

JFR - Kuffka

JFK (and King) assassination records appeals

Harold Weisberg 10/10/79

I separate this one special abuse by ZC40 because of the large number of appeals to which it is relevant:

Classification

Withholding the reasonably segregable

Withholding informant file numbers

by SA request and Robert Kuffka

by JFK appeal relating to Robert Kuffka

Arbitrariness, capriciousness, inconsistency and withholding what the FBI itself has already disclosed.

That Robert Kuffka was a San Francisco informant and operated in Mexico you know from copies of records I provided with the cited prior appeals.

is airtel with LHM,
Let in 68-109060-1637, which the San Francisco 12/4/63 airtel to HQ, every single word on the five attached pages is obliterated by ZC40, under "national security" claim. Line by line, word for word. Including Kuffka's name. (I do not attach this record.) of the airtel.

However, there are no obliterations on the first of covering page ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

There is where Kuffka's name and 134 file number are disclosed. Yet in other cases and under oath in court cases the FBI swears it has to withhold informant file numbers. (This matter is currently before the appeals court in U.S. 78-0249, in which you provided and affidavit, and before district court in the King case.)

The second page is entirely withheld by ZC40, without any claim made for it. His written claims to indefinite exemption and to classification begin on the second page of the airtel.

The captioned subject matter is the JFK assassination, relating to which there should be no non-essential withholdings, and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which has not existed for 15 years or more, nor with no legitimate "national security" aspects if there ever were any or any of other than a domestic intelligence and panoptic political nature.

This is not the only instance of disclosure of an informant file number without any hurt to the informant or the FBI. Nor is it, as I believe is probably, the only instance where the withholding tends to perpetuate hurt to the innocent. (With totality of withholding I can't be certain.)

This parallels many situations in the King investigation, a number of which I have appealed. There the FBI made selective disclosure of the identification of informants, limiting it to those it wanted the House assassins committee to be deceived and misled by. This is what happened and now the Department's newest self-investigation is limited to this house. Naturally enough there will be a self-warded clean bill of health.

In the King case the FBI also engaged in tricky filing, eliminating from its MURKIN file those records most embarrassing to it, like its intrusions into the legal defenses of the Ray brothers through informants of whom two are known, Patterson and Gappert. Here it gets even trickier, with the Department's election of in camera inspection of withholdings and the Department's selection of the records to be examined by the Court, which lacks knowledge of such matters as what has been disclosed, like the identifications of informants. The potential for deceiving and misleading the Court is increased by your failure to act on my appeals of long ago.

With regard to Kaffke, I filed a PA appeal in which I asked for a search of all relevant files to see if he informed on me, directly or indirectly, from his having been present at a study group I was asked to address and from his association with one who was then a friend of mine. I did file P A requests with HQ and all field offices. And while holding no to be a public person the FBI did make selective disclosure of ~~false~~ ^{false} and defamatory records relating to me in both King and JFK cases.

If the FBI can withhold or disclose on the basis of its liking or dislike of views or its opinion of veracity, I do not believe it can apply this standard inconsistently, arbitrarily and capriciously in historical cases.