

78-0322 appeals

Mr. James K. Hall, Chief
FOIPA Section
FBI
Washington, D.C. 20535

3/17/82

Dear Mr. Hall,

Some of the records enclosed with your letter of March 10 raise questions.

File 100- 10461-1A2, Serial 73, is described as "Copy of Oswald's Address Book." It says there are 184 pages and is corrected to indicate that 184 pages were provided. Claims made to withhold are b7C, b7D, b1, b2. There is an added note, "additional materials released 6-81, 2-82."

One page identified as Serial 1A73 is provided. It is stamped as declassified by DRG on 2-12-82, which is more than a year before you sent it to me. Also, no classification stamp is visible on it so I am wondering a) how Oswald's address book, which was published in facsimile by the Warren Commission, was classified, and b) how a record that was not classified is declassified.

The letter "(S)" appears after the first paragraph, which is ~~not~~ obliterated. It is the only paragraph so marked on this page. So, what was declassified if this paragraph remains withheld and nothing else is indicated as ever classified?

Two entire paragraphs are withheld under b7C. I am confident that some of the withheld information is reasonably segregable and involves no legitimate privacy questions. A considerable amount of information about the subject has been disclosed by the Warren Commission and by the FBI itself.

The worksheet for 1A7 says that Serial 328 is "Photos," of six pages, originally all withheld under b1, now corrected to reflect that one page was sent, and the exemption claimed is now not b1 but is b7D.

One page was sent but it is not a photo or a xerox of a photo. It appears to be a xerox of an evidence envelope that was stamped secret. It says that this is also Serial 5129. That turns out to be "previously processed." In FBIHQ it is 105-82555-3022 and prior to this disclosure the information that was withheld on this page was disclosed in it.

It appears that the pictures are described as of Oswald distributing literature, something that does not suggest any appropriateness in either the b1 or the b7D claim. If made for the withheld pictures, both appear to be impossible claims. If made for the name, I ask if the name is not already disclosed. I know of no such names that have not been disclosed.

This raises again the question of film. You have not responded to my recent letter about this, as the FBI in the past avoided any responses.

Your letter of March 16, forwarding a copy of 62-109060-2262, says only that you provide it under the agreement to provide me with copies of JFK assassination records provided to others. Because I knew this record should have been provided to me early in 1978, I checked. I find what your letter makes no reference to, that there are extensive "privacy" withholdings in 1978 not made in any single case now. Unjustified claims of privacy are probably the most numerous in my appeals that, for the most part, are ignored. This record validates what I said, that most of these withholdings are neither justified nor necessary. This is true also of the field office records involved in C.A. 78-0322. Are you going to rectify this? I do thank you for the unexcised copy. Can you tell me when to expect copies of other similar records not yet provided after being provided to others?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Dear Jim,

3/17/82

Only twice in a long time has the FBI sent me copies of what it discloses to others. Their letter of March 16 confirms the agreement to fo this. However, as my enclosed letter to Hall says, I was made curious. Only I was curious about more than I said, including why the indirectness and why not say who made the request? With the other records, Weberman's request, they sent the letter to him to properly identify the records.

In the Balkey case they have disclosed how many such fequests they have had, almost none provided to me.

These two pages are not by any means all of Serial 2262. There are two other pages in that Serial and other Serials on the same subject.

These are an excellent illustration of the fact that most of the privacy claims are not justified and not necessary and, when reviewed, are overturned.

Given the nature of what is herein disclosed, is there anything like privacy?

It is possible that I'm not sent the other pages because there are no withholdings on the 1978 copies of them. But then they haven't sent any corrected worksheets.

There has to be a reason for this effort to slide something by. Maybe it is to avoid calling attention to the disclosures of what had been withheld.

Best,