

to this case from Harold Steinhilber, his assassination and his records appeals 6/22/70

Malicious stonewalling

The Department's collaboration in the FBI's 1971 plan to "strip" me and my writings
Referrals

Department filings in 7-11-71 and elsewhere in classified materials

In my 4/15/68 appeal I raised questions about how copies of two of my letters to Naval Intelligence Service were provided in belated partial compliance by the Department 1971 and by no other component. Attached to that appeal was one I had just written to the Original Division about its long-delayed partial compliance.

In the recent past I received a number of communications from various agencies, allegedly in response to requests never identified and in at least one case from an agency of which I had never made any request. My inquiries elicited no meaningful responses, except with one agency, to which I had sent a copy of a completely incomprehensible communication from the National Security Council. From that one agency, too, I finally received a partial explanation yesterday. A copy of it and my response are attached to this, and is the agency of which I had made no request.

From all, and from it alone, I learned that all of these communications not explained by any of the other agencies, not even when I insisted, are attributable to the Department's belated action on a referral from NS in response to my 1/27/71 request. This is to say that the Department stonewalled for three thousand years - and still has not complied with either the NS or FBI requests.

This also is to say that the Department exacerbates release of referrals as a means of non-compliance. It is not a matter of knowledge which request NS or FBI requests.

It appears to be likely, possibly that the NS referral was to NS and FBI alone. It therefore appears to be likely that other agencies are to date also non-compliance still.

This is a matter of 1971 letters I received a copy of a long-delayed (1971) record. It is not a record generated by NS. It is a Secret Service record, and NS intended me that my appeal should be referred to the Secret Service. This record should have been provided by or at least requested for by Secret Service in response to my 1971 request of it.

Deputy Service did neither.

This gives the lie to the Department's representation - to cover stonewalling and non-compliance - that it can not provide declassified records it did not originate. In fact the Department has provided us with declassified information of other agencies. The Department, while not contesting my affidavit's statement to this, has never represented to the Senate or the courts and has revealed by its misrepresentations,

1977

this action/claim of activity by other agencies, in response to the 1977 request, indicates the probability of related Department action. In turn, that suggests that the Department has some papers in mind, like creating another situation it can stonewall.

At the time it was stonewalling the CIA material and other of my requests of it, for records on the CIA's participation in the Kennedy and King assassinations, the Department, through the Civil Division, the FBI and JCS, was providing testimony to the Senate. The unknown to me (so this was) he tried to keep the CIA the FBI and JCS out of the CIA's records on these CIA's activities.

The question of your new coming on my affairs did not come up.

For the CIA, the compliance of its witness was forthcoming. He was polite in telling the courts, in of which case to go. And it will have not complied with these requests.

The Civil Division pretends to the party of the records of Caesar's wife, which its witnesses did not want. It assured the courts that it would do something. It did not do it has - it continues to provide over the same and additional stonewalling, inventing new "CIA" devices to keep out, like maintaining a "court" into having no part in its commitment in my suit against the Department, for which it was to pay me. It ignored my consultancy report and its requests and continues to refuse to pay me. The cost of ignoring my report is great, in litigation time alone. At the same time, as were revealed by my 1977 special requests, it persists in non-compliance in response to my 1978 request and still withholds records pertinent to the CIA case. However, by getting - indirectly, not from it - some of its records - this year, in response to my 1976 request -

In my first book, based on my prior experience in intelligence, I state that Oswald's career in the CIA, just before the assassination, is consistent with establishing a cover. When I reported this on a San Francisco talk-show broadcast in January 1967 - minutes by my call based on the effects of a special FBI informant at the time of Oswald - a caller-in reported having been a Marine Corp associate of Oswald and believing that Oswald had been cryptic in his cover clearance.

In the Green Commission process without Oswald's confidential clearance after his reported return to the CIA, this and other items are reflected in the records pertinent to the CIA's investigation of the case. The CIA did receive the Dallas Corp's records, immediately after the assassination. It did not report any Oswald security clearance, at least not in any recent period.

The official records investigation shows that he was on record as a top secret installation - not that Oswald worked in it. This clearly does mean that Oswald did have top secret clearance, without which he could not have worked there.

One of the reasons not to report this is that because, at his interview the officer in charge of which I was not present and knew fully that the FBI included in a rather late report which was not without this, I did examine the testimony that officers gave for the various agencies, which should be known to. He stated that in order to do the work in which he was involved, Oswald had to have at least secret clearance. He was certified by at least one of the officers, I reported the foregoing in a 1967 book.

It is interesting to see that once the FBI decided that it had to "refuse" to all my writing all references to my book chapters for FBI records destroyed under my OIA, they did not require. The FBI did require to "review" all critical books but in this regard not to provide any reference by the last time of my current books. All these is that I had and completely independent the same result as in the other general all such matters. Another statement of mine (1971) concerning 1961, they had no reference to these files there as to Oswald's security clearance, essential items.

Not knowing that the Party referred to the Department, including the CIA, in response

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..