

record - JFK assassination records appeals Harold Weisberg 8/16/79
Withholdings of the reasonably segregable
Withholdings that can create confusion and embarrassment
Classification

Original filing reference to attached Not Recorded Serial of 3/24/67 from 62-109060 is illegible. With all other file numbers being 105s, or foreign ^{counter} intelligence, security related, the only classification indicated on the record itself, confidential, appears to be what is not within my prior extensive experience with classifications by #2040, unclassification. (Assuming any is now justified.)

Virtually the entire record is obliterated. One name only remains, plus the fact that there was some kind of Fisur in New Orleans. The name is that of George Lardner, Washington Post reporter then in New Orleans. An obvious possible interpretation because of the FBI's refusal to disclose the reasonably segregable is that George Lardner was a foreign counter-intelligence target who was also the subject of physical surveillance by more than one FBI agent.

I don't believe this but I don't know what others in the future may believe or want to believe. You don't know the Mark lanes of this world if you don't know what some people will want to believe or be able to allege, including about Lardner, based on the foregoing combinations and the wrong processing.

What nobody looking at this record can know is that there is any exemption claimed other than "national security," again relating to this Post reporter. The worksheet discloses that (b)(7)(C) and (D) also are claimed, but not indicated at the required appropriate points ^{at} each of the nine points of obliteration.

If there is any relevance to the JFK assassination or the Garrison meanderings of that time the possibility of what is withheld not being within the public domain would appear to be very slight, at least except for the reason for the 105 designation.

In addition, five full pages are withheld in their entirety, yet there is no way of knowing what exemption is claimed for them, even with the worksheet to consult. Moreover, I believe it is close to impossible to make a random selection of five pages and find not a single portion reasonably segregable if the record deals with the assassination of with Garrison or anything he talked about.

One could guess that the 105 filing relates to Cuban matters. As of the date of the record Ferrie is among those connected with Cuban matters in whom Lardner had an interest. If the FBI had Fisur on Ferrie it would have picked Lardner up because Lardner interviewed him in his home - in fact is the last persons to have seen Ferrie before death. The same is true of other Cubans and those connected with them and Garrison involved.

Handwritten notes at the top of the page, including "JFK assassination records" and "FOIA request".

While the other records are all 105s, if this one was suitable for JFK assassination filing were not the other records mentioned? Yet not one of the dates indicated is identifiable in any other records, including those provided by New Orleans and Dallas on on the appropriate worksheets.

When people like Lane invent false charges to make and perpetuate misinformation and disinformation I believe it is regrettable that the FBI, in its diligence in wasting the time of requesters it does not like and in inflating FOIA costs for its own political purposes, creates a situation in which further misinformation, disinformation and defamation become a real possibility.

I appeal all the withholdings and all the claims to exemption.

Now if one takes the only indication of classification alongside any of the many withheld paragraphs at face value it is made to appear that with the only indication of classification immediately following Gardner's name only what relates to him is classified.

And if this is true then the privacy and source claims are for the other five paragraphs only. That makes it less likely that nothing in what is withheld is not reasonably segregable.

There appears to have been no classification prior to 9/28/77, which was long after a number of reviews of the file from which this comes and thus a violation of the controlling E.O. In my C.A. '75-1996 Supervisor John Howard testified to having supervised three such reviews of the JFK assassination FBIHQ records.