

AW JFD

To Gain from Harold Weisberg, JFK assassination records appeals 6/27/79  
By Epstein/ Rosenko request/appeal;  
Files not searched, as those relating to assistance to favored writers;  
Information I provided the Department in C.A. 75-1997 (REDACTED)

When I was faced with a series of false CIA affirmations, presented by Department counsel, in C.A. 75-1997, which was for withheld Warren Commission executive session transcripts including relating to defectors and to Yuri Nosenko in particular, I provided several affidavits showing that the FBI and CIA had favored certain writers, particularly John Barron of Readers Digest, who must thus was provided with a book, MB, glorifying the FBI and CIA.

During the time of my efforts to obtain JFK assassination records from the FBI by litigation and confiding with the career of the House assassins committee both the CIA and the FBI did the same favor to the same Readers Digest through a writer also of known apocryphic record, Edmund Epstein. I filed a request of the FBI asking for all the information made available to Epstein/Readers Digest. The request was rejected and I appealed it. More than the backlog time has passed without action on the appeal. Meanwhile Epstein's book and the promotional efforts for it attracted major subsidiary attention, which always reaches more people and minds than the books, and the book has since appeared in reprint edition, which reaches a larger market than hardbacks.

This is to say that failure to act on the appeal in a timely way facilitated the FBI's media manipulation/propaganda efforts that serve no law enforcement purpose.

To date the FBI has not provided any records of which I am aware relating to Nosenko from the files of the Dallas and New Orleans offices, both of which have to hold such information, particularly Dallas as Office of Origin. The FBI also evaluated the Nosenko information of the <sup>CIA</sup> ~~FBI~~ and commentary/analysis of it by another defector not trusted by Mr. Hoover (and me). This came out in the narratives and testimony of the House assassins committee. It therefore is another indication of withholding by tricky filing by the FBI, at HQ and in the field offices. Even if the information I request is filed in wastebaskets or the cafeteria, if it is identifiable it must be provided, not hidden and withheld because, arbitrarily and capriciously the FBI limits itself to its show files.

When as an acknowledged expert I stated that certain records must exist Department counsel indulge in evasive comments rather than securing the responsibility of <sup>of</sup> lawyers and the Department under the Act and determining whether or not such records do exist. I submit that the record to this point is all one way - that in fact the records did and do exist and that in time I obtained proofs. Need I remind you of the long tickler and the indices? Or of so many photog copies and other records in the King case, C.I. 75-1996?

In the King case my requests also include information provided to other (also sycophantic) writers and the FBI denied providing any such information. I have again proven that it lied and have appealed, providing also file identifications for searching, files not yet searched in a 1975 case and 1969 requests. This also duplicates, save for a few less years, the Epstein/Readers Digest/ Rosenberg request, a JFK request.

I am reminded of those letters and ignored appeals by this morning's regarding of yesterday's Wolston decision by the Supreme Court. Information provided by the same FBI to the same John Barron also provided the libel being litigated. This please note was when the FBI claimed that each and every record it had was an investigatory file for law enforcement purposes and all were immune regardless of the limitation of the to exemptions to the Act. It forced me to the ~~supreme~~ appeals court several times and the Supreme Court, after which Congress amended the Act. Prior to this amending the FBI gave the libellous reports relating to Wolston to Barron, according to this morning's Washington Post. (Barron's book was published before the Act was amended.) In the court record in Wolston, according to the Post, "In listing Wolston as an 'identified' Soviet agent, Barron swore in an affidavit that he had relied, unquestioningly, on an FBI report."

It is not only that the FBI regularly discloses outside the Act what it withholds under the Act or that it favors sycophants and denies the rights of criticism, it is that <sup>ion</sup> by inaction on requests and appeals under the Act the entire Department becomes party to the FBI's manipulations and violations of the Act. This is why I provide this new evidence relating to continuing FBI withholdings on both subjects and renew my appeals.