

Affidavit of William N. Preusse, CA 77-0692

They all appear to have switched from more expressive descriptions of various kinds of domestic intelligence activities to the word "security-type." My first recollection of this in the Barron book, KGB. Preusse appears to have been a specialist in "internal security" and to be engaged in reviewing that kind of material under FOIA now

He appears to get a bit trick and is evasive when he gets into the stuff being put aside by court order. Examples are that "some of" the documents are within the court's order in the Lee case. Another is "prepared for internal use only." I'd ask if there was any distribution for several reasons and attach his affidavit in this manner:

were any of these records distributed to any other agencies? If so, which, specifically of in general. (In the Memphis case all the military people got copies and some went to the Secret Service. I presume some went to CIA and NSA.)

do you have any knowledge of any other uses of these records? Answer is that they were used extensively, to leaks to the press, to titillate LBJ and to influence members of Congress.

That would take care of his integrity and of the pretenses about classification.

My purpose here (his 3) would not be to get the nasty stuff they compiled, often fabricated, unless it had been released to others, including the Kings. It would be to destroy his credibility. There is no real national security case with King. That was an FBI fabrication.

For the EO to be applicable there has to be a national-security or foreign-policy involvement. He is so evasive he does not even allege the existence of either. Instead he offers an FBI self-service, "the information contained therein would qualify for classification under E.O. 10450." This is followed by his "examination was conducted in strict adherence to the standards and criteria found in 9emp. added.) E.O. 11652.)

How can this be if he does not state the need for classification or any basis for it other than he believes it qualifies, "would qualify for classification under E.O. 10450?"

I'm not familiar with the exact language of the EO but the Act does not include his breakdowns in (3)(d), like "Foreign Agency." All those records came from foreign government agencies - 13 volumes? Even an appreciable part?

His 2 has the same evasion I'm been emphasizing for a long time. misuse of the word "disclose." The question here would be is it new, not previously revealed? (2) It is plain b.s to refer to "covered by the statute pertaining to cryptography." He means NSA intercepts and is hiding it. I'd ask for specifics on this.. It does not "disclose" an intelligence source or method to say we eavesdropped and got this stuff thereby.

(3) can't be possible with King. It is an FBI device for hiding its dirty works. His words are "disclosing a system, plan, installation, project or specific foreign relations matter, the continued protection of which is essential to national security." In all aspects this is impossible so press for specifics on each separate item. All it can boil down to is cozy deals with other paranoid police to spy on a great man the paranoid police either didn't like or spied on to return favors of the same kind or be in a position to ask for them. Nothing like national security is involved and that it seems is the minimum essential for all this verbiage.

Before Gesell I'd be inclined to press hard on this misuse of "disclose" and I'd ~~easy~~ carry this farther by asking him how he can know if any or all of the information is un-disclosed. Does he know of the FBI's campaign against King? Has he read all the leaked accounts? All the books that deal with this? Seen the pictures, heard the tapes, know to whom they were made available? as he read the Drew Pearson columns? The Washington Post Stories? Those in The Councilor of the so-called "White Citizens' Council?"

This is all pretty vacuous. If there is a "specific foreign relations matter" why does he not state what it is? What country? Etc.

This is a very vulnerable generality that can't survive, despite Schaffer's opinion that it qualifies for b4.

In 4 he refers to "continue classified information." This, too, is an evasion. The information was not classified when he saw it. He means that in his opinion it could be classified. This does not meet the standards of EO 11652, as I recall it, that the info has to have been classified when generated.

Or the classification was added at the time of the OPR review rather than when generated. Combined with any distribution his answers to this, if forced, should end the possibility of compliance with the EO. The fact is they did not classify this stuff because they expected the perpetuation of FBI traditional abuses, which include ignoring law and regulation.

By his own listing there is nothing in Appendix A that is within his category 1, from a foreign government or international organization.

Each of the 14 paragraphs has the same claim made for it, designations 2,3 and 4.

2 is not all the cryptography jazz, the other part is "disclosing intelligence sources or methods." # because they had already disclosed all the methods they can't withhold because of bugging, tapping or physical surveillance or mail openings are the sending of Gointel-pro viciousnesses. Pretty much the same has to be true of 3, which has the broad heading "Foreign Interest." Meaningless. It makes one grapple with smoke.

I don't see a Category 4 here. In addition, I'd check the words of the EO. I have caught them rewriting the FPIS exemptions often enough.

His (5) opinion is that the itemized pages "are properly classified" simply because there is on each the number of a classification officer's. However, the date of classification would seem to be required to be in accord with the EO. I have found other Murkin records in which there was no classification affixed until 1976 and 1977.

He actually says this on p. 4, middle, with respect to Exhibits 17 and 18, "per classification dated February 17, 1977."

I look back over this and note that beginning with a 1 they all have 1977 classification dates, 1-3 January 17, 4-14 October 25, 1977. These are after your requests, mine, Bernard Lee's and those of the family and SCIC. In short, they were not classified until the FBI had need to try to withhold them. Followed Church and other committees, too.

That they didn't even bother to classify this stuff prior to the Church committee's day does seem strange.

With Appendix C they didn't classify Volume 1 until 12/8/77.

I'd ask if he is one of those who did the classifying. Officer 4915 in January and 6922 beginning in October 1977. If he were 6922 he'd not have had to read all that stuff again, would not have had to do anything except rubber stamp himself.

All of Vol. II is same date of classification, 6922, 12/15/77

All of Vol. III May 16, 1977, by 4915.

Vol. IV, 5/6/77, 4915. Same for Vol. V.

Vol. VI raises interesting question. There was a review by 4915 on 5/12/77 but some were not then classified, were classified on 12/20/77 by 6922. The latter are pages 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and even then 6922 did not know his business. He resumed classifying on 12/21/77 and added pages 27-32, inc., 34, 39, 40, 42-46, inc., 49-end, 57. But it would appear that even 6922 did not know his withholding business because he did not classify p. 17, pars 3 and 4 until January 17, 1978.

Vol VII, pretty much the same is true, except that 4915 was stamping these up earlier in 5/77, on the 6th. But good old 6922 had to withhold more, p. 11, on 1.10.78

Vol VIII, same situation, 4915 on 5/10/77 with 6922 coming in 12/16/77, p. 1, 3, 23, 24, 25, 27-32, inc. The dates change to 1.10.78.

Vol. IX likewise, ~~6922/6922~~ 4915 on 5/9/77 and 6922 coming in on 1/10/78 with p. 4, 11, 16, 17.

Vol X, only 3 pp, 1 and 2 by 4915 on 5/16/77 and 6922 adding p. 3 12/20/77.

Vol XI- even 4915 seems to have gone back and classified what he had not classified originally. P 1 not until 45/17/77 but pp. 2ff were on 5/11. 6922 came in on 12/14/77 with p. 7; 12/15 with p. 9, 14, 47. P18 was on 12/14, so it appears that he went back over his own work to see about withholding even more. 12/15 in 19, 21-25, inc., 29, 32, 34, 36-39 inc., 41-46, inc., 48, 49, 52-57, inc and 59.

I have detailed these things because it is apparent that there is a re-review for the purpose of withholding more, that this means they do not know their own business, and that the dates are such it can be assumed they coincide with a new need for an excuse to suppress. All are dated only after requests for them and not at the time these records are to

have been gone over for the Church committee and for other purposes, like the CRD review. We do know that CRD did classify its work, with its report, so how could it classify what was only from what was until then without classification?

Why are the classifiers identified by name only? Kelley has held that in historical cases agents names are not to be withheld. Withholding them can serve to keep from identifying them with other of their work, like the Gobles of the FBI.

I think all of this requires testimony. It is not credible on the face of it that a competent classifier would have to have his work gone over to have so much more of it classified, meaning withheld. And almost if not all of it under sources and methods? What single one remained to be "disclosed," that is, unknown, not already disclosed? On the names of informers could be secret in this category.

No method is undisclosed. Even that they had SCLC people serving as informants is disclosed. (In 75-1996, too.)

From Preusse's credentials, as he states them on p. 1 of the affidavit, he has been in "headquarters since the middle of 1957 and engaged in "a supervisory capacity in security-type work." It is a fair assumption that his career covers intimate knowledge of the spying and operations relating to "ing. He therefore, if this is true, could be asked which source or method is undisclosed, not counting the names of informers. There is none that he can't testify to and none that he can claim is undisclosed.

He should be asked, as I think I've said before, if he is aware of what has been published, what has been disclosed by the FBI and DJ, etc.