

NW M
Dear Guin,

4/20/78

This relates to my SA request, especially New Orleans Field Office, to their records relevant in the King case, C.A.75-1996 and to our previous correspondence on both.

The enclosures are copies of FO records provided under SA.

Earlier you suggested to Jim that the other records on or about me in FO would show up in the processing of these JFK records. I told Jim okay, with the request that personal records be copied and supplied as the files were being processed.

After going over the records I asked you to have them take another look because it appears that they made a limited search and because I have FO records they have not provided, having obtained them from another source.

I also told you that I would be sending you copies of the draft affidavit in C.A.75-1996 to show how SA did not have to tell the field offices not to make a complete search because the draft of the affidavit included this directive. (In this connection I do not recall receiving such records relating to C.A.75-1996 from the other field offices, which seems to be clear evidence of non-compliance by them.)

Because I think it can be helpful to Linda I'm sending the entire file we received, not only the affidavits. I am marking portions in blue to illustrate the kind of language I have referred to and to call misstatements of fact to attention. An example of the first is limitation to "main files" only and elimination of records on which there are notations that are of interest to me. Illustrative of the second is the allegation that I have records that had not been provided; that they were being processed when presumably they had been processed or other files were referred to and have not since been provided; and references to records not provided.

I will not be making comment on all the portions I mark. I also am not keeping a marked copy for myself. However, if it is desired I will take time when I am in Washington to explain the purposes for my markings that may not be clear to Linda.

I'm sorry some of the copies are so poor and that my typewriter is not functioning as I'd like it to.

I do not regard the 2/3/78 letter as an adequate response to mine of 1/28. From recollection there was no response with respect to clip-dings. I guess they clipped more than are here provided - more than the overtly prejudicial. I have copies of their records as they distributed these records without receiving copies from H.C.

For as these records are they refer to others not provided, by FO or the other FOs of HQ.

There is at least one enclosure not provided.

On the Rosenko/Epstein request(s) and appeal(s), what follows is merely to inform you.

Jim has filed the motion for a new trial with a number of attachments, including a new affidavit by me. AUSA Michael Ryan can provide you with a copy. Jim hand delivered it on Tuesday the 18th. I think that some of the attachments will assist your office, Linda or another, in understanding the facts. To this end I'll mark up and enclose a copy of an interview in Chicago and syndicated by the paper. This copy is from New Orleans.

If you would like we can lend you a copy of, despite the length, make a copy.

We also have the book and the "readers Digest condensations.

If Epstein is not lying I think much of the fact about sources is relevant. I also think that with regard to his sources he is not lying but I would caution that he may in some cases be less than completely forthright.

The appeals panel has set back oral arguments. September now, not June. Not our idea. I think it was the court's.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg