

Dear Mr. Shea,

4/12/81

One of your people phoned me several days ago to see if I could be of help with a name included in a letter from HSCA. The record apparently had been processed and this was one name about which there appears to have been some uncertainty.

I appreciate this effort to effect maximum possible disclosure but I suggest another means might have been more effective because I am not familiar with most of the letters sent by HSCA. If I were to be asked, without any orientation, if there is public domain information about John Jones, I could respond and a question in this form would not disclose anything to me.

Mr. Lesar has forwarded the most recent AG/DAG- King assassination records and I have read them all, some with considerable interest. (You may not recall it but there is an item of my 12/23/75 request pertaining to any re-investigations of the King assassination and these records are pertinent to it also.)

To date I have not seen any records pertaining to the plea bargaining. This is not only specifically sought in my requests in C.A. 75-1996, it is a matter that did involve the AG and the DAG, among others. I know this from what was disclosed contemporaneously that published in 1971 and from testimony adduced in the 1973 May evidentiary hearing. The plea bargaining was an important consideration in that hearing and it is of considerable historical importance.

There also are no records pertaining to the flap over the then AG's statement the day after the assassination that there had been no conspiracy. I presume his source was the FBI, which had not conducted any investigation. He then was accompanied by Cartha De Loach and he had gone to Memphis. The FBI has disclosed incomplete and self-serving records not originally intended for distribution of disclosure.

Correspondence or memoranda which should exist and are included in the C.A. 75-1996 requests are not included in what has been provided recently from AG and DAG files.

Ms. Janice Adams sent me a 4/9/81 form letter pertaining to the copy of my 3/16/81 letter to Mr. Buckley of the Criminal Division and JFK assassination records. She assigned a new appeal number. However, it is far from the first appeal I filed pertaining to the Criminal Division's withholdings from those records. Will it not get confusing if you don't assign numbers to most, do assign numbers to a few and ignore all the appeals?

I concluded that appeal with the statement that ignoring my letters and the questions raised in them makes unnecessary trouble for all parties. I began with reference to what I believe is unjustified claim to b5 and by asking Criminal to consult you about those kinds of claims. Since then I had to write Criminal again about b5 claims pertaining to the Hosty flap, which is the subject of a number of earlier appeals in C.A. 78-0322. I am confident that months ago I also raised similar questions. Now, if as I believe the claim

is unjustified and improper, repeating it throughout these many records merely assures that the matter will never end and that costs will be maximized while compliance is minimized. Why should all those records require re-examination if not also reprocessing? Would it not be easier and such more efficient and immeasurably less trouble to confront problems immediately rather than accumulate, magnify and repeat them forever? This also is true of other claims, like b2 and many 7C and 7D claims.

I will not be able to do as Ms. Adams requests, mention the 81-0533 number in future correspondence. It is not possible for me to make an extra file for it and it is not possible for me to regard each of the many contested matters pertaining to the one request as separate matters. I fear your office will be hopelessly lost if it has some but far from most with individual/appeal numbers. This also is discriminatory because it pertains to a 1977 request and 1980 initial compliance with it. It really isn't a 1981 matter.

For your information, a similar condition now exists in the JFK field office cases, from which you have detached yourself. The FBI has again been making improper claims, including to b2 and 7D, for what it had made public. And didn't qualify for these claims if not public domain. As long as there is no supervision and the FBI's ^dmiset is maximum possible withholding rather than maximum possible disclosure, these problems will multiply and perpetuate the litigation unnecessarily. Meanwhile, the FBI always manages to suggest that you have approved what it does. Neither it nor you ~~did~~ responded to my inquiries. I can't imagine your actual participation in the processing or your agreement to some of the claims made, but the FBI repeatedly creates records so indication, records for later retrieval and this misinterpretation. The promised time schedule is not being kept and hasn't been and the delivery of records is being delayed deliberately and false representations are made in an attempt to hide this.

For your further information, when the matter of the Marina Oswald Porter tapes came up I told my counsel to inform the FBI that I do not want ^{them} and do not believe that any transcripts should be made public. I was told that I might opt for summaries and I did, but they are neither provided nor have I been told why there has been any delay. The FBI did provide a few logs from which it withheld the already disclosed admat file in which it has this dirty stuff hidden.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg