To thin Shea from Harold Veisborg re "deliberateness" in G.A.75-1996 1/15/73 withholdings and withholdings from FMI's N.O. files on Oswald 105-16601 and Huby 44-02064; urgency of need of withheld indicate in any processing and prior to your offering an expert opinion to a court or even concluding that you have processed an appeal with due diligence and good faith.

It was not possible for me to be at the status call of 1/12/79 in C.A.75-1996 become I was teed in. Clearing my lane tired me to the paint where I had to alter my working plane. As a result I have begin to review the New Orleans FNI files, which I can do while merely mitting and reading. Before going to bed last night I have gone over the Cawald and Ruby files. I will be writing you in more detail about them. I have already appealed the withholdings from them.

It also appears that I now have the need to address deliberateness in the withholdings that I have established and to do the same with new proofs of withholdings.

I regard withholding any record by serely indicating "proviously processed" on a work sheet, not uncommonly an illegible worksheet although these are drasted in the FEI's FOIA unit, as not proving the information I request. We have discussed this and you have stated that it is not possible for the FEI to cite the Serial of the allegedly already processed record. Inhave stated that without even a reference there is no seems of the requester knowing or of the requester or expone else having access to that information and that is addition there is real possibility of confusion and error resulting from the making of an effort to do this correlating. In addition I have stated that given the mass of the paper in the Kig and JFE investigations served citation to any alleged existence elsewhere is knowingly meaninghous or a form of deliberate withholding.

In the course of reviewing these files and finding in them inconsistencies in those essentially meaningless citations to previous processing, which in any event does not man previous release or disclosure. I have come accross what I regard as proof that the Föll can in fact make specific social citation to the referenced record. If my interpretations is correct, and in view of the fact that the Föll unit appears to have written both on the same pieces of paper I presume it is correct, then it appears that the Föll has misled you and you have misled a court. I would prefer to believe that misleading a court would be one of the last things you would ment to do said in fact as of now I do believe this.

You will recall my cautions against merely repeating the PEI's word or that of others who claim to have searched and reviewed records with good faith and due diligence.

You will also recall that I informed you and the Court that it is impossible for me to devote as much of what remains of my life to going into elaborate details and explanations and to the providing of many illustrative copies. Of course I will continue to inform you, as herein I do, and in time I will provide copies of the FOLA unit's

君

recents referred to above. But I easest new ask my wife to drop whatm class is important to her this time of the year to make the necessary copies and I cannot any long drop what is important to so to help you with your work, such as I would like to in order to cirtain compliance and clean these cases up. While I will help as I can I believe that the burden of proof of compliance under the det is not size and it will require such less of my remaining time if I, when necessary, sarely prove non-compliance and if I must the mi existence of the information sought.

An example, of many examples of some of which I will write you when I can, from my "ew Orleans Raby and Cawald file reviews, follows. I melect this one because in a more or less story-book fashion it tends to provide a linkage between these two men, one I have no reason to believe existed in recal life but one indicative of need to investigate and one relating to which I found NOT A SINGLE RECORD in the Suby and Onwald "ew Orleans files. Although there were mentions of masses that could lead to this.

That less Harvey Caneld engaged in certain activities, like distributing literature and representing himself as the head of the entirely non-existing New Orleans chapter of to Fair Flay for Caba Committee is well known. That in the course of this he managed to get himself arrested when he had committed no offense against any law and then used the public attention this received in efforts he made with the Russian and Cuban representatives in Hexico City also is well known. (There is virtually no reference to any of this in the files I've just reviewed, allegedly the entire New Orleans Countl file.) What is not as well known is that he immediately arranged for more attention, including eather two local TV stations, and them staged another such event, which both did cover, and of all the places in New Orleans he could have selected he picked the building managed by Clay Shaw, whose name I' sure you've heard. Not mentioned in the Gaussid file I've read.

one that inp particular attracted my attention during my personal inventigations is that of a publication she had no chance in the world of breaking even. 't had a suite of three offices, one not being enough to attract benkruptoy. It was a publication feedling sith batis assertors metters. (If you'd like I'll trace it back to a Watergate limit for you and to Watergate figures.) It was the place of business of a GIA man named william George Gaudet. Of course I'm not saying that this or this alone is the reason Ossaid selected the Trade Bart Building for his demonstration. Nor is thus the only provessive aspect. I mention one other, not in the Ruby file I've just read.

Ruby went to "ew Orleans. While he was there he bough: a charp painting from a well-known New Orleans entrapreneur named Larry Borenstein, (If you are a jazz buil he onTrotsk: he can's Preservation Mail.) He seemer was Cauald's name mentioned in public after the

Assessmention, and I do mean a matter of minutes, this same Gaudet was on the horn to the Fäi with the first of many efforts a do by those of ultra-rightist persuadion to make it appear like as all-left series of comagnizacies.

What FRI records I've been able to locate, in this matter totally without any help under FOIA, indicate that for whatever reason the FRI managed not to properly identify Borenstein or Gaudet. With Gaudet the FRI managed not to give his International Prode Mart address (which it knew well enough, and I can tell you which agent covered that building and sky), prefering to orient his and those who might read any record with his country place, at Waveland, Miss., which is some distance from the ITM.

What makes all of this, of which I've not seen even a bint in the records I've just read, is the fact that Gaudet and Openid managed to follow each other in their we Orleans paraport applications. Idterally, one then the other. I'm not checking to tall you which was first. But they were together in the passport records.

This encapsulation does not by any means exhaust the possible relationships to government agencies.

If by any chance any aspect of the foregoing account is classified, then I tell You I acquired all this information and a considerable ascent more from what is within the public domain, with Gaudet himself having gone public to a limited degree long after my work, which dates to the previous decade.

To what I believe is the invention of the so-called "underground" back. After several mendings of my first one, which also was the first on the Marron Constanten, W.W.Morton, a major portion, referred as to the part where I wrote that Cowald's career in Massian major portion, referred as to the part where I wrote that Cowald's career in Massian major portion, referred as to the part where I would sealled establishing a cover.

Marton's respect vice-president told as that if I would rewrite around thin, or charge the government with conspiracy, they predicted the book would be a best-peller and they'd be happy to publish it. I would not have been happy with that kind of success what rejected it, opting instead the subsequent life of which you have some knowledge.

In the Cavald file I've read there is no reference to David Millian Ferrie, who I first brought to light in 1966. There is a reference to him in a Ruby Sub, a selfserving statement he gave the FBI, that he did not know Cowald. There is no reference
to any investigation of the Ferrie-Cavald connection in the Civil Air Fatrol, nat unal
enough when they were in it at the same time and it wasn't all that large. There is
no reference to the same who recruited Cavald, although he is referred to as a member
of the New Orleans vice squad as of the time of the crime. Or to his false testimony
about Ferrie to the Marren Consission. There is no reference to the Carrison investiention, although there is an elliptical report saking no reference to it but to the
fewless of three or four of the sore than 30 volumes as a chack of those sharges.

Now how do tou suppose the NO PO know which small fraction of the entire file to review without an index? Especially if the file was as utterly barron as the records if ye just read? Way would an Sk lock for what is not in the records, if I have a true duplication of those records? Or how, in New Orleans, could be know there were in PSUNG, if they had been sent there, as was not the case, of course.

(Parenthetically, the PMI told the All the day of his confirmation hearing that Clay Shaw was Clay Bortrand, whose name appears infrequently in a few of the pages but not once in connection with the IRM or Oswald's demonstration there. In fact these records do not disclose what I assure you happened, that the FMI got WDSU-TV's Omerald footage, two acquants besides this descentration, had you capted, and returned what WAN and not it alone told se was not the complete footage. Another course for this was Jesse Core, who did the ITH's publicity and was in the fortage before the FRI got it. He raised hell with Oswald for blackening the ITH eye. He and the ENGL-TV news director both told me they reviewed the footage as eson as Gewald's name was continued and Core was there. When I was allowed to duplicate the reseining footage he was not in it. When I was finally able to review the government's copy, the footage in identical. Yet the Secret Service urapper on its copy mays there were ive men helping Oswald while the existing ffootage says only one. It also happens that Ours provided the FMI with asspins of Cawald's Literature, through 5A Verren debrueges. Now this particular set did reach the Warren Commission through the PRI. I can only wonder how there not only being no reference to it into the Gewald file I've just read but it has been semory-holed from both the inventoory of the Sub and from the Sub itself. Or, no possibility of "previously processed" from this file.)

Now do you suppose the NO FO made any file review without reviewing the parties of Sewald demonstrating outside the building rum by the sam Garrison charged? Those files do not show that the FNI had it. (They also show that the FNI considered of no what the Jahn Martin - Minneapolis - file for which I maked. This, too, is natural, if there is no value in a motion picture of Sewald being arrested, a file not in any may duplicated in the FNI's known investigation or what it gave the Commission. Except for another similar affair, also part of my request, for the Doyle anatour foctage of the same arrest. Not having the footage, if there are no copies, which I don't believe, anabled the FNI not to spot any possible co-conspirators it it, of course.) Or without the Ferrie records, Ferrie also having been charged by Garrison. Or any Shaw records, despite what the FNI told the AG and the AG repeated to the press.

I could be devil's advocate and make an incomplete case. I've care you are aware of the recent attention putaids of and with the House assassing committee of false by Charles Bronson in Dallas. The FAL did not even bother to inform Ha about this film and

instead filed a completely false account of it representing that it does not even show the TSMD from which the FEI says the crise was consitted. In fact it shows the wery window from union the FMI says the deed was done and it shows some as yet unidentified motion that demant be of a single person. Too are more that the Separtment has been asked by the consistee to carry this forests - now. It is only because I was able to got this ballas record that is not in FBIBQ files that envene, including the "operationt, had any way of knowing of this Bronson film. (I believe this is not the only a identiary importance of his footage and film, not all of which has been disclosed publicly.) Those of an generally chiled "critics" are also generally larged together, despite our many disagreements. In this case were sere limited because we are without seems of financing. It took sees time until a newspaper could be interested. Other gold a prese conference to show more of the footage in Kashington. The Separtment probably is not interested but I may as well tell you that what this film that is known is said to show I proved by other means and published that proof in 1965, so I would not believe that any new official statement of valualeaguess or meaninglessness could be expected to redeive assumetioning acceptability, if and when made.

If for the sake of ajagment I coacede that all of this is merely normal FEI incompetence at the time of the crime as I to assume that FEI incompetence is perpetual and is perpetuated by FEIEEF How about the Congressional investigations? How about the reviews after the Warren Seport mass was out? In fact how about the FEI's own review of my first book, which addresses the same information by other and complicately tangible proofs as well as testimony?

of course I do not regard the FBI as incompetent and I do believe there is at least an element of deliberatement in this, as in what follows.

I have been addressing photogryChs and withholdings from the JYE files in which they belong. (The New Orleans seb with meremes of still is, by a remarkable combaldence; the only one out of focus. The documents, like of Cavald at Secolar Field, are illegible. Whatever the photographs are, they are merely sandges. Receive I can understand, Cavald having had at locat a Secret and nore likelyTop Secret and Crypto clearances, which the FEI's records do not reflect in any way as I've been able to read these YEI records.)

You may recall that the FMI score it had no platures of the score of the Hing orine when it did, and that it swore to this after allegedly reviewing the seconds reflecting their existence and sources. Not deliberateness, only incompetence?

How a year ago I naked the PM to rake a date for my examining the JFK photos it had assembled in its reading room. When it never responded I made a new and duplicating FULA request for copies of all of those pictures. When it did not respond I appealed. This common over into several cases new in court. You have not acted on my appeal and we have not had then to discuss this when we have discussed nathers. I have written

Ų

about this several times without response. May I please hear from you on this? In this connection, may I also resind you that you sere in the courtrees during the hearing of a year ago tomorrow and are or should be aware of the Department's promises about compliance than as well as to the Senate consistes.

The natter of deliberateness in withhelding appears to have been ande quite relevant in C.A.75-1936. In this I have addressed the "ex Gricans records I have just reviewed in a rather liadies names, despite the detail, which is such less than I can provide. There is similar detail available on easy King/Say withheldings and not by coincidence they also involve how Orleans, the New Orleans Field Office and the records it provided, and did not provide.

For new, and again addressing deliberateness or any claim that there is no deliberateness. I give you a few of the promible illustrations relating to Now delegas records not provided and appeals not acted upon after about two years. In the light of the foregoing JPK assessination information it appears to be appropriate to select information that suggests conspiratorial contacts.

Before baving not Joses Farl May or having may contact with him I wrote, in my book on the Sing assassination, that he had phone contact with one "agus Maquivel, a louisians State Trooper who was assigned to the Maten Range headquarters barracks and lived in suburban New Orleans. I learned later that this was such more strongly emballished than I wrote end that the FMI knew of this from the mass original source.

Whether or not relevant May said his contact used the name Macul.

The VMI also located a man in N.O. whose last name was Macul and who in other ways fit what "my had said and the FMI learned he had said initially from Ray's "designator," William "radford Sais. (By the way, as compliance with that Item. Not deliberate after all those years?)

FM/directed that there be a real investigation. I do not preume that PHIMQ was not obeyed by NO FO. But from noither files have I received the results of any such investigation, only the fact that Caquivel was the ambject of civil rights complaints. There are other response for the FHI's having an Escaivel interest and I have conveyed these to the FHI forthrightly, if not also to you.

The Fall also knew that May had phone and in-person contact with one J(smen)C. Hardin, who gave both May Orleans and Atlanta phone numbers. I have received no record at all free or relating to New Orleans and no sore than confirmation that such a named person in Atlanta is also an FM informer. Here also my appeal has not been acted on.

Of the same nature, involving MFO as well as NO FO is sy appeal that has no response, releating to a same who used the name Sarrie and confessed prior knowledge of the orise that links back to bouldiers. Samply records disclose the possibility of the correct name and when I reject this with the FMI it fell totally silent and remains that may.

I'll be writing you further.