

Dear George,

3/4/80

Here are copies of two of the records I could retrieve from a subject file on Clay Shaw. There are others, including others that mention you, but I can't now go through the various volumes to locate them.

The ~~mark~~ slash mark through your and other names is a directive for the marking of what they call a see reference. You are not the subject of the "mail," as the FBI refers to these kinds of records, therefore the record is not indexed to you. But a search at central records will disclose cards under Lardner, ~~Shaw~~ George, with the file and serial number of this and any other records.

Generally, the FBI pretends that it doesn't have any see references and does not search them in response to requests.

There is ~~an~~ reflection of the (repressive) times on the Post's first page today, three stories, on the Kissinger decision, your Stockwell story and the FBI's puffery with the spy who spied out nothing, plus the AP's on the bugs court being a rubber stamp. This is an advanced part of the long-visible campaign only part of which is against FOIA.

The people who defended Snapp and the "reporters' Committee don't know how to fight. It is more difficult now than earlier, when they were all snug and self-satisfied, but they still haven't really learned. I fear they won't.

None helped when Jim and I, alone, fought through on the investigatory files exemption, as you heard Gesell say in my 77-2155. The committee, the Naders and the ACLU, belatedly were going to file amicus briefs, but none did.

How about all the guys who without prior clearance, as on talk shows and interviews, of which Epstein's are an example, who took the same oath and breached it, only (for most) the way the CIA wanted them to speak? No suits against them.

Best,