

*DeLoach, John B*

JFK assassinations records appeals  
Privacy claims  
Records not provided

Harold Weinstarg 12/3/79

Copies of the records to which I refer are not attached. They also are not unique records.

It is the FBI's stated and reiterated claim that it withholds because it must withhold to avoid defamation, to protect individual rights to privacy.

62009060-4672 reports that John A. Danzhauser had been subpoenaed by Jim Garrison, that he was an assistant manager of the New Orleans International Trade Mart (Ulay Shaw was manager), and that on 12/9/63 the FBI had shown him six photographs of Oswald distributing literature outside the ITH. It is stated with regard to these photographs "that he could not identify any of the individuals in these photographs."

The conclusion of the text is that according to a 1954 New Orleans file the man "is a sex deviate." Reference to HQ 65-62474-252-3 is added in hand.

In 4673, from which a paragraph is withheld, the purpose of showing Danzhauser these photographs was to see if he could make identification. "Are the photographs are described as "of Lee Harvey Oswald and two companions." Now these are 1967 records, not those of 1963. I believe it leaves without doubt, as my prior appeals state, the fact that the FBI knew Oswald had associates it has not identified.

In 5716 there is a Domestic Intelligence Division Informative Note which begins, "Layton Patrick Hartman was a homosexual associate of David/<sup>William</sup> Harris. ..." I do not recall seeing any records in which this is stated. The basis for this DID note appears to be withheld from what I have been provided from HQ and SO records.

If the FBI can disclose records identifying Danzhauser as a "sex deviate" and Hartman as a homosexual, can it really make any claims to privacy withholdings? In the Danzhauser case the analyst bracketed the information for withholding, as it is not disclosed by accident.

With regard to the photographs, only two of which were given to the Garrison, my request and appeals have been ignored for many years. Can the reason be that some show this other Oswald associate?