

# REMOVED RECORDS

JFK and King assassination records appeals  
Removed records  
June Mail  
7E claims

Harold Weisberg 6/19/80

Attached are two different worksheets for 62-109060-4240 and parts of the serials. Both worksheets are phonies. There also is reasonably segregable material on the one page finally indicated as withheld.

In the King case the FBI claimed that June accounting are accurate. This indicates otherwise.

The original worksheet for 4240 reads, under description, "Removed to Special File Room for Safekeeping." Under claim to exemption it says "Check Special File Room." That was not done when the records were provided. Instead there is a removal slip, "Permanent Charge Out," with what has never been provided printed on in advance, "See File 66-25640 7530 for authority." The subject is given as "JUNE MAIL," with "Assassination of President Kennedy" written in. Nothing else was provided then, and the worksheet indicates that the entire record is of but one page, provided, without claim to exemption.

With a worksheet dated 2/27/80 I received two additional pages, the worksheet indicating there was another page. The description now provided is NY TEL to DIR. Claims to exemption are b1 and b7C only. Neither is posted on either of the two pages provided. If both are claimed for the page admittedly withheld, then the worksheet does not include what is claimed for withholding from what is provided belatedly.

The first of the two pages is a Domestic Intelligence Division Information Note form, the upper third of the note on which is entirely obliterated, the claim being 7E. What is not obliterated pertains to Ramparts magazine and Bishop Pike. Content of the attached is not indicated and the attached is not provided. A note added by Supervisor Long refers to an attached clipping. Carefully marked for indexing is a copy of a Washington Post (AP) story reporting that Ed Keating, publisher of the defunct Ramparts magazine, and Bishop Pike called on the President to disclose withheld information pertaining to the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy. Long's added note reads, "File clipping with the attached teletype."

Do you suppose that a clipping, of a syndicated newspaper story, had to be removed from the FBI's assassination file for "safeguarding?" Or a typically distorted "informative note," informative being Orwellian usage? Was the KGB rummaging through the FBI's files? If so, what damage would have been done by its finding the Post clipping, which its government had already gotten by the AP wire? Or by its getting the FBI's perspective on "eating and Bishop Pike, which were known in any event?"

Even the New York teletype - did it have to be removed from the regular files, to which even you do not have access any more than FBI SAs in FOIA work do, for "safeguarding?"

The give-away is in the belated 7E claim. Originally that paragraph was marked U, for unclassified. Then it was obliterated and 7E was added on the opposite side.

The 7E claim, by/the Department's own interpretation in C.A. 75-1996, can be made only for secret intelligence methods or techniques. Reading the Washington Post is not all that secret, is it?

Now it happens that I have a fairly clear recollection of what Ramparts was up to at the time in question, and it received considerable public attention. Unable to accomplish anything on its own in investigations of the JFK assassination, it fixed upon the little-known Pam Jones, who had a weekly newspaper in Texas with a circulation of about a thousand copies. Jones had reprinted a series of pretty wild editorials on the assassination as a book, "Forgive My Grief." Without acknowledging that Jones had printed the book, Ramparts reprinted portions of it and made the TV news with its sensations. It is the attention, not the content, that bugged the FBI - into some kind of bugging of its own, for which the 7E claim might be made, in continuing efforts to hide FBI misconduct that today would be embarrassing to it.

The real/purposes of the initial withholding and phoniness and the subsequent continued phoniness after revision and partial disclosure do not involve any "national security" or any secret method or technique. They merely hide FBI improprieties, an understatement when there is any intrusion into First Amendment or other Constitutional rights.

And just how subversive is the thing that Ramparts, here supported by Bishop Pike,

2

*Mr. Attorney General  
JFK Appeals - Exemptive Clause - FF*

were up to when later the FBI and the Department, thumping their chests all the while, did exactly what Keating the Bishop asked, as had many others before them, including me? Well, not quite exactly, as this and thousands of other illustrations show.

But what has been disclosed could have been disclosed in 1966 or earlier - save that it would have led to more doubts about the FBI and Warren Commission solutions to the crime.

Those of your staff who believe that those processing the records for disclosure have no interest in unjustified withholdings might want to examine this illustration and the initial denials - of a newspaper clipping and the misinformative note. I am certain that at the least they will find reasonably segregable information in the teletype - and that no secret method is involved and that the claim is made improperly to hide the FBI's domestic spying on its critics.

For your information, as part of its strange macho, along with its reprinting of Jones Ramparts carried the most brilliant spoof I remember. I was its victim. There was a "review" of the self-published work of one Ulov G.K. Leboeuf. (You love, God knows, the bull.) The spoof was so brilliant the Boston Globe ran an ecstatic account of the writing of the non-existing Leboeuf.

Of those many appeals you have done nothing about I ask you to recall the one pertaining to the effort to do me in on my December 1966 trip to California by an FBI symbolized informant. He was well prepared to provide a garbled and distorted account of my <sup>(FBI version)</sup> alleged past, of before he was born. As I have told you, it had the opposite of the intended effect, for which I have expressed my appreciation to the (silent) FBI. I had been invited to address what was known as the Citizens' Committee of Inquiry. When the time came to pay for a hall they were broke, so they asked the Rotakrites to sponsor the meeting. I was no more scared of them than of the Chamber of Commerce and other groups I have addressed. The FBI arranged for the audience to be standing room only. SA Keating was the ~~speaker~~ <sup>speaker</sup> who preceded and introduced me. His attributing my work to Ramparts was so inspirational that although I began so weary from nights without sleep I could not stand for long the sirenalia flowed and under ridicule he finally admitted that Ramparts' spoof victim was me. (The meeting was "covered.")