

2000 11/2/79

JFK assassination, PA records appeals

Harold Weisberg 11/2/79

records not searched or provided - ticklers

2040 and his classification bings, continuing (can't you dry him out?)

The DeLoach "Crime Records" operation

62-109060-4119 is a Rosen to DeLoach 5/1/66 memo relating to the sajour story, 5/29/66 across the entire top of the ~~Washington Post~~ Washington Post. But you'd never know this from reading ~~it~~ 4119. Its purpose is not to prepare factual responses to my published criticisms, or those of Edward J. Epstein, but to see what the files held that could be used to smear us, the FBI's traditional means of avoiding confrontation on fact. Accordingly there is a string of such a stew the ingredients of which are factual error, distortion, misrepresentation and prejudicial slanting. If there is any salt perhaps it is in the paragraph relating to me that 2040 withheld as exempt from GDS 2 & 3 indefinitely. (I feel certain this was in violation of the then applicable executive order and certainly is of the newer one.) ~~assuming~~, that is, that at any time any classification ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> proper.) He did this on 7/28/77. There is no indication that the record was ever classified ~~before~~ then.

So you can better understand what I mean by FBI filthiness I reformulate a sentence relating to me, attributed to the Civil Service investigation of my wife, "...Harold Weisberg had been an associate of Maurice Halperin, who was involved in Soviet espionage conspiracy." If you had no association with them prior to Government employment causing it the reformulation is ""Quinlan Shea has been an associate of L. Patrick Gray and Robert Mardian, who were involved in the Watergate conspiracy." There would be a difference: your alleged associates were charged, Halperin wasn't.

The JFK investigation was not centered in DeLoach's Division but in Rosen's. I therefore am led to believe that "Crime Records" holds records relating to me and to the JFK and King cases that has not been provided.

On page 3, under "action," it says that "Bureau files are being expeditiously reviewed in order to determine the complete facts to resolve any alleged discrepancies which were mentioned (sic) in an article appearing in the Washington Post..."

20150117 10:10 AM [unclear] [unclear]  
Hand-lettered in the margin opposite this is "ON TICKLER LIST." No such tickler and no such list have been provided.

If the FBI meant what it said the list would be of book length for prior to this I sent Hoover a copy of my book. A large part of it is devoted to what the FBI downplays by terming them "alleged discrepancies."

And you know something? In all the years it has addressed none of them yet.

They came close once, however, when there was no factual answer to my accurate quotation of Hoover's testimony. The bureaucracy solved the problem by making what Schott claimed was never made, a left turn.

The information in the withheld paragraph, if information it is, has to have been 20 or more years old, which appears rather old for classification under that E.O. with a "confidential" grade asserted. Unless it refers to red chickens, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Cornish.

While all ticklers, all of which are within my appeals, and all such lists would be of considerable interest to me and are of considerable historical importance, I have a great personal interest in this one because my first book was the first book on the Warren Commission and it remains a basic one the accuracy of which has never been questioned to my face, save by FBI proxies on talk shows, where they swallowed their teeth. (You have not acted on those appeals, either.)