31

12 Serial 3004-A in Volume 22 is of 12-10-71. It is described as Memo, Hearn to SAC, NO. Of the 13 pages 10 are provided. Claims are made, in blanket, to b7c,b7d, with no copies of the three pages which are entirely withheld, not provided with obliterations. There are other obliterations in the 10 pages that are provided. This date is 8 years after the assassination, more than 4 years after the Shaw change.

This record was added to the file because it relates to Serial 3004, of 5-8-67. That is a rather long teletype, of 20 pages, indicated as "Previously Processed." Because it was to FBIHQ I had a search made of the FBIHQ records provided for that time period. No 20-page teletype shows in the 105-82555 or 62-109060 files. From this it would appear that again "previously Processed" is FBI Orwellian usage for memory hole.

In an excess of caution I also had the Ruby and Commission (62-109090) files checked, along with the worksheets. Again no 20-page teletype. For the same date the Commission file (62-109090) holds a Not Recorded Serial reporting a news story that Garrison would seek a Senate CIA probe, hardly properly filed under the Commission. It is of seven not 20 pages.

The article is said to report Garrison's subpoenaeing of SA Regis Kennedy, not a Commission matter and not included in the proper files I've read, as best I can now recall. (The matter is.)

There is no reference in this teletype to the subject of 3004A, "Lt. RAYMOND COMSTOCK Information Concerning." However, the only NO SA connected in any way with Comstock in the 10 pages provided is SA Regis Kennedy.

The first page of the 12/10/71 LHM on Comstock notes only that he "SERVED AS INVESTIGATOR IN THE OFFICE OF District Attorney JIM GARRISON beginning May,1962" and that a "summary of the pertinent details found in the New Orleans Office files re. subject, Lt. RAYMOND CONSTOCK, New Orleans Police Department" follows. (Caps in original.)

The first page that follows is numbered 3. The first three paragraphs are obliterated under b7c and d claim. The 44 file number is not obliterated prior to the second paragraph. This leads to the belief that at least part must be reasonably segregable.

The next two file numbers not obliterated are 80-267. and 80-267-1376. The first is not attached, the second is. It is a news story reporting that among eight policemen transferred to the DA's office Raymond Comstock of the narcotics squad is one.

What is a news clipping doing in an 80 file when it signifies "Laboratory research [redacted]

matters"? Or a xerox be added to 67-4715 when that signifies "Personnel Matters," the * indicates "Applicant-related Classification?"

If Comstock applied for a job with the FBI there would be no privacy involved for all who knew him, including many police associates, would know it.

And then there is the D claim, which can indicate source or informant.

Which reminds me that on the first page, the printed form, there is added by hand "1cc-697," which does not signify any known FBI file.

Aside from several 89-69 citations there are next two 46 references. For 315 the claim is made to both exemptions, for 314 to C only. All else is obliterated.

After another 80 citation, the clipping attached as page 9, 7 and 8 being withheld, there are two more 76 references, 3600 (00:Dallas file #76-4261) and 76-3600-12, which is provided, an SAC letter to the COP praising Comstock's cooperation with Regis Kennedy. There is no other file indicated on the letter, [redacted] (76= escaped federal prisoner, etc.)

The page 9 clipping reports that Comstock was among "the next 24 in line for lieutenant.." There is a double vertical marginal line opposite his name and those close to it.

Next there is a indices searches slip from which there are three obliterations with the b7c claim made only for the third, the name of the fugitive Comstock helped the FBI capture. Page 2 of missing 3004 refers to Comstock in connection with the assassination. The prior entry is entirely eliminated.

The 10th page is 20 numbers higher in serialization. It is 3024A. By this slip, which is not included on the search slip, 3024 was classified for the first time on 8/22/77. (By 2040, who I've observed is willing to classify almost anything.) The 7/1/77 date is also used in this. The record is reflected as also 62-109060-5224. In its place in that file is a slip showing referral to the CIA, which has not acted. Nine pages are indicated. But for the NO copy, Serial 3024, the worksheets reflect that 7 rather than 9 pages are "previously processed." Not unusually, into another memory hole with "previously processed" now extended by two pages.

While reading the NO files I became aware that the FBI had an inside source in the Garrison office. I also became aware that the records provided, which may not be all and of course, there could have been more than one source, show that the source was not fully aware of the assassination operation of the DA's office. This could fit one whose major responsibilities were a specialty, like narcotics. Which was Comstock's.

And it may indeed have been FBI practise to write fine letters to the COP even if this is the only one I've seen in these many thousands of pages. Perhaps Comstock's aid to the FBI was that unusually significant and helpful.

If Comstock by any remote chance were an FBI informer inside of Garrison's office I would expect the FBI to consider withholding of the fact proper although in such an exceptional situation I think the rights and wrongs can be argued. I am not saying that the foregoing makes a case that Comstock was the or an FBI informer. However, I am saying that the excessive and I believe unjustifiable withholdings require suspicion, even though such abuse of FOIA is FBI SOP.

The use of the 80 file allegedly research (as by Orwell?) in the Lab for a newspaper clipping is pretty far out, as is the hidden existence of a Garrison file I've already reported as an "80" file. And asked for.

So also would be such use of a personnel file for non-personnel if not an actual applicant, not a Nixon/FBI/Danny Schorr type non-applicant.

This entire thing, even with fudging on the numbers of pages and ex poste facto classifications, requires the appeal I do make.

It now also appears to be necessary to look in 80 and 67 files for what can't be found elsewhere if the records have anything to do with the assassinations or those who raised questions about them, like me. After all, did I not find records on me filed as government-employment candidate when I wasn't and wouldn't be? Which is to say that the FBI did not begin Orwellian practise in justifying and filing with Schorr.