The response that you handed to me today was composed over a month past your extended deadline for response. It's also unclear to me why a response that is dated August 19th should have been given to me on August 28th, and only after multiple e-mails to yourself and to the assistant warden. As for the response itself, the institution fails to provide me with the copy of the local TRULINCS supplement that I asked for and which it is required to have on hand, presumably because no such local supplement exists. Moore himself said he’d cut it off because I was talking to the press, not because I threatened anyone, and did not refute my account of the conversation when I filed a BP-3. And this new excuse for cutting off my e-mail, that I supposedly threatened the documentary filmmaker Anna Smith by replying to her e-mail about a conflict between Anonymous and ISIS with the phrase “You cannot prevent us” is obviously absurd. “You cannot prevent us” is a phrase that Smith herself jokingly cited to me in an earlier message that is readily available to your investigators, taken from a public incident that the two of us have discussed on this very messaging system in which North Koreans supposedly hacked Sony and released a poorly-composed statement which included that phrase, something that can also be verified with a five second Google search. It is also clearly not any sort of threat, nor would it be immediately clear to any honest or competent investigator why I would be inclined to declare to an Austin filmmaker that she cannot prevent someone's online campaign against a Middle Eastern terrorist group. Smith doesn't seem to agree that this was a threat, since, as SIS knows well since my mail is subject to additional scrutiny via the Central Inmate Monitoring System, she and I continue to exchange letters. One might ask how it is that I'm still allowed to write her letters when the institution supposedly thinks I'm threatening her from prison? I'm assuming that the patent absurdity of this premise is why the institution is refusing to provide me with a written copy of the original April 1st notice based on its latest nonsensical claim about “safety concerns,” as I would have obviously made it public. Finally, it remains unclear to me why it took over four and a half months for the institution to come up with this rather improbable story. Aside from all of that, it's a very satisfactory response, thank you.