

attachments w/ copy in P [redacted] file

To: Colin Shea from Harold Weisberg, King assassination records appeals 6/7/80

Abstracts

— Referrals C/K

Withholding what the FBI and Department have already disclosed

Withholding the reasonably segregable

Under date of 6/4/80 Mr. Flanders sent me copies of nine previously withheld

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

CIA [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] in [redacted] FBI.

[redacted]

[redacted]

and [redacted]

FBI's [redacted] of [redacted] the CIA.

[redacted] that the

abstract is [redacted]

the CIA. In an [redacted] in [redacted]

reviewing those [redacted]

supposedly 10-day law. Once the [redacted]

The ( [redacted]

version [redacted]

the record [redacted]

ever was, as [redacted]

all in the so-called [redacted]

[redacted]

the FBI referred it to the CIA in 1977.)

That the FBI identifies it ~~now~~ now is no big deal because based on information I provided his my counsel included a list of those ten withheld records and when the FBI called on the CIA for help it identified the other nine. Identification of the tenth thus was automatic, but it was withheld by the FBI until 6/4/80.

In C.A. 77-1997 there was partial CIA compliance, but in no case with any FBI record. In no case was any FBI record referred to or in any way identified. None of the information added by the FBI has yet been provided. This means that there remains total FBI non-compliance because all of those FBI records remain withheld, even those disclosed by the CIA. Information is always added by the FBI and that information is of significance to me and to others. On this added basis, what may be provided in terms of a CIA copy does not comply with my request of the FBI.

In his belated providing of excised copies of the abstracts <sup>Mr.</sup> Flanders proves that there is and always was reasonably segregable information and that it did not have to be referred to the CIA. Moreover, the CIA was identified by the FBI, as in the referral slips, so the identification of the CIA, the identification of the MURKIN caption, the dates, the file and serial numbers, at the least were always non-exempt information.

Neither the Act nor FBI practice require that copies be provided by any other agency. With a self-serving letter to my counsel, of which he provided a copy to the judge, Department counsel provided an unexcised copy of an FBI record of which an excised copy only was provided under discovery - and then was withheld for months, until there was no time to use it in the depositions. What was excised disclosed the FBI's proper procedure, of consulting with another agency and then response to me by the FBI. An obvious purpose served by this improper withholding is the attempted covering up of the FBI's disproof of its present claim that only the other agency, in this case the ~~the~~ CIA, can comply.





for the CIA to have indicated 201 or personality profile files, in this case not obliterated, the normal practice, for the here obvious reasons, to hide that interest, not to keep proper secrets.

Included in the withholdings is the names of CIA employees. Yet the FBI also has disclosed them because in fact they also are not secret.

These kinds of withholdings and Catch-22 operations by reciprocating agencies and the explanations offered are intended to intimidate the judges, especially those regarded as more timid; to negate the Act; to make use of the Act costly if not prohibitive and close to impossible for requesters; to waste requesters; and are part of the campaign against the Act.

Moreover, in this case, C.A. 75-1996, and pertaining to CIA information referred by the FBI, the CIA authorized the FBI to disclose what the CIA itself withheld in C.A. 77-1997.