

# *Pf in surveillance*

To Quin Shan from Harold Weisberg, King and Kennedy assassination 2/25/80  
Records Appeals:

Improper withholdings - misuse of exceptions to hide inappropriacies  
Surveillance items of King requests; "technical" surveillance of Marina Oswald  
"Director's Special"  
Ticklers

For a long time, without any response, I've been telling you that the FBI engaged in unauthorized electronic surveillances, hence index consultation does not constitute a full and proper search; that to cover this it makes improper claim to exceptions; that there are important records that have not been searched for (in both cases), like the "Director's Specials" ( for which purpose I provide the attached radiogram, Serial 5808 of Section 219 of the illegible file number I believe is 105-22595); and that there were many ticklers that have not been searched for.

With regard to Marina Oswald, the many records of which I provided you copies, clearly have content that could not be the result of the sole remaining caption, "physical surveillance." If you had responded in any way or performed the appeals function in any way I'd have been saved much time and great copying and other costs, and there would be fewer outstanding questions in that case.

In Serial 5092, those nice FOIA people your people think have no motive for any improper withholdings, slipped up for the first time in many thousands of pages of records in the three very large files in which this could have been filed, and for once they didn't withhold "technical", applied to surveillance of Marina. (Perhaps it was because the record has to do with rewarding those who engaged in this illegal activity. (The file holds no request for authorization, no granting of any, and the Warren Commission was not so empowered. The former solicitor general, who as chief counsel ran the Commission, had a paranoid view that Marina would flee to Mexico so he asked the FBI to keep an eye on her, but he had no authority for electronic surveillance.)

In 1978, in the King case, I informed you that your response having to do with the electronic surveillance index was not a full and proper response. You also have not responded to my appeal after I found in what remains of the long tickler what has to

have come from some form of telephone surveillance. In turn, this proves that the Baltimore office was not honest in its searches and less honest in its compliance in response to my PA request.

When the FBI is determined to hide what can embarrass it there is no end to its trickery and if the appeals function is abdicated it becomes part of the trickery.

My King requests go back more than a decade, the JBL requests even farther, and my PA request was first made in 1975. In all cases I appealed promptly enough, giving the FBI a decent interval after the time in which I could appeal under the Act. In no case did I get any response to any appeal until after I filed suit. I have not filed suit under the PA request and I have no response at all - and we are in 1980.

When you provided what was styled as a response to the surveillance items of the King requests I informed you that whether or not intended your response was inaccurate, un dependable, mischaracterized the requests and even then limited the response to the so-called electronic index. If you read the inventories and requests for inventories that you found after my complaint of their deliberate suppression (which continued to this very moment in both cases) then you know very well that FBIHQ keeps itself in a deniability position and in fact has to ask its field offices (aka memory holes) for such information when it wants or needs it. You have not done that, either.

I have disputed what King told you, second hand at that, pertaining to records of King information provided to the Director. I then referred to the Director's Brief only. I forgot then about these "Director's Specials." I recall now that I asked for a search of the list(s) of them and you have ignored this also. I provided you with a number of records indicating those subjects were such "specials."