

Don Reads with DC ~~primary~~ <sup>Index</sup> ~~primary~~

Dear Mr. Flanders,

3/29/80

Attached is a copy of some notes Ms. Barrett made as a result of her initial checking of the Dallas cross references.

While in some instances it appears that the inconsistencies can be attributed to the FBI's abandonment of unjustified claims to exemption, this does not explain all the inconsistencies and contradictions.

It does appear that the initial worksheets pertaining to which the FBI made sworn representations to the court in C.A. 78-0249 are not accurate.

It also appears that all referrals still have not been acted on and that the FBI has not attempted to get them acted on, no record of any such effort having been provided.

History, scholars and the FBI itself, I believe, will be better served if in the remainder of the cross references there are no inconsistencies or contradictions. One set of records ought yield only one set of worksheets, ought it not?

Ms. Barrett's Nos. 7 and 8, 100-10451 48 and 49, pertain to Oswald in Mexico, a subject that is of some interest and was aired extensively by the recent House assassins committee. In 105-82555 there are 43 In and 4 Out, distinctions not made on the cross references or on the single record provided from FBIHQ records, which appears to be 43 In Out.

This cablegram is ~~marked~~ classified Secret, although every word in it is within the public domain and was published by the Warren Commission. A partly legible note in the margin indicates the date of classification was 1973. It refers to 62-81830-140. The second paragraph on the second page, which is a note, is withheld. It appears unlikely that the withheld information is not within the public domain. If it refers to electronic and/or photograph surveillances in Mexico or surveillances on the Communist Party, its Daily Worker, or the FPCC, all that has been disclosed by the FBI itself. Press treatment of the Mexico City surveillances has been extensive. Director Hoover's 11/23/63 letter to the Secret Service incorporates this and has been disclosed.

The last sentence in 43 Out is "CIA FURNISHED BUREAU THE SAME INFORMATION AS IN ESCAB (i.e., 43 In)." This indicates that the content of 43 In has been within the public domain since the time of the Warren Commission and there thus is no justification for withholding or referring it to the Langley stonewall, which has not acted on it.

This matter was also the subject of FBI testimony before the Warren Commission, in 1964. It also was the subject of testimony before the House assassins committee long before the cross references were prepared. They seem to have been prepared to attempt to justify unjustifiable withholdings rather than to eliminate them. The FBI had liaison with that committee.

You could eliminate such work, cost and trouble, if you have any such interests, by eliminating unjustified withholdings rather than seeking to perpetuate them.