

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, King assassination records appeals 4/2/80

Abstracts

About six weeks ago I wrote you about the processing of the abstracts and asked if, having been involved by the Court, you would be monitoring the expectable FBI withholdings that, from a long record, are largely improper. I also filed an appeal after examining the first I received from the FBI. I have heard nothing from you.

I also informed you of the AG's privacy waiver in the King case, a record of which I finally found in FBI records obtained under discovery, not in compliance with my requests.

My forecasts to the Court and to you about the character of the processing of abstracts is amply confirmed by examination of about half of them. The FBI has repeated, to the degree it dared, the improprieties of the processing of the underlying records. As I said it would, it has processed the abstracts in an effort to hide its improprieties, repeating unjustifiable withholdings.

Enclosed with this you will find what I have written about the abstracts through those I received this past Saturday, 2/29/80.

You will find that the FBI continues to withhold the public domain, what it disclosed itself and what the Department has disclosed. Spurious claims to exemption are made as they were in the underlying records. Wrongful processing appealed three years ago and with the appeals ignored is perpetuated. Reasonably segregable information is withheld even though already disclosed in other versions of the same records.

At the same time it has again disclosed what it swore in C.A. 7590249 it is required to withhold, an untruth you also affirmed in that case, the cooperation of foreign police. With your support it represented that disclosing this could lead to such disasters ^{as} the rupture of relations, even worse. Having prevailed in that case by these false representations the Department now discloses farther identifications of cooperating foreign police and intelligence agencies and even that the FBI is operational in foreign countries.

The Attorney General has found the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King ~~is~~ and their official investigations to be cases of great if not unique historical importance. In both cases, after the Court involved you in the King case, I provided you with many detailed and illuminated appeals from improper withholdings, at considerable personal costs, so that the historical records might be more complete and more dependable.

The King case abstracts and the JFK case Dallas index may be the most valuable ~~single~~ records. Yet after I asked you to monitor the processing you have permitted the repetition of the same abuses I have already proven to be abuses. In plainest language, you have permitted the corrupting of the historical record in these significant cases, perhaps forever, because I doubt that there will be another with my subject matter knowledge who will take the time I have taken, now wasted, in an effort to enable the historical record to be complete and honest.

This mocks the Attorney General's determinations, the Act and any appeals function. It makes appeal no more than a rubber stamp.

The FBI has no monopoly on Orwellian practice. It cannot rewrite history without your assent. When you do nothing you assent.

Obviously, when I provide the improperly withheld information it is not required for all my work or for any personal interest.

These abstracts, like the Dallas index, are a single record. They also are an index to the FELHQ MURKIN records. The processing is improper. It violates the Department's and the Act's standards. Moreover, it is knowing and deliberate violation. I therefore ask for the reprocessing of the entire abstract file, based on a more than adequate sample of approximately half of it. Withholdings must be justified. Perhaps the FBI would like to begin with the (b)(5) deliberative process claim pertaining to the judge who presided in a state robbery case in which neither the FBI nor the Department had any jurisdiction. And a state judge and an FBI agent represent the Department's deliberative process? You will find other similar illustrations enclosed.