

already have - 1R

12/27/70

The Attorney General  
The Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. KENNEDY,

Your letter of December 14 requests two of my opinions for information under the Freedom of Information Act. One is for all the information on who can be called, other than an informer, in other is for the identification of a conspirator. In this case, you do not seem to like to make explanation, for which I thank you. It may be helpful to both of us. This, however, motivates me of my first unanswered letter to you in which I suggested that you are dependent upon my own sources for your information on your predecessor.

With regard to Mr. Salter, you now say "that the file of this Departeent contains no information that Salter was interviewed by the FBI concerning the participation of Frank-  
dom Society in continuing Conspiracies". While my recollection is incorrect, this is not  
consistent with earlier statements. It is certainly inconsistent with what you say  
and that to me your department has not denied. First let me recall the respect to Au-  
diobase and public of the criminal investigation. For while says he was then interviewed  
by your department and I know it will be clear such interview could not have been  
for any law-enforcement purposes. Next let me make this second explanation to you so that  
you can answer clearer the forthrightness and completeness of what you have been told of  
the character of the investigation:

The FBI interviewed everyone but the above result, everyone by me. I was  
engaged by the FBI to find Salter for employment (I have nothing to do with his fugitive.)  
He applied to me for a job (public relations). Salter's address is entered in Gould's  
address book in the same a notation, stamp of then telephone and reported on its file  
was a close associate of one George Johnson with (whose contribution to New Mexico to  
testify before the grand jury on conspiracy related by him then Governor of New Mexico).  
Salter was the New Mexico representative of a group organized, financed and directed  
by the CIA. He documents obtained by Salter, but without specific date and, although  
it was thought to establish this information from the source information. After Salter had  
resigned from this group, he and Salter organized what they called the Group; to free  
George and engaged in a fund-raising campaign. In this they also used the FBI files on them.  
That salter, see also the (radio, telegram from New Mexico Governor) address of a former  
and very prominent FBI agent, not normally assigned for agents to have the space for their  
building if there are not all the relevant facts, are being set around to indicate the  
incompetibility of no information, especially with with Salter was Gould using the same  
address, that of a former FBI agent.

With this information and I will gladly supply more detail you so desire, for there  
is more but, as relevant, I respectfully request that you and those who have supplied you  
with your information to be certain every fact and circumstance and, if this demand too great  
for your request, I respectfully request you limit to relevant. You, in my understanding, propose  
to affidavitive sources to prove the applicability of the exemption (exemptions of authority  
relating from your department's functions to intergovernmental relations). A waiver, and with  
the war being, moreover, a request will be filed soon with regard to the broader request.

of this you say, "Indeed, one would be hard pressed to imagine a clearer case of a request for data covered by that exemption." Because, being as you are, your information must come from others, I make this brief explication in which I will expand, should you so desire:

The incident in question was before the assassination (when no law was violated), and the leaflet containing the fingerprint was supplied to the Department after the assassination as part of an investigation that the Director of the FBI himself, under oath, said was put for law-enforcement purposes. Indeed, no went far out of his way to say there can be no legal authorization for the investigation in this sense.

Cowald engaged in such leafleting activities much more often than the Warren Commission reported. He has stated to have had at least two associations in this, only one was ever identified (and he has said he had at first assumed there was another, but could not name him, other individuals, in several occasions, given representation and another identical inciting file of that particular operation and from it still measured that he just exists in either the files of the Warren Commission or, today, even in the footage from which they were obtained. I can supply you with copies of FBI reports that are explicit on this point. I can also supply you with the log of what is still ongoing toward that file in the National Archives, specifying that it shows the man helping Cowald spread the footings he chose only once. (So you may better understand the situation, I also tell you that the Warren Commission's copy, supplied by your Department, did not have such a copy. This copy is now in the National Archives because of my effort, and it was confidential.) In addition, the same FBI reports quote the only people in the world in a position to know as saying that the printer did not make and deliver those leaflets to Lumbe. These reports do not identify the man to whom delivery was made, and the security agent giving of the name of Lumbe apparently stated it was Cowald. Now, I have also determined from persons the only ones involved, aside from the man to whom delivery was made, and from them, independently, I have obtained an identification of the man to whom delivery was made. I have been interviewing on tape, those I called, six of my reported offices of what my own investigations have disclosed. While the law does not require that a request for public information be accompanied with an explanation of a request at all, I think the information all of you want to receive, and I would, in fact, state the Department's function, can best reveal it, not in their specifications but in the manner suggested or in accompanying interpretations.

You say you cannot "imagine a clearer case" than is presented by the expedition which results, "Investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes, in the course available to, but in a completely illegal" especially in the context of the administrative burden imposed upon the Department by the law, to justify the withholding of over one thousand's representations made to Congress, of over 8,000 pages of "other burdens of power" is reflected upon the agency which is the only party able to justify the administration." I wish you to let me know what law you think enforces and I point out that what I have said is not an administrative report but a simple A.R. report. However, some of those you may have may right in addition this, under the law, but it was not enfored by any one of the law enforcement.

I respectfully request that you re-examine certain requests before a proposed litigation. Although it is not required of me, if a law may further substantiate your claim, I will provide the, if you please, to obtain the information to which I believe I am entitled and to obtain compliance with your law, they are not to determine the Department or to lawfully elucidate the matter. I do request that you will eliminate the need for extracting volume of those records in the process.

Very truly yours,

Harold Goldberg