

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg re processing in C.A.s
75-1996, 78-0249, 78-0322, 78-0420-

1/17/79

Withholding of FBI names; arbitrary and capricious; bad faith; inconsistencies;
harassment

The slugging is for my filing, not intended to reflect Departmental belief. It is apparent to me, as a result of the status call in 75-1996 I was not able to attend, that I'm going to have to start keeping records relating to what I regard as bad faith, arbitrariness and capriciousness and other demonstrations of what I believe is deliberateness in improper processing I also believe is intended to be harassment of all other parties by the FBI.

There is interrelationship in these cases. Some of the same people are involved in processing the records. The same standards supposedly apply to all historical cases.

While I am making copies of some records for you as I told you and the court in C.A. 75-1996 I cannot continue to make as many of them for you. However, I will give you citations and the FBI, which has no lack of help or time to waste, can provide them. In this case begin with New Orleans 89-69 Volume 31.

In recent days I have gone through the entire New Orleans Oswald and Ruby files, as provided, meaning with most not provided but referred to as "previously processed," a matter I appealed without the appeal being acted on, and all of the JFK Assassination file through Volume 31, after which I went to bed last night.

Through all of these records, duplicating an abuse I appealed with the earlier JFK Dallas Field Office Files, FBI names were not withheld until about the middle of Volume 31 of 89-69.

I have no idea how many thousands of pages there are in these three files prior to Volume 31, but in that file the Serials are at about 4,000 by the time this abuse of withholding names was repeated and continued throughout that volume, the point I've reached in reading them. This is what duplicates the Dallas abuse.

The name that first took my attention in itself has considerable historical importance. The sense of the belated withholding, the context, can be misleading in an important manner. It is the identification of the FBI Supervisor on its anti-Garrison operations. And on this I find what there is no special file, something I simply do not believe. The operation was at once too large and too secret for it to have existed only throughout other large files. The time and cost of retrieval prohibit this, more so when New Orleans was bombarded by unreasonable demands from FBIHQ that on time alone were the equivalent of have this done by yesterday.

To this point the Supervisor was SA Wall. I recall his name very well. From what I brought to light about this agent he was well qualified and suited for that job. He conducted an Oswald investigation in which he succeeded in misleading FBIHQ and re-writing history relating to a building that no longer exists. (That particular "Oswald" area has been demolished for the new federal building.)

Explanations may be helpful to you before this is all over and because the FBI appears to be determined to delay that time until far into the future. It also, in time, may be helpful to a judge or a judge's clerk, so I provided it.

Oswald used the address 544 Camp Street on some of his literature. The FBI stone-walled the Commission on that so that, in the last minute, the Commission turned to the Secret Service and obtained that sample.

As I brought to light along with SA Wall's expertise in my Oswald in New Orleans, there is a second address for this small building, on Lafayette Street. The Lafayette Street address was that of the late Guy Banister, a former FBI SAC. And David Ferris, charged by Garrison as a co-conspirator, worked out of the Banister office, along with other characters who appear in these files without any indication of it. Wall managed to dispose of the address matter without revealing any significance of connection, as he also did with Banister and the Cubans who had used the 544 address and who had the office above Banister's, on the second floor.

This proximity is not indicated in the Warren report or its 26 appended volumes or any of the many, many thousands of FBI records I've read.

Also not indicated is the fact that Oswald did use that building and was ejected and the man about whom the FBI told me it had no records, Ronnie Cairo, about whom I've already written you, got mail at that building along with the former head of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, Sergio Arocha Smith, who ran something called the Crusade to Free Cuba. As I've already told you the CRC was CIA organized and funded.

None of this and much more that is relevant appears in any FBI records I've seen and Wall was an essential part of that investigation.

So he became Garrison supervisor. Beginning in Volume 31 the identification of the supervisor is among the identifications withheld with arbitrariness, capriciousness and deliberateness. Despite your dislike of the word deliberateness, I presume that with 30 earlier volumes to contradict, there was no need beginning with this one.

So you will not misunderstand about me and Garrison: I did not work for him and we did not have a good personal relationship. I did not sit at the feet of the guru, did try to prevent some of the insanities and if I succeeded to a much lesser degree than I tried I did prevent some of them. I also did not investigate Shaw. My New Orleans interest was first of all Oswald and secondarily a frivolous lawsuit filed against me by another character in these files, an ultra, a racist, a publicity-seeker and a fascist named Carlos Bringuier. I will be writing you separately about this when I provide a copy of a record not provided in response to my PA request and appeal.

At some point the FBI may come up with a New York Times story that has me sitting at the prosecution table. It is in error. I was never in that courtroom, in fact never laid eyes on Shaw and wasn't even in the corridor near that courtroom. When on the

Sunday before jury selection began I learned the essentials of the alleged case I disassociated myself entirely from it. After the judge held that Dallas evidence was relevant I agreed to be the prosecution's Dallas evidence expert but that only.

Withholding of the supervisor's and other names serves no privacy interest. Prior to this point in the files the names, addresses and phone numbers of SAs do appear, together with a list of those assigned to review the files for HQ on the Garrison charges. Oddly, some of the exceptionally brief reports do cite earlier records that are indicative of conspiracy but they cannot be retrieved from what I have been provided because they are withheld as "previously processed." They are beyond retrieval by me or anyone outside the FBI in the mass of what was disclosed in FBIHQ records, which in any event is enormously incomplete.

This gets to an FBI practice I have previously reported and of which I have much earlier proof, the creation of false and self-serving paper. I have written you earlier about that in these files with regard to the press.

The anti-Garrison operation was, understandably, large, given the nature of his allegations. It involved the press in ways not indicated in the files. There were what amounted to parties in the New Orleans Field Office. David Herrie was sometimes present and participating. I have contemporaneous reporter's notes on them. These include the names of SAs present.

In part the anti-Garrison operation was self-defense. In part, and the part that interests me for other than historical purposes, it was to continue to cover up what to then the FBI had succeeded in covering up. Earlier I referred to others known to have been associated with Oswald. I made this reference in connection with photographs, those still withheld from me as they had been from the Commission. My FOIA requests are now more than a decade ^{old} and remain unmet.

There is a San Francisco-related record I have come across in these files I presume because those processing them are not subject experts or like me sometimes slip up. That record pretty clearly reflects the fruit of surveillances in which I am involved. You know I have a PA request and there is a surveillance item in C.A. 75-1996 where I understand you testified there was no deliberate FBI withholding.

I have no choice but to appeal the withholding of the FBI names after even the names of clerical help were (properly) disclosed. I also have no choice but to appeal the withholdings of entire files that are within my request and are of historical importance, of which the anti-Garrison operation is one. I do make these appeals.

In this connection I remind you that a year ago, before the crew left Washington to obtain the Dallas records, after conferring with you my counsel and I also conferred with Daniel Metcalfe, the Civil Division lawyer assigned to that case. We asked and it is my recollection that he agreed that a fair sample of the records be processed

and then submitted to your office for review and to me for my comment before there would be any more processing. I am confident the figure agreed upon was 5,000 pages. The FBI refused and instead processed all these entire files without any review, with the results indicated beginning with my first specific Dallas appeals and now continued. I regard this as deliberate and done in bad faith, to stonewall, to create large and unnecessary costs and to force litigation as a means of frustrating much else, including the use I could and would make of the information I receive.

As you know, these names are not to be removed in historical cases. I have ~~sent~~ sent you a Director's letter so stating. In addition, all these names are already public because Director ^{Mc}cover did not have them removed from the thousands of FBI records published in facsimile by the Warren Commission in its "report and appended 26 volumes of an estimated 10,000,000 words. They also were never withheld in unpublished records available at the Archives until after the 1974 amending of the Act, when the FBI made them into an instrument for noncompliance and of stonewalling.

In my review of these records I am well past the point of the King assassination. There is Garrison overlap. I have seen no reference to this. ^{It} is within both my requests. I have personal knowledge of some. Garrison made charges that were published and the MO FO was instructed to keep up with all that was published. There is no doubt at all that the FBI knew that some of Garrison's financial backers were likely suspects in the King case and had been involved in earlier civil rights matters. Garrison had people who do appear in these files working on that, too, including in Memphis, where no such records were provided although I recall a single guarded reference to the Memphis Field Office's knowledge of this.

I can illustrate the importance of names for the case of a former FBI clerk named William Walters. You may have seen him all over TV in recent years, in news, on specials and as a Congressional witness. The files provided are entirely incomplete on him and this. He went up to Mark Lane after a Lane speech in New Orleans and reported having seen a HQ message reporting a threat against JFK just before the assassination. Lane and Garrison subsequently embroidered on this, to my knowledge and in my presence. As a result the public charges were exaggerated, which provided the FBI with an excellent means of obfuscation by addressing the inflated rather than the real.

My point here is that the entire Walters matter has become a separate matter of separate historical significance and that any withholding of any names is improper in this added context. (For your information, if the FBI did not send some such message it was negligent in a manner I do not believe it was because I have records that should have required such a message or messages. The arrangements for the President in Miami just before he was killed were changed over one the details of which I have published. And this gets back to the continued withholdings in the King case relating to Miltner and Somerset, who were involved in one such threat that then was reported to the FBI.)