

Dear Jim,

8/25/83

A little of Freud slipped into the FBI's yesterday's letter to me about my Nosenko requests (they refer to one only), where they say that referrals can be "a timely process." Considering that my requests go back at least to 1977, and the last I heard about this one was more than five years ago, on May 17, 1978, "timely" is hardly the word for it.

I enclose both letters.

They are so used to flailing classification stamps they withheld as SECRET (in 1978) what they had disclosed in 1975 and I published that year.

And there was not really anything properly classified in it.

Moreover, Hart's testimony for the CIA before HSCA should have declassified almost everything that was properly classified, as it relates to the JFK assassination and/or its investigation and Nosenko's credibility.

Nosenko was made available to two Readers Digest authors, Baron for his book KGB and Epstein for his Oswald book, Legend.

I have no idea what prompted this letter at this time. But they must be doing something about some Nosenko records.

I wonder if the initials are those of Martin Wood, who was an FOIA supervisor in 1978 and then was taken off my cases, I thought at the time because of his reassignment.

In the event you have forgotten, you crossexamined Wood in C.A. 75-1996 and, as I recall, we established that his affidavits were almost never truthful; he then swore in direct contradiction of SA Phillips in C.A. 78-0322/0420; and the information given to Epstein enabled him to expose an important FBI informer high in the USSR delegation at the UN, "Fedora." Because this exposure ordinarily would have endangered "Fedora," and ordinarily would have been very much against FBI interests, I wondered at the time if there was an unperceived political purpose in letting Epstein have what should not have been disclosed.

I also wonder if this Nosenko business indicates some 20th anniversary disclosures.

Best,

Don Edwards
~~JE~~ Nosenko request
Nosenko file
PH
H Hart