

Quinn JPK

Mr. Quin Shea, Director
FOIPA Appeals
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

12/20/80

Dear Mr. Shea,

Today I received a copy of the FBI's Mexico City file (105-3702) as processed for another. The date on the worksheets is 4/80. There are obvious omissions in what is provided and these omissions are not explainable as "previously processed." Because of the nature and the filing this pertains the Headquarters and field office records also.

Recently I sent you a PA appeal because I'd read the records of other than the FBI and found references to FBI records not provided to me under any request and referring also to me. This pertained to what I believed to be an official prank aimed against critics of the official account of the assassination and what for other reasons also was dubious, the mailing a xeroxes of a letter signed, supposedly, by Lee Oswald and addressed to a Mr. Hunt. There was a Mexico investigation and it is not included in this or the Dallas records. It should have been included in both, whether or not also in the FBIHQ records. It should have been included in the Dallas records for an additional reason - published attribution of the Oswald connection to H.L. Hunt and efforts made by his son, with the FBI, to offset the damage to his then deceased father's reputation. Some records are, of course, included in the earlier releases, but not what I have recently reported to you, and not the Mexico City investigation.

There also is no reference to the investigation certainly made after appearance of Ron Kessler's stories in the Washington Post in which Kessler reported on the interceptions of Oswald's phone calls in Mexico City. The most probable explanation is filing in another file despite the pertinence to these and inclusion of some records in them. (Not in what came today, the Mexico City file, however.)

In connection with Mr. Shenefield's 12/16/80 letter in which he approved the withholding names in part but not all of the Dallas file, please note that in these records I received today the FBI does not withhold a single FBI name even though some of these names are

withheld from the Dallas records. I am saying that what the FBI got Mr. NMA Shenefield to approve withholding of under date of 12/16/80 the very same FBI disclosed to me almost as soon as the letter was mailed. Mr. Bresson's letter is dated 12/18/80.

With regard to the names of the Dallas agents withholding of which was approved on alleged privacy grounds, the FBI has again made fools of all of you. It disclosed the names, home addresses and home phone numbers of all its Dallas people. So what privacy was there to protect?

Aside from harassment one thing only was accomplished: it is not possible to identify any agent who may not have done his job well or who may have erred or who may have refused to report accurately and fully. These are not privacy matters.

On this same point, for the record and your information, in C.A. 75-1996 the FBI filed an affidavit earlier this year, executed by SA Martin Wood, in which it attested that the policy regarding SA's names was changed in 1977 and that since then it did not withhold the names of SAs. It also attests that the policy of withholding the names was abandoned and the claim withdrawn.

This affidavit was executed after the withholding of the names in the Dallas records. The Dallas records were processed after the attested-to change of policy.

Also for the record, the initial order to disclose and permission to publish was by Director Hoover. The Warren Commission did publish such names and they have been readily accessible at the Archives for 15 years.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg