

May 12, 1978

4/27/81

You and the FBI's total non-compliance with regard to the records to be provided to me in the Dallas office FBI case as a result of administrative action as well as guarantee the total work of all the other office law in this matter and could not be better defined in either guarantee sufficient litigation of non-compliance with the act.

One of the exceptions claimed appear to be excessive, others unjustified.

If the substance for 85-43-000000 20 is to be believed, in Serial 10537 there are 24 pages of which not a single word is reasonably appropriate.

According to the several pages of this out of substance, presentation of some kind appears to be desired, which I find rather surprising, but the fact is that of the eight records not referred to DOJ, Memphis & San Antonio for every word of every record.

In Section 90, two FBI records are claimed to be "Not Agency Records" under the claim to exemption. Both are of 7/12/78. 10315 in "The to Hill," clearly an FBI record, and the same appears to pertain to 10314, a 41-page memorandum.

The same claim is made with regard to the Atlanta FBI records, Serials 10488 and 10489, both of 12/12/78, the first a bill and the second to Mr.

In the past I appealed to the FBI's indication, that it was and does destroy records of all and kind. The records in those I received recently reflect the contrary, that where any destruction is possible, there must be a request and an accounting. They are some, in this case from "things to Dallas, but the form used by all offices. These are from the "my file, 44-1039, 6473 and 6474. I cannot explain the "NO FILE" notation on both.

According to my visit with Mr. [redacted] and with the FBI's ability to locate records it wants to hide, there is the 10/25/75 Dallas to File (10-10661), pertaining to allegations by former clerk William Walters. The SAC states that "On explicit instructions of Deputy Associate Director JAMES ADAMS, I was told not to place letters in our file. These letters were furnished by date indicated to Personal Attention of Mr. ADAMS. The letters deal with my inquiry into this matter in the Dallas Division." These hidden records are pertinent in this litigation and should have been included in the general releases. I appeal the withholdings.

The above matter is extensively in the public domain, including Congressional hearings.

Knowing as the FBI's intent not to comply with my request and other matters, including unjustified and unnecessary claims to secrecy, etc. (see 8-4) records. According to 10/11, the initial records were limited to FBI files, clearly an inadequate and knowingly deceptive search. The withheld information is that of 10/11, about which I wrote you previously. It is my hope to have released information as the investigation herein is pulled out in addition to this supervisory function has a public relations function. According to 10/11, 10/11, if there are other things they were not sent to FBI, for processing.

According to 10-11-1956 the indices for these files only were sent to FBI for processing. All indices are within my request and the agreement in that copies of all indices would be provided.

In 1956 there is 10 and 11 claim for the file numbers of the disclosed surveillance in James Oswald, with the question 10 claim was the primary reference number used to claim that the FBI did. (Remember that the wiretaps were not illegal, the FBI didn't even bother to withdraw permission to tap her.) The withheld information is not solely of interest to the FBI and it has nothing at all to do with personal matters.

I've already specified the withholding of the long FBI file number, information that is now the FBI has completely disclosed, as I've informed you in the past with copies.

While I did state that I did not believe the actual transcripts of the taped intercepts should be disclosed, I was granted summaries of them.

Other withholdings are really designed to protect the FBI from full comprehension of its inevitable failures when it declined to investigate the assassination of a President and instead followed a prearranged political course of sparing Oswald's low guilt. One of these matters are currently, supposedly, being looked into by the Department and the FBI. They are clearly very embarrassing to the FBI because of the unflattering exposure of its failures by its critics, including me and those with whom I am associated. These are lines of inquiry following the work of the recent House committee.

One of these matters pertains to the photographs taken by Charles Brown. After

The Dallas FBI examined "Duncan's film at the time of the assassination, at the processing plant, it reported what is grossly false, that the film is valueless because it does not even show the building from which the FBI claims all shots were fired. (The FBI's official source photographs is that they were valueless unless they showed Oswald with a smoking gun.) In fact Duncan's action pictures include close to 100 individual shots of not only the building but that part of it and the particular windows that are important in the FBI's representations about the sniper. (I've seen the film and I state that it disproves the FBI's representations.)

Knowledge of the "Duncan film originated with me and this litigation, in which I obtained copies of the Dallas reports and photographs copies. When copies reached Guy West and that film, both of the copies, in Dallas, they located Professor and examined the film. They also arranged to protect the rights to the film. Duncan gave film permission to examine same from all papers, the Dallas Morning News. That paper devoted major front-page attention to the story and made and made a page or more of photographs of individual frames which do reflect strongly in evidence where the FBI claims only Oswald was.

One of the main reasons I have not said a word to you the name of Al Spink is because of Guy West's reporting of this and other meetings and conferences. There is nothing worse about it and, in addition, if the FBI wants with and accepts information from other and reports thereon, it has no basis for an official assertion that it is maintaining the privacy of the matter when in fact the FBI got a major project of locating the snipers with no privacy and little cooperation.

Widdowson, in 02-07-1963 is under 70 claim. West Spink, also also withheld, reports evidence with that West told me and I believe that "West's is the name of Widdowson. He also is a public figure, as there was, essentially, no name. He is a public figure professionally, in his own career, and in his role of justice. Now the FBI is seeking to cover itself, not West, and to take advantage of what it requires to be more difficult.

This is the kind of record the FBI prepares for distribution, one not including what the FBI does not want to distribute. It does not hold all the information the FBI would have required and West, in the best of my recollection, did then provide. His name there

are pertinent and withheld records, as I have ample reason to believe, in addition, from my knowledge of what has been going on for several years now as the FBI continues to obstruct what is embarrassing to it.

There are similar and unjustified withholdings from what appears to be Serial 10505, drafted by Specht as his LHM's report to FHEB, of 11/27/78. This covers the LHM, 10082. Specht also has it garbled a bit. But did not get the records under FOIA, I did. The first copies Mack got were forwarded by Paul Mack. As is apparent from this article, the paper had by then printed its account of the ^B Warren file.

It may help you to understand that from 1978 until now the FBI has not issued any report on its examination of the ^B Warren file or on any computer enhancement of it, as the Attorney General agreed to do when asked by the Warren Commission committee.

In 10480 Specht reports on the continued efforts of full cooperation by Warren's lawyer, John Nigrolo. This does not explain the FBI's actions and failures. The report also reports that by then, 8/19/78, "a computer enhancement was made from some of the frames of the original film."

Despite Nigrolo's repeated offers to the FBI of a copy of the film, none were ever satisfactory because of its protection, on 1/14/80 Specht's LHM reports he did not have a copy. It is written to suggest otherwise, of course, and allegedly to report his "investigation conducted in an effort to obtain the original and/or a copy..." Nigrolo did arrange for a viewing the film, and Mack was also there. He acted as witness, no doubt another factor compelling the FBI to ^C claim privacy for his disclosure.

Specht also reports that Warren took 5 still shots, which Specht does not attack. (At least one shows the fatal shooting ^D of the President from a different perspective, no doubt explaining the FBI's dishonesty and its failure to even let the Warren Commission know of its existence.) Specht has no description of the still pictures in his memo.

Page 4 reports copies of the movie to the Department, provided by Nigrolo.

Several days later ~~XXXXXX~~ (10523, 3/13/80) Specht prepared another LHM on other files.

This is ^E the only instance I recall of the FBI's withholding the name of a photograph ^{or}

and assassination files. In the other cases it even disclosed addresses, phones, etc.
One is tempted to suspect ^{for} after its experience with the ⁴Hyman file after I obtained
knowledge of it the FBI's real ^{purpose} is to deter critics' locating other files it failed
to come up with when it was supposed to be investigating the assassination of the President.

This FBI begins with a reference to an earlier record I do not recall having received,
sent to FBIHQ on 12/27/79.

Specht's name appears to have been withheld from the text.

In an LHM on 5/29/80 the FBI appears not to have provided the assurances of protection
of the Hyman file asked by Higgins. This record is Higgins' letter to the Department
offering copies of "recess" and another file, that taken by Jack Daniel.

Serial 10553, 10/1/80, pertains to the analysis of the Dallas interviewing of
their 11/23/75 broadcasts.

This record reports what I reported to you earlier, that the original records "were
provided to the FBI within a few days of" the assassination. This also reports that the
Dallas police retain more the real-to-real copies of the recordings and gave one to the
FBI. He kept the other. So the FBI has had a copy since the time of the crime.

and did nothing at all.

One of the records allegedly of non-urgent material is Serial 10900. That record
provides no indication of the subject matter and content. However, the fact that there
was 47-file records, information case, may indicate that the subject matter was disclosed
earlier and here is withheld because of the House press release committee's interest. The
disclosed information matter relates to an alleged contact of an SA with a publisher.
His name withheld in the original disclosure. (Jack Willert, Richard Bergen, New-
den House, 62-109080-6184.)

I have just obtained a record which confirms what my prior reports state with regard
to the executive order on the preservation of JFK assassination evidence. This is Form DC
123-013-3, the Attorney General's 2/11/66 to the CIA Administrator, reports about the CIA,
which was intended to obtain title to what was not already in the government's possession.

The Act states that the entire body of evidence is preserved in the national interest.

Now, referring to P.L. 93-502, the Act states that "The Act, however, does express a public policy to preserve items of evidentiary significance, and I believe that this policy is equally applicable to items to which the United States holds title but which in fact are not covered by the Act."

In this we do not include all the FBI's records.

I believe that your silence and your abdication of your special responsibilities makes a job of the entire process. If the agencies were willing to disclose public information there would be no need for the Act. If under the Act the agencies were willing to comply there would be no need for any special authority.

What you have done is involve yourself just enough so that there might be the false pretense that the FBI is complying when clearly it isn't and never intended to.

I believe it is obvious that the covering letters with my division of any of the records provided.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan