Department and exempt from disclosure under subsection (e) (7) of section 552 of Title 5 of the United States Code. In view of this advice, the Department of State returned the affidavits to the originating agency and so informed Mr. Ray.

Since the Department of State no longer has custody of the affidavits you have requested, we are unable to comply with that request. I regret that we cannot be of assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
ל, ©
Deputy Legal Adviser

Dear Bud,

The purpose for which 1 phoned you todey wes then immediete, now is not. The Kleindienst-Lyerly (how mervelously both ara nemed) didn't get here until today, in a bedly chewed envelope on which tae stemp was not cancelled.
I. would not write either withaut consulting you snd I wented to write both, to include in some writing 1 was doing and have completed. However, I think these are so fantastically beyond spectacular, we should really make it irrefutable. When me meet, perhaps we should telk about really nailing both. I had in mind esking $k$ if he really read our letters, his own gnd the law and if he understond ell. Lyerly's evasions may be transparent encugh, but State clearly hes copies and tuis he not only does not sey but seeks to convey the opposite impression ty the trickiest formulations. His letter is much to my likimg. I do not think he reakized how muck he wes telling me. $K$ has to be the nost atupid testard to get mest kindergerter. But, having survived loldwater, perhaps he doesn't care about his reputation.

Between them; these legel eagles heve confessed a cinlnable conspiracy that I think we' 11 be able to prove in caurt. then you gee whet + have writ ten on this, you'll understend, if you hove ant seen it for yoursolf.

Mesnwhile, do not forget we have it from Foreman ne saw everytaing, es elready in tice book.

If there is anything you want done in England, my pert young thata Heri is home and so is a more mature professor of hers. i'hey mere both here je sterdey and sill not be returning until efter the first of tue yesr, a bout the 3rd. I'll probebly be seeing both again before tnep.

Fieard from Barker yesterday. sie now says 15 snd 15. But mith Binnz here dey kefore, + now heve no coples of either half of the book. I do not know when Faul will be xeroxing II. I should have a $I$ bock from a university archive sonn, With a second cony, my pey for meking it avallable under reatrictions of no use in any way.

Liave a good holiday.

```
PS Becruse these gnt chewed up, would
you please gs'c your girl to mote me as
clear s copy of each as possible? I intend
using tnem in the addition to the addition already written, end the wrinkles
defy gond copying bere and wili show in sny copying if l use toem as they are.
I'll get them when I'm in town. I'd rather not have them folded anyway.
```

