

Mr. David Flanders, Chief
FOIPA Branch
FBI
Washington, D.C. 20535

6/26/80

Dear Mr. Flanders,

Enclosed are the four pages of Mr. Barrett's notes that were not attached to my letter of 3/29. These notes are based on a spot check of the first section only of the JFK cross references. If what is true of these records applies to all then there remains a considerable amount of inconsistency, error and withholding.

While three of the records have now been provided, three remain withheld, Ms. Barrett's Nos. 17, 18 and 19.

Five days ago I received copies of Dallas records originally withheld as processed in FBIHQ records, which they were not. I have been reading them and now have read most of them. I find that contrary to SA Martin Wood's sworn representations in C.A. 75-1996 you have not abandoned the withholding of FBI names. And Wood's affidavit was only a month before I received these pages. The claim made is 7C, which is exactly the claim Wood swore was abandoned as a matter of FBI policy change beginning after the processing of the last FBIHQ MURKIN record, in 1977. (The Court ordered that such names not be withheld before any MURKIN records were processed and the FBI merely violated that Order.) Wood also stated that the claim was withdrawn in MURKIN but no reprocessed records have reached me and I have not been informed that any were being reprocessed. I remind you that these records are pertinent in C.A. 75-0322, in which your counsel assured the Court, my counsel and me that a real effort is to be made to eliminate all such problems prior to the next calendar call. This represents the opposite of that assurance, as also your refusal to respond to my communications does. I am attempting to resolve these problems and you refuse any consideration and then violate the FBI's own sworn pledge.

My wife has asked me to respond to your letter to her of May 14. You studiously avoid providing the file number of the record you state was included in what was sent to her with a letter of January 31. Without that file number and in the absence of any identifier at all it is impossible to identify the letter to which you refer. In order to be able to state that this unidentified letter was included in the January 31 mailing you have to have identified it and could have provided the identification so she could.

Pertaining to the King assassination records and the review I made of the abstracts, the enclosure to 5711, a referral, still has not been provided. In your accounting of these referrals it was referred to the Army 8/17/77 and it replied on 8/23/77. Serial 6123 states that WFO sent HQ Sections 1-3 of the main file and 1-5 of Sub C. I have not been provided with these records and I presume there were Subs other than C. With many records withheld as previously processed I received a volume of main file records, with missing serials in the majority, the numbers beginning with 8 and ending with 796 plus some of 1A-1, the last number being 50. I received no Sub C records.

Please note that with Items 9 and 10 of Ms. Barrett's notes, without informing me separately, you have abandoned claims to EX b 2 and 7D, without providing what was withheld under b2 and 7D. The exemptions are not identical and unless improperly asserted to begin with in such cases withheld information remains to be disclosed. Her notes indicate referrals still not acted on and inconsistencies as I stated under date of 3/29.

If you have any questions please ask.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg