Prfenuls, JFR

JFK and King accassination records appeals Referrals b1 claims in C.A. 78-0249

Harold Weisberg 12/2/79

In prior appeals in both cases I have alleged that referrals are misused by the FEI as a means of withholding what cannot properly be withheld under any FOIA exception. I have also appealed failure to do anything about referral. To now most have not been queted on gaid this goes back more than three years. These referrals from the CIA to the FEI in the King case that the CIA acted on it did not act on until it was in court on the same subject and then at the last minute. The FEI returned the favor, first by not acting on referrals from the CIA and then acted on them in the last minute, as I now recall.

It was only about a sonth ago that the FEI actually made the refermals it claimed to have made in 1977 with regard to Treasury referrals. I know this from the Treasury, which only two days ago phoned to ask for more time.

There has been no CLA action on FBI JFK referrals allegedly made in 1977. However, I have just come upon a record which indicates that even then the FEI might not disclose, regardless of how the CLA responds to referrals, if it ever does.

In Section 131 of 62-109060, in place of Serial 5345 Out there is the attached referral slip. An FEI FOIA note added reads, "Upon receipt of referral from CIA, determination as to dissemination to be made." This clearly seams that even if the CIA said to disclose the information the FBI might not disclose it.

The CLA, on its part, has not acted on my 1975 requests and appeals for the same records. Nor has the Secret Service component of the Treasury complied with my similar 1971 request and appeals, even when disclosures have been made to others.

In short, the record indicates that all the foderal police and intelligence agencies are using referrals as a means of withholding what is not within any FOIA exception.

I also have just come upon a corias of referrals to the HCMP. The first two I recall having seem, in 02-109060, are of Serials 6842 and 6858. There are other HCMP referrals of later Serials and in subsequent Sections. If there was any response by the HCMP it has not been communi ated to me after more than two years.

In G.A. 78-0249, in justification of the withholdingfof the identification of ECMP from the processing worksheets, you provided what I described as a rubberstamp affidavit supporting the phoney "national scennity" claim made by the FBI. You did this despite my having proved, by an affiavit to which copies of the underlying records are attached, that in fact the FBI had disclosed the identification of the RCHP. I provided this affidavit in response to the FBI's boilerplated forecast of deemsday in its affidavits, which disrogarded its disclosures.

You staff, in both King and JPX cases, have stated that these processing Fill records have no motive in withholding. This parlacts what I regard as an uninformed and main/wattitude and a predisposition to approve unjustificable withholdings. Fact is what counts, not some concept of motive that has no bards in either fact or experience. Rather is the experience of your office, from affidavite you have filed in my eases, to the contrary, for you have affirmed that in more than balf of what reached you the Fill did withhold improperly. (This is not in only way reflected in response to my quite numerous appeals in both cases, about a file drawer in each. In what is reflected to me you have done virtually nothing after many yours and I have received virtually nothing as a result of three appeals the accuracy of which is almost entirely without question.)

You staff might take note that regardless of what it conceives to be a lack of motive, the FMI FOIA personnel provided affidavite alleging the need to six withhold even the initials RCMP whereas these had been disclosed not only in the underlying records but also in actual referrals to the RCMP.

Regardless of this alleged lack of notive, according to the Treasury the FBI's FOIA personnel did not actually make the 1977 referrals to the Treasury until 11/2/79.

Although the FBI claims a blanket need to withhold all information received from all other police and mimilar agencies, dogustic and foreign, in practice it does not withhold what it has political objective in disclosing. In the past few days I have read in FBI records information, particularly bad information, from the GIA and an assortment of other agencies. The obvious prupose of dusclosure was

2

to make public what the FHI considered defenatory of those critical of it, beginning with Jis Garrison, and what supported the FHI's representations with regard to the political assumediantions.

I do not contest the need to withhold information that will disclose undisclosed and authentically confidential sources. You should recall that I have informed you of what may have been accidental disclosures of this nature so that the reading room copies sight be convected. I recall several King records instances.

For do I conduct that there are sume confidential relationships between the FBI and forwign police and other official agencies and that such authentically confidential relationships need to be preserved.

However, these are not at issue in the appeals I have made in both Hing and JFK cases. The fact of this cooperation in both cases is public, including in court proceedings and stories planted by the FHL, officially if claimed to be unofficial. Not is the withheld information secret. In the Hing case, for example, it was used by the Ray prosecution, in court, after being provided by the FHL, and in other says, like being given to Jeremiah O'Leary and others.

withholding,

What the FEI actually seeks to do with this kind of mikersely and particularly with the BCMP and Scotland "and in the Ming case, is hide the fact that these agencies did the work for which the FEI takes credit. Not only did I allege this, without contradiction after several years, based on my own knowledge and experience - now it is is confirmed by the Assistant Director who had been in charge of the FEI's demestic intelligency excelling operations. William Sullimen makes this explicit in his book, as you should have read when you read the book. (I will provide the pertinent passages separately.)

Two FSI FOIA chiefe ago I was informed that at long last the referralsm were being acted on. In what I have received they have not been, save for the one current case, the Treasury. For the foregoing reasons I renew my appeals relating to referrals and misuse of them to withhold what cannot properly be withheld.

3