

JFK assassination records appeals

Harold Weisberg 10/5/73

Classification of the public domain - by 2040

Workbooks classifications - out of 2040

Classification of what the Warren Commission published - by 2040

Department and FBI affidavits attacking its propriety and need of classification

Over a long period of time (during which you have not acted on any appeals) I have been appealing what I described as outrages perpetrated by 2040 and I have provided some, far from all, examples. Providing all would take a lifetime.

When the subject matter is the most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a President; when the integrity of the FBI and the Department are involved; and when all of this is under an Act supposedly guaranteeing the right of the people to know, I have regarded this as indecent and its own kind of subversion.

During all this time I've also been wondering if there is any sin too vile for 2040, the other 2040s and those who ~~do~~ approve their work.

From what I attach I conclude the answer is that nothing is too vile if negating the Act, harassing requesters and the courts and covering up the FBI's record are the result.

Now, and I believe this is not the first time I've appealed it, I find 2040 classified the National Enquirer. And in the same Section, 105-82555-183, he also classified what the "Lautsen" published and years ago I ~~personally~~ gave to the FBI.

I am not going to the cost of copying the entire records. I provide the first pages of Serials 4213 and 4236, the latter withholding as "Secret" what the "Lautsen" published and I gave to the FBI years ago.

The classified news in the other record is that of Richard Elvin Giesbrecht. The "classified" information took up an exceptional length in the National Enquirer dated 1/23/66 (in which what I may have said in case to mean other than intended), four pages, with five authors, including three editors, one the top editor.

Among other publications (not counting Garrison) there is the Winnipeg Free Press, The Toronto Star (almost an entire page) and Maclean's Reports (more than a page).

add to notes filed - abridged 1/7/77: see transcript of the
CHOS This is what I could lay my hands on immediately. I am without doubt that the possible amplifications would take up pages.

You have written, and I presume that at what it considers an opportune time the Department intends to use your letter, that the FBI does not withhold what the Warren Commission records disclosed years ago. So I refer you to CD645, which the FBI can provide you. It also is in the 105-02555 file.

Now what is going to happen when the FBI makes the same phoney, entirely unjustifiable claims with the index it is processing, the one in which I offered help so it could avoid such contrivances and had my offer rejected?

Would the Department and those who attest that the FBI does not withhold what the Warren Commission disclosed like these kinds of things produced in court? Can there be judges partisan and insensitive enough to accept this?

Does this represent what the Department thinks and does about the Attorney General's finding that the assassination of the President is an historical case, requiring fullest possible disclosure?

Does it represent the protection the Act requires for those who fabricate and commercialize fabrications about the assassination of a President?

Do you believe for a minute that the FBI, especially # 2040, did not know this was all fabricated?

Obvious fabrications are properly classified?

Is there anything the Department, the FBI, will not do to the Act and to requesters?

If you doubt my word or if the FBI refuses to provide the public domain material I cite (and I'm confident such more), I will.

And if the Mintzen part isn't checking enough, ask the FBI if it hasn't disclosed those and other records in another case, as I believe it has. I'm not taking time to check.

This is the new, the reformed FBI, whose Director testified to the Congress to get the Act amended. Probably 2040 wrote his testimony for him?