(a) A SHEMERA CONSTICE (b) A STATEMENT OF NEBAL (c) A SHEMERA CONSTANT (c) A SHEMERA CONSTANT

MAY 2 1978

Mr. Harold Weisberg Route 12 - Old Receiver Road Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harold:

The road to hell is paved with good intentions and I am a lousy correspondent! To a considerable extent, however, my time has been spent in working with the Bureau in an effort to get some things moving that are of interest to you.

By now you should have received the first Kennedy release and I'm sure it did drive the local postal officials up a wall. As to the excisions from the Kennedy worksheets, we will get that appeal assigned as soon as we can. At this stage, I am still in a state of being pleased that they were released. As you know, I'm still working as hard as I can to improve the Department's performance in telling people what they do not get. This is a matter of concern to Congress and was commented on in the G.A.O. report. It looks very promising for a real breakthrough within the next month or so -- I will keep you posted.

My source at the Bureau said that everything they had on Oswald -- pre-assassination -- was processed. This makes sense, because it all had to be picked up and incorporated within the Kennedy files. I saw this with various "early" Chambers and Hiss materials and I'm sure it was done with the Oswald materials.

I am also assured that you either have gotten or will soon get everything on the King and Kennedy assassinations that has ever been released to anyone. In response to another of your questions, the F.B.I. did not release any of its King records in the form of microfilm/microfiche. Lastly, I am still trying to get your (I suppose I should actually send them to Jim) copies of the Field Office destruction/retention guidelines that have been in effect over the past 10-15 years. The current ones alone would be easy, but it seems to me that we want more than that.

Ŷ

Before I close, I do want to touch on the matter of Mr. Epstein. Linda was the one who thought of checking our own records first. Lo and behold, we had never received any appeal from him. Since I am unaware of any writer who went through the F.B.I. and did not appeal to us, it came as less of a shock when we learned that he never filed any F.O.I. request with the Bureau at all -- for Nosenko material or otherwise. It seems that he (and/or someone representing him) did review some of the reading room materials and (I think) ask a few questions. Through some other part of the Bureau, he got a copy of Jim Adams' testimony before one of the committees (you will get a copy) -- and that's it! Accordingly, it is not a matter of expediting your request for what the Bureau gave Epstein about Nosenko under the Act, because he got nothing via that route. It actually makes sense, given the Russia-Cuba thrust of Epstein's book, that he would have gone to the Agency, rather than the Bureau. If you haven't made the same request to the C.I.A. (everything released to Epstein, or everything released on Nosenko, or both), you might want to do so. Sorry not to be of more help, but it may be that this "negative information" will itself be of some assistance to you.

I will write again soon when I have some time. Linda sends her best.

Regards, 11111

Quinlan J. Shea, Jr., Director Office of Privacy and Information Appeals

CC: James H. Lesar, Esquire

P.S. Some nice Sunday, the sons and I may take you up on your invitation to drop in.