

*Dallas bullet appeal*

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, reur 10/22/79  
JFK records, records removed, "Changed To"

10/25/79

That you respond to my letter of this August while ignoring appeals going back more than a decade is in itself interesting. There is the suggestion that you select for response what enables you to put a defense of the FBI on paper. As you are aware, there are multitudinous specific appeals about which you have done nothing. Some would have required less time and effort than checking out what you did check.

The seemingly reasonable explanation for the removal from the JFK assassination records given to you by the FBI is "there is no real connection with the subject."

If you and your staff were as familiar with the FBI's records as I am you would be well aware that by this standard most of the records provided to me would either have been changed to another file or would not exist to begin with.

Just yesterday, along with much other paper having to do with insane asylums and their inmates, I came across records relating to an insane person's dreams about Barry Goldwater. It remains in the file, along with an incredible amount of detailed and extensive checking out of the utterly irrational and obviously insane. Along with this there is the totally irrelevant, which is far and away a more extensive part of the large file than actual details of the assassination.

I have seen more relating to a Hoadny, Oklahoma, housewife, Shirley Martin, than I have to anything relating to the shooting.

There is much more about peoples' dreams and visions than there is on the medical evidence, of which there is little. And that neither dependable nor complete.

The Director's special list, an appeal you have ignored, was heavy on the nutty, and by this I do not mean that he was nutty.

The FBI is not stupid. Its answer to everything is statistics. It compiles and misuses statistics, as how many interviews it conducted. But nobody ever has a chance to know what interviews. It then, when forced to do what it avoided doing, creates phoney paper with which to cover itself. So it was not by accident that all of what can now be described as irrelevant was originally included in the file. Once

these phoney statistics were compiled and misused and there was any review of the file it may well have been that someone regarded such records as the one of many to which you refer as irrelevant. But removing such records from this file was not the proper course and is inconsistent with the practise in most cases, of leaving the record where it was, as part of the FBI's statistical base. A copy could have been placed in another file, the usual practise.

If not also prior to writing you about another matter on 8/7/79, and you do not respond to that other matter, then subsequently I came accross many other such cases of removals from the main files. Some will be enclosed with this, for pursuant to your request + held off mailing appeals to you. There are so many instances I have been forced to discontinue including them.

You lose sight of the fact that there is interest in the FBI's record in its investigation of the assassination as well as in details of the assassination itself. There thus is considerable interest in how and what the FBI filed as relevant to the assassination, particularly because it wasn't.

You are also aware that I have been forced into a public role in this matter by the Department and the courts. I therefore am compelled to appeal matters that are of little or no personal interest to me in my own work. These "Changed Tos" are of much less interest to me than the many appeals on which you have not acted.

You say that the documents relate to "an unsuccessful request by a Colorado newscaster..." Who judges the relevance, in subject-matter context, in the context of interest in what the FBI did, of "an unsuccessful request"? Why is my initial - and still unsuccessful request - relevant and his not relevant? Mine and such that is defematory was released in this file relating to me. A great amount was released pertaining to Paul Hoch's requests. Why ours and not all the others?

I believe the FBI's refusals are relevant and should be disclosed as part of the historical record. Also, I'd appreciate response to the matters about which I wrote you, illuminating/it by the four "Changed To" sheets.

Postscript, so you won't have to take time to retrieve the records:

The matter was the Dallas bulkies. You accepted, unquestioningly, the FBI's explanation which I find does not explain the absence of records that should be in them and I did not find in them. Some are involved in litigation and have not been provided.

I believe I sent you, relating to this, records showing the existence of what I did not find.

Scientific tests were made, relating to the assassination, but I do not have the results.

In one case of which I know I also do not have a record in what was provided of even the making of the test. My information is solid. I know who made what test and why. The results had to be uncongenial to the FBI's preconception of the crime.

On 8/7 I did inform you that the explanation given to you for the absence of records from the Dallas bulkies is inconsistent with FBI practise, as illustrated by what I had just seen after getting your letter, these four "Changed To" sheets. I know of no departures from this practise save what I appealed.