

JU MC

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

Harold Weisberg 6/19/60

attached are two different worksheets for 65-109060-1240 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 ~~these~~ accounting are accurate. This indicates
otherwise.

The original worksheet for 4240 reads, under description, "Removed to Special File
Room for Misfiling." 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 66-25540
7530 for authority." The subject is given as "JAMES HALL," 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 2/27/60 I received two additional pages, the worksheet indi-
cating there was another page. The description now provided is NY TEL to HR. 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 free what is provided ~~separately~~.

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 Files. 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
Files called on the President to disclose withheld information pertaining to the investi-
gation 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 FBI 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 "outing 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 GAs 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 O.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 Reports 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 Fern 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, Reports reprinted portions of it and made the TV news with its annotations. It is the attention, not the content, that dragged 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/purpose of the initial withdrawing and phony and the subsequent continued phony after revision and partial disclosure do not involve any "national security" or any secret method or technique. They merely hide FBI ineptitudes, an understatement when there is any intrusion into First Amendment or other Constitutional rights.

and just how subversive is the thing that Reports, here supported by Bishop Pike,

for attackments see: Exemptors Claimed
JFK Appeals - FE

were up to him later the FBI and the ^{Department}, ~~changing~~ their charts all the while, did exactly what ~~keeping~~ the Bishop asked, as had many others before them, including not well, not quite exactly, as this and thousands of other illustrations show.

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

Some 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 sensibly recognizable 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 work, along with its reprinting of James Rusperts carried the most brilliant spoof I remember. I was its victim. There was a "review" of the self-published work of one Elv G.L. Lehouf. (You love, God knows, the hell.) The spoof was so brilliant the Boston Globe ran an extensive account of the writing of the non-existing Lehouf.

If these many appeals you have done nothing about I ask you to recall the one pertaining to the effort to do so in on my December 1966 trip to California by an FBI spooked informant. ~~He~~ ^{He} was well prepared to provide a garbled and distorted account of ~~my~~ ^(KBI version) ~~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 "rotaxites" 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~~ ^{speaker} only. Ed Keating was the ~~speaker~~ ^{speaker} who proceeded and introduced me. His attributing my work to Rusperts was so inspirational that although I began on wazy from nights without sleep I could not stand for long the adrenaline flowed and under ridicule he finally admitted that Rusperts' spoof victim was me. (The meeting was "covered.")