Coursell - numb

JFK assessination recents appeals

Harold Meisberg 10/1/79

This is a further estaloguing of classification and FOLA and \$2040 horrors. I will add captions as I god.

As you reed this please recall how such time has pessed since I asked for a review of all claims to classification under the provisions of the new R.O. and that there has been no action.

Chalmers Roberts and the Washington Post (apparently also 94-5(?)-6-430).

The captioning on page 5 should also include the withholding of the reasonably segregable.

Sum different copies of the Juman to Palosch same of 19/6/64, captioned "Challess H. ROBERTS - "THE WASHINGTON FAST!, "are attached

The first, Bot Recorded in 62-109090, want classified by 2040 on 6/27/77, when he found that indefinite examption from the GDS was required under Categories 2 and 3.

That the record was pust classified earlier is established by the attached copy also from the same 62-109090 file, which 2040 did not get his dukes and and was not classified by sayone class.

As I have informed you on a number of occasions, there had been not fewer than three prior reviews of these records, so lack of classification was not an oversight.

What 2040 regarded as requiring withhelding so the nation could be saved in that "Roberts had frequent contact with representatives of the Russian and natellite Embassion..." Do you suppose that this was unknown to the "Russian and natellite Embassion?" Or that this is in any way ususual for a reporter - other than required of a diplomatic reporter?

Why Chalmers explained this to the FEU is not included in what 2040 withheld but that Chalmers did explain it is included. A matter of "national security"?

Post 'fake liberit'. Employing while I do not suggest that this is because Chalmers "gave written reports of" his sectings with the Russians and others "to the USSR Affairs Deak, State Department" this also is not a matter of "national accurity."

Withholding of what the Merren Commission disclosed (Quin was to the contrary nebrithstanding)

PM 1977 classification of what the Gonzalesden did not classify to withhold what the Warren Consission published (again Unia Siesa to the contrary noticelthertanding)

Presence make a complete on Coweld (separate FOIA request not complied with)

(Omeconsery and improper) referrals not yet acted on - after more than two years

Under date of 3/26/64 the Commission wrote the FUI speking amplification of the informating on Osmald prior to the assessmination that the Commission had received.

Attached to the letter was five pages of quantions.

The Commission did not classify its letter and questions and indeed they are not properly subject to classification.

but them 2040 got his cotton pickin fingers on them and they became "SPEREY" in the 63-103030 file.

"to appearently did not check to determine whether this record is available in/the Countsalon's records at the Archives or to determine whether all or part was published by the Countsalon. For that matter, although the record status that the original is 103-32995-3302, he did not check that file.

Fortunately. Pacause it severas no much work needing the other copies. In the 105 file it was not classified and there are no expurgations a la 2040e she did consor both questions and negress.

but the covering letter, although stamped SECRET, is disclosed in the 62-109090 file. However, when the quantions were there withheld and referred to the CLA, the letter itself was not withheld and with the SECRET stamp and classification not confolled was provided. (Both are attached). Crassified letter and reformal slip)

With full one pairs and expression of appreciation the letter was band-delivered to the FML, as the bosom to "electh same of the same date states. The note Director Boover chief, which can be then several contradictory ways, say have Lappined 2040 to field his stamps and blacouse. Receive it is not entirely Legible in the attached 62-107090 copy I repeat it from the original in 105-12575-2044. The top priority. The questions containly would indicate FML did a poor job of inventigation is supervision."

Epoter made this comment on countless occasions, Spartimes be mount it so the Countmist's expression of its opinion or an others would interpret the record and quite often be mount it as his personal opinion, particularly with regard to the supervision and "induly menticular" FSC interpretations of Countmist interpret and quantions.

As an attachment to this case 2040 did not withhold the questions. Nor did he classify either the mass or the questions. Until he case to question 20. "o then steeped that page only "MUNES" and childrenton cal withhold own the number of the question, to avoid the derinda authoral scennity disputor, no don't.

As it appears in the sampurgated 105 file copy the master questions asks, "What was the FRI evaluation of confidential information received on Sevenber 18, 1965 regarding Canalil's letter to the Seviet Inhoms in Mashington?"

with the letter published in faceballs by the Conclecion and the fact of its coverage of the Cabassy ands public by the FM RAFF's remain is not apparent. There is no justification or need for the withholding and no basis for the notional security claim, albeit outside the regularments of the E.O. Sesides, the letter was made available by other means.

In a Not Recorded Serial in 62-103090 M.A. Scuniges, on 3/27/64, boiled those questions down to mia. 2040 withhold part of the memor to one.

Sing record here in better them that of the one who processed the 105-62555 cops,

Serial 3205. There the third of pranigan's questions immediated withheld. In the 62109090 copy it reads. The analyzes of Gesell Pollowing Our Interviews Eith Eig....

Considerion desires Fill reaction to the CIA report of August 10,1965, regarding Osmald's

visit to the Seviet Beheasy, Series City... (The date is arought use the end of the

most month. In Question 25 the date is given correctly, October 10.)

any bands within the act for the withholding is not apparent. Normover, like all class involved, it was within the public decain as well as disclosed in the 63-103030 file - and it was the subject of FMI testionny before the Considerion - also published.

\*

The also applies to the Bracken basetion 6 withholdings.

licover's slind unto characterises the questions as "obviously leaded," perhaps to 2010 a signal.

Defers retirming to the questions and their asserts, there are other relovent records in the 105-62555 file.

decades a 4/3/64 sees to Sullivan, Serial 3205, also was associated by Boorse.

principal series substituting Here the classification was by 2000, He apparently ignored Hower's note below his first withholding on page 2, "I see no reason for so boing sticky re classification." A note by another either legal and provides part of the withholdings judging from the line and arrow Booter this is true of the second withholdings judging from the line and arrow Booter from his note to part of it.

The response to Fackin, dated 4/6/64, is classified but the classifier is eliminated in the PD's zerosing of the recent.

With all of the Liberation disclosed by the Canadasian there approach to be no basis for the 1977 charaffication and withholdings. Smither the levier ner the attachment were charaffed in 1964. It was the Fall's practice to charaffy that it believed required classification when it wrote the Canadasian and with the covaring letters added that they were uncharaffed upon the removal of charaffed attachments.

The first of the questions withheld as secret although view are also disclosed by the FSI and are also unclassified is in, 8, on page 5. The withheld second part of the answer is within the public docate, unless the FEI lied earlier.

Question 9 is "Now and when did the FMI learn of Countd's move to "aw Orleand".

The masser is withheld in toto, although it was testified to before the Countering by SA Hosty. As I recall I sent you menumes of this testimony and of information relating to the FMI's oun disclosures of its interceptions in Sec York, all public.

Unless the access to question 10 is flase it also is public, disclosed by both the PEI and the Commission, but here "Secret" and withheld in toto.

The mithheld answer to Question 15 (intermettingly marked only "C" rather than as stamped, "Secret," does not appear to be subject to classification. And the source

referred to as "confidential" has been disclosed by the FM. In the disclosure it is apparent that there was no seed for confidentiality.

Enhancement rather then the requirements of deticual ecountry can explain the in the 62-109090 filet.

Withholding and charaffication of Quantum 25, which is disclosed. "That was the PM reaction to the CIA report of October 10, regarding Occald's what to the Societ not have a section to the CIA report of October 10, regarding Occald's what to the Societ not have not information by the CIA? What was the PM evaluation of Occald in view of the CIA report?" Whether or not the answer was made public by the "emplantage, and I have no way of busiding whether some say not have been, may proper master does not appear to be properly subject to charaffication, particularly not in an Materical case.

While all of the answer to Question 26 is withhold at least core is public and see testified to. There appears to be so busin for classification of for any other class to withhold the sames. Ot withhold the sames, but within the Act, anymay.

Constinue 26 is also withhold in the 52-109090 bopy although the equivarious content squite indicate that there is no busis for it - as well as Constanton disclosure. The answer and the question are ultimbeld in the 105-62555 copy. The withhold part of 29 also is public and was testified to unless it is not trabball. The questions were asked by the Constanton proparatory to its taking of testimony, and the testimony was published. Besides, both questions are disclosed in the 62-109090 copy. Or in the file from which they are also wit held!

And if none of this were true it would remain true that reasonably sugregable information is withheld.