

Dear Jim,

10/12/79

~~XXXXXXXX~~ After supper I read Attachment B. I'm satisfied that not providing it earlier was not an accident. There is much useful material in it. I've marked the parts up and will be writing about them.

Tentatively I think I'll treat each matter separately so that later, if necessary, what I write can be included in an affidavit without my having to rewrite for the draft.

In addition to what I spotted yesterday in the first couple of pages, the FBI/Beckwith interpretations of scope, there is a Parle Blake memo quoting what Green said in court, including scope and including all my early requests as part of the 4/15/75 one, of which I reminded you today for you to throw at Cole. He is quite explicit, too.

He also held that because those early requests are earlier than the FBI's claimed backlog they took precedence, as Blake states. I mean this entire request because of their age. The FBI said first-come-first-serve, so I'm first.

He is less than honest or accurate relating to the index to the prosecutorial volumes. He claims that Green held they were within the request whereas they were provided under discovery. He never says that and says the opposite.

There are many surveillance items not provided and I don't mean the wrong ways.

Harp rewrote the request in writing New York and told them to classify records that they had not classified. They replied that they didn't have to because they could make (b)(7) claims and besides, the items were not properly classifiable.

I'm a bit tired and don't remember it all but I think you can see there is useful information. I may read all of the stuff first and I'll probably clean up the copies I've made for appeals before I write anything.

We will face the same problem on your return from Singapore this time so please think about possible solutions when you won't really have time to do what needs doing. I don't want to waste all the time and work I wasted last time and in this case. Without having thought it through I'm inclined to think that an affidavit is the way to handle it.

This and the record we've made the past few days should be very helpful on attorney's fees. Especially when as of today they've made no searches for items 5 and 6 records! And having admitted that my early requests are relevant have not complied with them except insofar as the material is lost in the MURKIN file.

Best,