

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg re prior appeals  
JFK assassinations records  
King assassination records

7/26/73

Attached are copies of FBIRG # 62-109060-1245 and 1246. I intend these to illustrate what is wrong with the FBI's approach and attitude toward the processing of records that can embarrass it; its processing of historical case records, where different standard ought apply; what resulted when the FBI refused to use the indexes to the published books on the King assassination, including my own; and why all the records in both cases require the <sup>re-</sup>processing about which I kept warning the FBI and which it really cannot/<sub>not</sub> have known might ~~not~~ be required of it as a result of its obduracy and out-and-out refusal to heed what it was told.

I've picked these records when I came across them while engaged in other work because everything withheld and everything marked for withholding but not withheld is in the public domain and has been released by the FBI before it processed these records and because the FBI has been stonewalling me on the same information in the King case despite my informing it that it was withholding the public domain.

All the men mentioned are dead, in addition.

The withheld name is that of Willie Somersett. It would appear from 1245 that secretive FBIRG was not letting the field offices know that Somersett had been a symbolized informant of the Miami F.O. as well as of local Miami authorities. It also was keeping secret, as it kept it secret from the Warren Commission, that the threat against President Kennedy was tape recorded by Somersett for the Miami authorities, who gave the tape to the FBI.

This in itself has separate historical importance.

The note states that the information was provided 11-10-63. The tape was made the day before. The President was scheduled to have a motorcade on his Miami appearance of 11/19/63, which is to say three days before he was killed. Because of threats that motorcade was cancelled. And what the note obscures is that the official account of the JFK assassination has it pulled off exactly as Milster said it would be.

What FBI also does not in this record disclose to the other field offices is that immediately after the JFK assassination Milteer in effect took credit for it and said he had known what he was talking about on 11/9/63.

None of this is secret because I published it and more in Frans-Uy. It has been within the public domain, depending on the information, from a decade to almost a decade and a half. In addition, all the withheld information and more is readily available at the National Archives. I mean the FBI reports holding the information.

This also gets to one of my FOIA requests with which the FBI has yet to comply, for the tape. I published a partial transcript, which came from the Miami States Attorney.

I told the FBI this and much more in the King case when I recognized the withholdings as what I had published. I await any response or compliance or replacement of records.

The FBI also stonewalls on other information given to it by then Assistant States Attorney (now judge) Seymour Galber, who has provided copies of some of this.

Whatever may be in any analyst's uninformed mind this has become a major disinformation operations, with the House assassins going ape over it.

This and newer information have been published by Miami magazine, as I am certain the Miami field office files (whether or not other files) reflect.

The foregoing characterizes a large percentage of the withholdings, withholdings in which the FBI persisted and persists despite my informing it all along with regard to such cases and despite Jim Lear's warning added to mine that we would have to request the reprocessing of all the King records.

Also bearing on what underlies such withholdings pretendedly to protect people is a sensational item on this morning's Good Morning America 7 a.m. newscast, that a prisoner who had served time with James Earl Ray reports having been offered \$50,000 by a businessman's group to kill King. His name is given as Myers and the original story is credited to the New York Times.

It long has been obvious to me that the FBI has been playing misinformation games with those with a built-in weakness for them, the House assassins committee. I have already put some of the records indicating this in court records, without any comment from the FBI.

In this instance the leak is by it <sup>as</sup> as a consequence of its feeding this kind of known bad information to the sensation-seeking committee.

In this instance also the integrity of the Department and of the Attorney General is involved because the same canard is a significant part of the OHR report, where it conjectures ~~that~~ motive it attributes to James Earl Ray.

You may recall that the memo I prepared for Civil repeatedly warns about the harm inherent in the improper withholdings, such as of prisoners' names. What now has happened illustrates this, harm in misleading the country all over again and harm from my inability to inform the press of precisely which of the many such records I have shows the story to have been proven to be false. (One illustration that could fit what I heard on TV is a simple misinterpretation of what a businesswoman said in a moment of bitterness over not being able to get a loan she needed.)

This kind of typical FBI news management effort is a much more likely explanation of its reason for withholding the names of prisoners, especially of those who have gone public on their own, than the claimed need to protect them from harm, as I've suggested from the non-conspirators.

(The name is Russell Myers. The item was repeated at 8 a.m.)

I have given the FBI copies of news stories holding the fabrications of a number of these prisoners and then informed it that its own clippings files held even more, but not a single withholding has been replaced.

One way or more the cost of these kinds of FOIA malpractices, which I believe the foregoing shows cannot be innocently accidental, has cost and will cost the Department such. If its integrity also is involved, now or historically, I believe the cost can be greater. Aside from this there is the question of compliance with law. I go into this in the hope that performance can be better and costs reduced in the processing of those records not yet processed and to reflect the need for reprocessing.