

I did not such thing. Rather, as what follows inadvertently reflects, I told the FBI of requests I would be making so that as it made other searches it could be aware that I would be seeking the same information and could save time for itself. That this is what I did ~~is~~ ^{pursue} is reflected in "indicated he plans to ~~press~~ ^{disclose} further the Martin Luther King assassination case..." and other matters. I did ~~disclose~~ ^(Emphasis added) my "plans" and I note the use of "further" because it reflects the FBI's awareness of my prior and ignored King requests.

It is true that Mr. Lesar reflected the Silberman correspondence referred to above as "not responsive." The reference to what was "furnished to former Congressman Boggs" is quite inadequate, as I am certain was known. The late Mr. Boggs also had been a member of the Warren Commission. His son had disclosed that the FBI had furnished the father with defamatory information. The son had made some available to the press. ^{What he was given by the FBI} ~~That~~ included the defamations of me given to the President, Attorneys General and others.

Although at the top of page 3 with reference to this the memo says "copy attached" in fact none is attached and it certainly is pertinent and easy enough to find. The request made is again misrepresented because I had not said anything about being the "subject of surveillance." (Nor had I limited it then or since to the FBI.) This is followed by a denial of "other intrusions into his life by the FBI." Now although it was not what I had in mind at the time, not being what had been reported to me, in fact the records supposedly examined prior to this reflect a clear "intrusion" into my life by the FBI in New York. I have provided you with copies of relevant records. The FBI undertook to try to ruin me with my first book my providing under-the-table information to what wound up as a panel of four lawyers ^{on a TV program. (Their} whose failures contributed to the spectacular success of that book which followed.) I ~~has~~ ^{have} also provided records of ~~an~~ ^{another} similar effort by a symbolled FBI informant in San Francisco. So there ~~were~~ ^{FBI} ~~known~~ intrusions into my life and the memorandum in this regard is absolutely, that favorite FBI word, false.

While I am confident that I made a request similar to were "Director Hoover's confidential files" searched, I know I did not know the "OC" distinction and ~~did~~ ^{did} not presume these were or were only "official." In fact I believed his personal files were personal. If I am correct in this personal files were not searched, as the OC were on 3/14, ^{Or what} remained of them.

still appears
It ~~still appears~~ unlikely to me that Mr. Hoover's records did not include my pointed and totally accurate criticism of his erroneous Warren Commission testimony or records of the nature of those given to President Johnson.

That there is intent to mislead here is apparent from the limitation to FBIHQ records. Most of the records of the kind in question are never in HQ and are always in ~~the field offices~~ the field offices. I doubt there is any FBI SA who was not aware of this.

However, the record is explicit in stating that after receiving Mr. Lesar's letter the FBI did not check with Tom Boggs, who had made the disclosure to the press.

There is reference to memos being sent to the Civil Division and the AUSA. They are not here and I recall no claim to exemption for them. In the past such memos have been disclosed.

The foregoing are all the relevant records in this Section, which I read for the first time yesterday, when my wife also made the attached copies.

The time of the last record referred to is long before any compliance with my PA requests. The FBI supposedly has separate copies of what was provided to me in supposed compliance with my PA request. I would like this appeal, which really relates to both the King and Kennedy assassination records as well as the PA request, to include a review of the records that were provided in still incomplete compliance. I believe that they as well as the readily identifiable other records like these in the general FBIHQ releases will make it clear that these records cited above are not accurate and not honest. I believe any inaccuracy of dishonesty is an important factor in FOIA and PA matters, particularly those before courts of law. If by the one now in charge of the FBI's FOIA/PA unit then I believe the matter is even more serious.

I have checked my file on the C.A.75-226 case. It is incomplete. What records I do have indicates that the affidavit I refer to above as having been executed by Mr. Bresson may have been by SA John Kilty, the other SA present at the conference. I do ~~not~~ find his first affidavit in this file. It states that the total of 54 pages provided after an addition to the original 22 makes compliance complete: "The FBI files to the best of my knowledge do not include any information requested by Mr. Weisberg other than the information made available to him."

The attached copy of Director Kelley's 4/10/75 letter is expurgated at the bottom to eliminate all notes and the initials of the actual author of the letter. ^(Appealed) However, it makes clear that no NAA information was provided until after my counsel's phone call to Mr. Bresson on an earlier date in April. The number cannot be made out on the remote-generation copy.

In checking my own writing (Post Mortem, page 422) I find I referred to the FBI's ^{not} pretense that at the conference I stated I did not want the NAA material I requested and included in the complaint: "When we complained about the omission of the NAAs, the FBI had the gall to say I didn't ask for them."

Perhaps there was not an affidavit by SA ^BBresson. But it is beyond question that the information his own records states I did ask for was then withheld with the false representation that I had not asked for it.

Because of the frailty of recall and the volume of the records I did not ^{in this section any} trust my failure to see ~~as~~ copy of any 3/10/75 letter from the Director to Mr. Lesar. The worksheets ^{for} both the assassination and the Oswald files show no such record being provided. Its relevance to the foregoing is apparent, as is motive for withholding it.

I do hope that three years after my appeal it is not asking too much to ask that at least the records allegedly provided be complete, particularly when they are relevant to litigation.

The relevance of any FBI record stating that I did not ask for what is included in the complaint should be pretty obvious, too.

As relevant to FBI intent and further bearing on FBI truthfulness I provide also the Serial immediately preceding the first of those I attach relating to my FOIA request that became C.A. 75-226. (Serial 7146)

The most casual reading of the records relating to my request makes it obvious that the letter to Senator J. Bennett Johnson was of knowing untruthfulness.

The general releases of 1977 and 1978 leave no doubt on the score.

After the 1974 amending of the Act a constituent asked the Senator about the opening up of FBI records relating to the assassination of President Kennedy.

"The documents which have not been made available at the National Archives," the letter over Director Kelley's signature to the Senator states, "are contained in investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes and are therefore ^{by} exempt from public disclosure" under FOIA.

The untruthfulnesses include the fact that there was no law enforcement purpose in the compilation of these records, as many FBI records ¹ have provided state repeatedly, and if there had been only those records that fall within the exemptions are "exempt from public disclosure," which even then falls short of the actuality, that they could be released as a matter of administrative discretion. (Prior to the date of this letter that had been done on occasion.)

The records provided do not contain any comment by Department counsel on the staff of the DAG, Ms. Susan Hauser, to whom a copy was routed.

I believe this kind of official statement by the FBI subsequent to the 1974 amending of the Act is a fairly forthright indication of FBI intent not to comply with the Act. My subsequent experience is in accord with this belief, as I believe the records I attach in themselves make clear.

There is another record in the same Section that bears on the FBI's faithfulness of reference internally, in records that work their way upward in the bureaucracy and in this case reached the Director, ~~XXXXXX~~.

Quinn Martin productions, which has a long record of producing film and TV shows to the FBI's liking (the FBI has what are virtually agents in residence on the sets), wanted to do a film for CBS on the assassination of President Kennedy. He asked what he received in other projects, official FBI assistance. For reasons that to a large degree are substantial and actual the FBI declined and offered assistance in what would amount to further FBI promotional movies.

One of the reasons advanced for recommending refusal to help Quinn Martin is that it could result in "An avalanche of requests under" FOIA. Of the FOIA requests "Up to this point," the 4/18/75 memo states, "such FOIA requests (such as one received from well-known FBI antagonist Mark Lane) have been declined on the basis of privacy..." (Emphasis added)

The one request from Mark Lane is not typical of FOIA requests. A single request does not reflect what by this date was a fairly substantial amount of litigation. Much more representative - and not mentioned in the record that would reach the Director personally - were my suits, particularly the one that is the subject of considerable space in this same Section of records.

It involved no considerations of privacy. Nor did my prior ones. Yet the Director was told that up to them FOIA requests "have been declined on the basis of privacy" and nothing else.

That the Director would not want privacy violated is a safe assumption. He was led to believe this is the only reason FOIA requests were rejected.

In this and in the record relating to Senator Johnson's inquiry I ~~am~~^{am} not appealing any withholding. Rather am I addressing what you, the Courts and I are required to accept in FOIA cases where the FBI alone knows where and how it has what filed and when all depend upon its word and the integrity of its word as well as its interpretations. I believe these

records indicate that the FBI's unconfirmed word cannot be accept and should not be accepted in FOIA cases.

In addition, as I hope by now is pretty obvious, with regard to the records relating to both assassinations and my C.A. 75-226 in particular, the FBI has engaged in some pretty tricky filing. I have cited records that should have been in this Section and are not in it. What the FBI withholds from this Section in turn addresses the integrity of the FBI's representations as well as its prior intent not to be honest, ^{Witness its} refusal to make and keep a record of the conference and then providing what is an inherently incredible account of it for internal and again higher-level consumption and as it happened, ^{Miss led} ~~misdirection,~~ ~~leading~~ to long, costly and continuing litigation - and this in the oldest of FOIA case, the one over which the investigatory files exemption was amended. Why else would my counsel's letter and the FBI's rejection of it not be in the file where it belongs? Only as part of an FBI advance and continuing effort to hide what it was up to.

When these are the actualities, as they are, and when such great periods of time pass and you do not act on the numerous and detailed appeals, usually accompanied by explanations I believe should be helpful to you, what else I can do to make the system work is quite seriously limited.

By now the record is also pretty clear ^{that when I obtain} ~~on my frequently using~~ records that had been withheld ^{they} establish that still others remain withheld.

Above where I refer to what I actually told SA Bresson about my old FOIA requests, where I say the FBI could have saved itself much time and trouble by knowing I would be ^{it is pertinent to cite} renewing them, ^{He testified} the testimony of SA Howard in C.A. 75-1996 ~~the next year~~ was that he was then engaged in the third review of Kennedy assassination records - but had no knowledge of my existing request for information from those very files. You have had a copy of the ^{the FBI had not plan on non-compliance what I told SA Bresson would have been helpful to the FBI.} list I provided. You also have my recent appeals based on ~~continuing non-compliance.~~

To the degree I can I inform you so that appeal can have some meaning. I wish the record to now indicated the time, effort and cost required of me is justified. It has

I would like to