

all records not in MURKIN

and JFR

24

Using surveillance records against

House Meeting 4/12/60

Committee to Investigate Assassinations Item (CIA)

Surveillance item

Exemptions claimed

Bud Fuster well -

Withholding what the FBI itself disclosed

Abstract Classification

An item of the requests is for all information pertaining to the CIA, whose founder and director is Director (Bud) Fusterwald. Fusterwald is included in the surveillance item, as are all of those who participated in the Jason Blair Ray defense, as of the time of the requests, I provided his primary address, although there is no doubt that in its general view when the FBI views him to be a public figure.

I have filed a number of appeals that have not been acted on. Most I present here was drawn to my attention in reviewing the documents. Clearly there was surveillance on Fusterwald and his group and an investigation was the FBI withheld it also has disclosed. It also withheld information it has not disclosed and within my requests.

The FBI has made full edition of the official accounts of the political assassination into public figures by the character and account of what the FBI disclosed about them.

In partial accordance with the FOIA request the FBI provided some material from its CONFIDENT file, on CIA. It also provided the same material elsewhere. Copies of both versions are attached.

of Serial 4

In the version provided in this case, on the first page there are two signatures, four attributed to NC and no check mark for the Justice at the top; the next scroll to the stamp reading "Deleted "copy sent" is deleted. On the other copy it is not and it is one treated as a public figure by the FBI, Barbara Michael physician.

Above this and to the left the initials of the one who wrote the letter are withheld under the new claim. In the other copy the FBI did not withhold "NC." From the withheld signature, also provided in the other copy, this is DeWayne Rice, a Washington Lawyer of the FBI who apparently believed it was the proper business to have a copy of the articles of incorporation and other CIA information. Rice says his error was the Dalton police, which also appears to have engaged in domestic intelligence operations.

In the Case 70-1756 copy the letterhead, including DeWayne's name and address and the

information kept at the institution, when forged, was forged, but not the photo itself. On the other copy none of this is withheld.

The FBI's concern for privacy rights did not extend to those it does not like, those listed, as it happens without their consent or approval, as board members - of whom I am one as listed even though I opposed organization of CIA and would not join it. The value of this kind of information is dubious. To proper law enforcement purpose exists.

There likewise is no concern for privacy in the FBI's discarding the telephone entries that an organization not sympathetic to the concrete cause in both ~~64-10500-657~~ and the records of FBI agent in ~~64-10500~~, most likely withheld on the first copy in the records in the present, which on the same page is, "Reference is made to your letter dated January 16, 1962, regarding ~~WILLIAM~~ and the recently declassified document ~~EX-REF ID: A1~~ et al., your reference ~~64-10500-657-3~~." Within on the third page is, "Classified 'Secret' Bureau as the incoming Security from CIA in this matter has been classified 'Secret' by the CIA - notwithstanding the fact that there is no classifiable content. The primary purpose of the CIA classification, as it pertains to the content of this in CIA, is to hide CIA illegal domestic activity."

~~64-10500-7~~ has reference of information, as do all from the Alexandria office. Fornellini's home, not his office, is in the Alexandria territory. All but the recommendation against disclosure is obliterated in the abstract under FO claim. This is consistent with the content of the file, which appears to have been obtained from some form of surveillance, possibly electronic. No relevant information is thus with the request. There is said to be an enclosure. It is not attached.

We opened a "D-List" file on the report of one of its "excluded informants" about the military personnel CIA working at Georgetown University, held in 11/13. I recall no other reports from either file.

The abstract for Serial 33 states that the underlying record includes a report containing partial coverage of the first session of this meeting and copies of material now available there, all original, replaced by a printed form showing ~~orig/origin~~ was the CIA. The form states the information was deleted. It does not state that it was referred to the CIA.

The Bureau Service also had coverage and the FBI disclosed that, without referral, the withholding here appears to be improper and to have the intent of protecting illicit CIA domestic intelligence activities. The coverage is a form of surveillance and thus within the request.

Also Serial 33 is an FBI Letter to James Angleton of the CIA, referring to the first part of the serial, what Angleton had to the FBI. It discloses that the FBI had "our sources concerning this conference." I do not recall any such information provided by the FBI and that also is a form of surveillance and within both requests. This report was classified Secret only because the CIA's function was as clandestine, apart from its illicit domestic intelligence activity. This report indicates distribution to field stations which did not provide their information.

Serial 15 pertains to Penberthill's report for photographic subject in London City
Gathering to one Pinto/Valencia. It asks whether those ~~postage~~ photographs are identical with those
from to Dallas on 11/20/62 by A. Paul, exhibits of a prior series of up to 10 to which
you still have not responded. Because the FBI are taking the position that it cannot
provide the information of other agencies, classified and unclassified, I note that in
that information as it did provide Penberthill with copies of those photographs, which
were classified by the CIA. The abstract has the file number which, from which I recall
no records being furnished. There are 603-44 and 710-
100-40717-11 reported that appear to be still coverage as a subject report and that
this subject had received mail, including from the CIA.

Serial 26 is for Penberthill file 603-44 from Los Angeles. It has two subjects, one of
Penberthill's FBI code, code, THING, not known, which I believe represents a
commercial transcription. The abstract refers to an FBI-1 so not recall providing.
603-403-40 (glossed at 100) pertains to the robbery of the American's Bank of Liberty,
etc., etc. to identify the phone number 301-3237 as that of the CIA. The file number reflects
the FBI's long association with this theory, that the New Mexicans robbed bank to
keep Cuban alive. The subject is Penberthill's phone number, as far as, an appeal on
which you have not acted, namely, I believe, from Harry Fay Merling to ask him to represent

Jame, a letter about which he had earlier phoned me. Except for the several ~~more~~ ~~more~~ items of the request and the FBI's representation that all pertinent information is contained therein, no individual item has been provided in which either phone or phone bill surveillance is reported.

The abstract for Serial 17 also has file numbers written on it, including 105-4477. No records ~~by~~ which I refer, will attach, other pertinent records not provided. They also apply to prior requests particularly to correspondence with ~~any~~ ~~any~~ items of my requests, particularly surveillance. No punch to apply with those items has been made or attached to.

Date dictated 10/10/03

Re: [REDACTED] v. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] is his name appearing on the original order close to it. Another name pertains
to [REDACTED]'s request for the [REDACTED] case [REDACTED] and date [REDACTED] has I question
the "partial custody" claim and the informant claim that in those paragraphs nothing
is specifically assignable.

The duplicate filings are in the 01 CIV annexation and file number 21100.
Although there is [REDACTED] content, there is no duplicate filing in that file.
File is still another illustration that all witness information is not filed under that
caption or by file number.