

PA - Sec 4/7/80 appeal, under Classification

4113. Pertains to a Washington Post story on Edward J. Epstein's innuendo, by Hitchcock, and personal information about him and me, although not marked at the point of withholding, one paragraph pertaining to my wife and/or me appears to be classified confidential, with nothing in it allegedly reasonably segregable. In context whatever the information or misinformation it is 20 years old and I question the classification. Particularly because of the prejudicial formulations in what precedes this I ask that you take a close look at what is withheld to determine whether or not it is properly classified. (It also is within my PA request and my wife's.) Page 3 states that the files are being reviewed because of what the books states and that this is "on tickler list." No tickler has been provided, despite the fact that there would be continuing need for what is to be included in it. These questions exist today. If any one was inclusive it has not been provided. (This Social not attached.)

XXXX. Classification is by XXX, who appears to be a chip off the 2040 block from the records I have examined. He has withheld in the first paragraph what from the second paragraph is not subject to either classification or withholding, the reference to SAC Williams. The subject matter, the Hasty flap - he destroyed a note by Lee Harvey Oswald after the assassination - is the subject of old appeals on which you have not acted. The FBI is covering up in this case because before it was drafted the FBI had confirmed that Oswald had written Hasty and that Hasty had in fact destroyed that note. This raises questions about any withholdings. ^{on page 1} The marked paragraph reminds me that one or more of the things Hasty was asked to prepare was filed outside this file and where I informed you it was filed but it has not been provided. The hearings referred to were held and were public, so there are additional questions about withholding and classification. This also applies to the Inspection Division edmunds, for its investigation, supposedly, has been disclosed. I believe these withholdings are actually to deter embarrassment to the Bureau. (I also call your attention to page 5, for an explanation of the uses of the duplicate copies of field office records. As you can see, this means they need not be exact duplicates and one can hold information the other does not hold.) That there is other reasonably segregable information is disclosed ^(p. 6) by the reference to Commission counsel Stern.