

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, PA records  
JFK assassination records

1/11/79

In today's mail I have an anniversary present from Mr. McCreight that I share with you in the form of this appeal, with explanation. The appeal is from what is denied.

In response to my PA request the San Francisco FBI field office wrote on January 9, 1978 that it had located records it suspected might relate to me. On February 13 it informed Mr. Lesar that it had completed a "review of the records" and "an investigation reported to" FBIHQ. (I have received no copy of any report of the investigation.) There is nothing in this letter that represents the forwarding to FBIHQ of all the relevant records.

One year to the day later, under date of January 9 of this year, I have from Mr. McCreight the enclosed letter and attachments. Once again there was less specificity than I would prefer, no assurance of completeness of the search and what I hope it will not offend the FBI for me to state, no indication of either good faith or due diligence in this great effort represented by seven pages as the result of the year of FBI effort on both coasts.

While I do not hide my disappointment over the fact that this mountain of effort yielded so small a mouse of compliance I hasten to assure you that I am more than pleased at the recollections they trigger, of matters that did not come to mind several days ago when I was preparing a biographical statement for you that I did not have time to complete.

With this jogging of my memory that I also share with you I appeal from the continued withholdings of the San Francisco and Los Angeles field offices and their residencies in which I also made such public appearance. I presume that FBI disappointment over the repeated refrain, "He made no critical comments relating to the FBI" will not discourage a more careful search. One that would, for example, turn up all the records indexed and all the index cards not supplied with their relevant records.

Before getting to the records themselves, which I shall address in the sequence in which they followed the letter on receipt, I would like to know what law was being enforced to justify the claim to FOIA exemptions. If the FBI cannot come up with some law then the exemptions do not apply. My interest in this will become more obvious. But before getting to that I remind you of a discussion in which the question of what might be called "operation" of a non-medical nature was raised. This relates in particular to the withholdings from the FD-306, beginning with that most urgent of national security secrets, the date of the report. (No claim to exemption having been noted opposite this and other excisions I do Mr. McCreight the courtesy of believing he did not intend (C) or (D), claimed in his letter, to apply to this.)

U

However, I cannot extend a similar courtesy with regard to his claim of (D) for total excision following "method of delivery (check appropriate blocks)" After all he did not make claim to E for the mail or a personal meeting with the informer.

This sheet is designated to 10 files identification of which is not withheld or it withheld in part plus one withheld in its entirety. Is it being overly suspicious to wonder if that one is excised because it is not provided?

Has there been any search of any of these files for copies that include any reference to me? The file number of the one page provided is withheld under claim to D, which I appeal also.

Three names are withheld following the 100 number of three files. These names given in the attached informants report are of Sylvia Weinstein, Edward Keating and Hal Berg. (It should be Verb.) Mrs. Weinstein was introduced to me as a member of SWP and she participated in the meeting as such. Keating was as I recall founder and editor of Ramparts. FBI interest in both is not secret nor is the keeping of files. For that matter, are not the SWP files to have been provided in a well-known case in which it is suing the FBI for money damages? SWP counsel informed me that he did not see any San Francisco records referring to me.

The file from which this record is provided in SF 100-58175 where it is Serial 2. Serial 1 is last in the sequence as provided. The highest number is Serial 4. It would appear that this "internal security" file is on me and I ask by what authority it was started, so styled and discontinued, if it was discontinued, when this was but the first of my appearances in that part of California and what I said later was of no less if not of more interest to the FBI. Or, I do not believe this is all. In this connection I repeat that neither the filed office nor the headquarters letters states that I have been provided with. (Nor did headquarters provide a copy of the records sent to Crime Records. May I again ask for a search of headquarters records, including those of "crime records"?)

Serial 3 reminds me of much I forget in the memo for you. It makes clear that an FBI numbered informant was engaged in "operations" against me at that time. Before telling you the story I appeal the withholdings that are inappropriate in an historical case. Whether or not by now the multi-million dollar suit of SWP makes that historical, my involvement is part of the JFK case and that has been so held.

While the FBI's interpretation that I was plugging my second book is not unjustified the fact is that this was not possible because only one bookstore west of the District of Columbia had any copies. I was in California at the request of some Los Angeles people and of their San Francisco associates in the so-called "Citizens' Committee of Inquiry." I knew this had been organized by Mark Lane but was not aware

two and part of a third card that are attached contain no reference to any FBI files by number, refer to my being in a photo book (not provided) and quite remarkably, even with my prior experience with "coincidence" and the FBI, has a 1940 entry of - yup - those same news stories attributed to library research/

If there are more cards, this is not clear. It also appears that some remain withheld. The card provided refer to underlying records not provided. Nor is there any record indicating why the SFO had any reason to have any interest in me in 1940 and 1941 aside from the common interests of the FBI and Dies committee. But even then there should be some records.

And I do appeal the withholdings from the cards. The card for 12/16/66 appears to confirm by the withholding that the FBI's fink try to embarrass me from that withholding and the 7D claim made for it.

If my recollection is to be trusted after 12 years the FBI's boy did not come out to well and he surely did build the audience. I believe the report giving it at 300 is an understatement. While I don't know the capacity of that hall in Golden Gate Park, I recall what I believe was a larger crowd and I am certain there were standees. (As well as portable tape records in that period before they were common.)

The card also refers to a withheld report or reports, its source(s). I request it.

The first card as xeroxed appears to refer to the newspaper called the National Guardian because I remember that review only by selfrage, unless it was syndicated, not likely with so minor a publication.

There is no reference to the source of "Reputed to be a frequent contributor to leftist newspapers and magazines." I was not at that time a "contributor" to any newspaper. I was doing magazine free-lancing and as an intriguing entry on the listing above this reminds me, I was for a short while "Washington correspondent for 'Friday.'" I'd forgotten that. That magazine was a liberal one owned by the heir to the Sperry-Rand or perhaps then only Sperry gyroscope fortune, that kind of "red." The association lasted only briefly because of my dissatisfaction, I do not now recall over what.

One gets the impression that SFO was a sort of west-coast FBIHQ. Or that if this FO went in for such law enforcement, can any field office have failed to?

"5th Col. vs D.C." appears to be a book no page of which (P. 7) is provided.

~~XX~~ I have a mild interest in who was "extremely upset (obliteration)(approximately 10:20 p.m.)" as well as a less mild interest in receiving the withheld copy of the report on which this card is based.

Now this FD-306 has no reference to any files other than the "internal security" one on me. With the subject clearly the JFK assassination I appeal all the withholdings in the historical case sense, which means less restrictive interpretation of the with-

holding exemptions (there is withholding without claim to exemption, of course). In addition, because this was not a proper activity and because there can be little doubt that the FBI was out to harm me, if not wreck my publishing possibilities and my credibilities, I want to know who was doing it and for whom, both identifications having been removed.

There has to be a source for the notation about my being a retired poultry farmer. It also is not provided.

If there was a tape of that program I would like a dub. I'd like to listen to it again and deposit this early if not exactly successful Cointelproing in the archive. I'd like to listen to this part again, too. It was an early part of my enforced education in matters that were strange to me. Early but not the first. Or last.

That FBI effort made a couple of friends for me, Harv Morgan and Jim Eason (right) who was his friend and was in the audience. Whenever I was in that area thereafter I always spent at least a night with the Morgans (wife Judy and adopted son, then infant named Mike). I regarded them as very good friends. When Eason got back to doing talk shows they were quite provocative and I always did them. Given his opposition to the Vietnam war I am inclined to believe that his shows and I on them were covered. Please ask the FBI. Intermittently since then I've done the Eason show by phone, when he calls.

I did many shows I expect to have interested the FBI out there and held press conferences that at least with the book whose subtitle says FBI and Coverup have no doubt it interested them.

I sent you two pages from a book co-authored by one John Christian. He phoned me from Morgan's office/studio phone.

There was other newspaper, radio and TV coverage of my press conferences and stories in college papers other than the single one of the next year that is attached. I left that meeting early to fly to Los Angeles, to a convention I'm sure interested the FBI. It was of the radio and TV reporters and Jim Garrison was the main speaker.

Also in Los Angeles, I was asked to go out there in 1966 by Mrs. Maggie Field, whose husband Joe was a partner in Hutton & Co. (they lived in Beverley Hills) and an actor named Bill O'Connell, who also did a Pacifica program. At that time I met the late Lillian Castellano, Ray Marcus, David Lifton and several students, Steve Burton and Steve Jaffe, the latter two later connected with Garrison. I know there are files on some of these at the least because I've seen references to them in other files. So there are more files for the FBI to check, assuming it has no indices, which I do not.

The last record, which is the first by number, refers to my appearance on the Dunbar Show at KGO-TV. I did that show each time I was there, and other shows on that station, so there from this should be other such reports as well as the SFO's records, not provided with this memo to FBIHQ.

U  
Serial 1 has 62-0-23706 noted and stricken through. This is one of the file numbers not stricken through on Serial 2. Serial 2 includes a 100-0 file on me. It also holds a reference to a "dead" file. This may provide an opportunity for learning what these mean because I ask for those records that are withheld.

I regret that I have no more time for the recollections these records bring back. There are other persons whose names can lead to other records. However, I believe that the FBI does not need them. What it needs is a desire to comply rather than one not to comply, its regular desire magnified in this case by its unintended disclosure of its illicit activities, its intrusion into my life and interference with my First Amendment rights.

I also regret that I do not have time to read and correct this because, as you know, we are both due in court tomorrow, when I will give this to you. I will ask my wife to read a copy she has xeroxed and to provide a copy of it if any of my errors makes for unclarity or confusion.

*Heedle*