To Quin Shea from Herold Weisberg, King assassination records appeals in enclosed 8/10-13/79 letter to FEI re its 8/7/79, with enclosures, to me

8/13/79

I believe these are self-explanatory. You should recall my earlier appeals because the Fill did not provide copies of the records it had provided to the Ray brothers.

In response to a subposma in C.A. 75-1996 we obtained a copy of your 8/14/78 to Mr. McCreight with regard to the providing of copies of records provided to others, so I am aware of the FBI's awareness of this. (And virtual non-compliance since.)

I believe that the records of the various bank robberies the FEI tried to attribute to the Rays and did succeed in comming the assessins committee into going for are relevant and should have been provided. (Remember the one including me under this caption?)

The FET refers me to the copies printed by HECA. These are not complete. Nost are Springfield office FD 302s, which are not all the Springfield records (and FEIHQ copies could hold other information). These disclose the existence of relevant St. Louis files also not provided although all Ray records were to have been provided.

If Mr. Mitchell will compare the pages printed by HSCA with the withholdings I have speak appealed, with the single exception of the names of informants (replaced by the word "informants") I believe he will find that most of the generic withholdings in the records provided to me are not withheld in any of these hundreds of pages now published by the Congress. I don't believe the FMI can really expect or have expected for it to be acceptable both ways - to withhold and continue to withheld in the ones in court and to permit the same kinds and the identical information to be published later.

Based on this as well as what I have provided you earlier I offer the opinion that costs and troubles all around and for all parties will be reduced if all the records provided in G.A. 75-1796 are reprocessed. Which means no more than processed as they should have been processed to begin with. I think and suggest that this is preferable for all parties if accomplished on the shministrative level, and better for the PBI for it not to be comepiled by Court Trier. I do ask this - and at the same time hope the PBI by it will be led to cease and desist from the same abuses of me and the Act in the other cases where the same situation exists. (The PBI's withholdings have forced me to make other requests to obtain information it knowingly withhold in these other cases. I would prefer, as I hope others would prefer, not to have to take the same steps more than I have and in the Eing case, too.)

It is, I believe, apparent that the same generics cannot be proper withholdings in the JFK cases. Yet the identical withholdings are the practise and I am informed are the practise in the index now being processed. Inevitably this means are and costly problems. (Particularly "sources".) I believe it is possible to eliminate this problem at the outset by proper processing.