

OTHER ABSTRACTS

3976. There is no withholding here. I cite it because of the FBI's disclosure of its purposes in some of its other than law enforcement investigations. This bears on the applicability of claims to exceptions in general. The abstract states that the officers of the SCEF (Southern Conference Educational Fund?) residing in New Orleans "WILL NOT BE INTERVIEWED RE MURKIN IN VIEW OF PRESENT OR PAST SECURITY TYPE INVESTIGATIONS CONDUCTED AGAINST THEM." (Emphasis added.)

4046. (b)(2) claim is made to withhold part of the memorandum pertaining to the removal of Inspector Joe Sullivan from the MURKIN investigation. The abstract states that "We are now engaged in a fugitive investigation," which was always true, the FBI never having investigated Ray in any other way, never having investigated the crime itself. What is withheld was disclosed to and by the House assassins committee. In its XIII this serial is the first cited. It states that Sullivan was transferred to Detroit to "work on the racial informant program." This is not appropriate for a (b)(2) claim, is any at all. Aren't you the one who testified, after the judge involved you in this case, that all (b)(2) claims are inappropriate, that where withholding is required another exception suits or the withholding is improper? (p. 163-4, "Inf 60, 3867.)

4673. Here the FBI withholds the name of a Bureau of Prisons official, in overt violation of the Court's Order, merely because it was improperly withheld, in deliberate violation of that Order, in the underlying record. However, the offense is greater, more so in 1960, because I appealed this before and in doing so reminded the FBI that not only were the names public, the FBI itself had disclosed copies of the news stories including them, in this case. So, three years later, the Gaintalpro operators repeat the improper withholding.

4743. The above is not the FBI's only withholding of what was in the papers and it knew was published. In 4743 what it withholds came from the Toronto Star and was also disclosed by GPR. The man of the withheld name, Sydney Whitaker, had phoned the paper to report that in early May 1968 he had met Sneyd(Ray) at a Canada bar and, on being asked for the name of a quiet hotel in a quiet English town had recommended one.

4696

~~4696~~, 4813. I have noted earlier that contrary to Department counsel's representations to the Court, that the abstracts were made only not to be used, they were used and notations were added. Among the notations added to 4696 is 007. A line is drawn to what is illegible. Who (or what) in the FBI is 007? And among the numbers added to 4813 are several that can indicate files and Serials, 7-111 34 and 7213 30 (or the reverse).

4102. Withholds what OIR disclosed and what, because it does not identify a person, does not in any event qualify for the (7)(C) claim: "LETTER ADDRESSED TO ERIC S. GALT REC'D 5/23/68 BY (obliterated) at (obliterated)..." The letter was from Toni G.A." with no address but a P.O. box number. That this is not a real name is indicated in the underlying record, which first obliterated the "Toni" in "LETTER SIGNED BY (obliterated - Toni) with initials (obliterated - C) and (obliterated - A) AFTER NAME."

4790. (7)(C) and (D) are claimed to withhold the name, pretty clearly from the content of the underlying record that ex FBI Sergeant Fettes, and some of the information attributed to her. This is another of the many appraisals you have not acted on. I informed the FBI in 1976 or early 1977 that it had disclosed Fettes' identification. Were none of this true, when it is alleged that Ray got not less than \$100,000 for the job, ought there be any withholding?