To Quin Show from Sarold Weisburg JFK assessination records appeals Field office and SQ records Suferrals

- Withholding of the public domain - what the Warren Commission published Failure do specify exemptions claimed - really refusal to specify Wathholding of referred records for two years

Under date of 4/18/60 I received from the FM 2511 pages of raferred records pertaining to the investigation of the apparentation of President Kennedy. I have begun to empire them but have laid this aside because the records require reprocessing because in the processing the FM has again indulged in Cointelproduc, its FOIA disty bricks.

Of course this is not all the referrals. The FRI's letter is careful to cover the FRI on this widle also being careful not to inform me or anyone also readings its fovering letter. A glance at the vericoheets discloses that the GIA has not acted on the referrals to it. After all, it was only in 1977 that the records were referred. With all the intelligence disasters it has been required to arrange so that it, like the FRI, could attribute failures to the FRIA, it has not had time to process referrals. Moreover, the GIA is stonessalling its own compliance pertaining to JFR assausization records. It has not to comply with 1975 requests for them. (Not its record - I have a 1971 request not complied with.) Of course it was only a President who was assausinated when in theory these agracion were to have provented it by their superior intelligence operations, that President to boot, and he is dead supers, isn't he?

If you examine the workshoots you'll find that the dates the referrals were noted on by those who did not on them is stated. Department of Defense, 1-25-78; State, 2-17-78; Secret Service, 4-17-78, etc. May the FM standardlod for two years and nore in providing copies of these referrals I do not know unless it was citizen the time required by projecting and filling Salac, deceptive and minimum antidavita with the courts or the time required for its company against the act or the time required for its puffory, like having its agents who are engaged in supposedly deagarous intelligence operations against maspected political numberors (Seega 7) appear on 60 Minutes. (Mitheut 70 claim.)

Of course it also required some time to go around trying to extrapt public officials while making it agrees that they were not embrapped, and more time to cut the TV note in so they could have their commons in place to film the supposedly somet goings on.

Whatever explains it, these records were referred in 1977, according to the original workshoots and the referral slips with the underlying records.

If you compare the worksheets for these referrals with the referred records you will find that no claims to examption are posted on the records themselves but that claims are indicated on the worksheets. This means that nobady outside the FHI knows what claim is made for what withhelding.

In only one case up to Sarial 1230 in there a single claim to exception. If only one exception is claimed them it is obvious that the withholdings are straibuted to it.

But take 1254. It was referred to the Secret Service, which chalmed (7)(C) and (D). The FSK added a (b)(1) chair. But there is no way of knowing what withholding is attributed to any one of the three chairs.

Nost of the withholdings have two claims made for them. The FRI knows it is supposed to post the claim at the point of exception and # when it had to in the post it did.
Unless it does there is no way of knowing what is claimed, the requester has no rights and the act has no meaning. Near one militarite attent to the fact that the FRI has extend in more than half its withholdings.

I don't want to waste time having to reread those records so I will not examine
the rest water they are reprocessed and I can know what examples is being claimed.

It appears that there will be a substantial number of questions because the large number of other claims, like (7)E).

and the brase, saybe by then other agencies, not only the GIA, will have acted as on referrals. The the archives, which has no backless.

In what I have read it is quite common for the public domain to have been referred, withheld by referral and them withheld by the usual FM stoberalling of two years.

his includes what the Warren Commission published, referred to State on several occasions.

and these are unclassified records at that. Idice an account of Oswald's protended remandation of his citizenskip in the Moscow Mahasey, by the one who testified to it before the Commission and whose reports are sade available by the Commission. Or like the Equation gaps business of several reports of the Mexican closing of the border to help the FMI catch the assassin. The border was closed briefly by the Pericomeon 11/22/65, but by the U.S. One of these reports is detect 11/25, or three days after the border was reopened, the other the might of 11/22, or hours after it was reopened. Both allage it was closed at the time the report was written.

Considerion, like 472. Both did disclose what is withheld there, in 1980 yet.

December of its certier Cointelproise, that "proviously processed" dedge, the FRI has also involved the field office percents in this sortid business.

Need I regind you of what this kind of withhelding means for that rather large project, the case index, the commune cashs that an be wanted, including by prolonged littgation and endless reprocessings?

These binds of dirty tricks to make requesture, the courts and all others and they are an effective part of a long-estimating compation against the Act and requesture. However, they are indepent and historically they will be a self-indictment by the Fil.

And however elight, there is always the character test common the sill be heard may take on interest.