

*Ruffin*

JFK assassination records appeal; RI appeal - Robert Kefauver, the FBI and critics of the official solution to the crime

In this I add to my prior appeal relating to Kefauver, Hal Vard and his friends and the RIF and no. 105-2582, a Not Recorded FD-4 Routing slip of 6/21/76 with an attached classification change from from Boston City Legal File 105-7702 and Serial 245 are attached.

The 1976 notice of declassification appears to be of a record that bore no stamp of classification, a strange procedure.

The FD-4 form has a box for instructions to prepare a motion. I again raise questions about my not having received any copy of my JFK records folder.

Since writing you about Kefauver, an apparent FBI source if not an informer - please note Legal's routing to RI (10154-207), a file for "security information" - I have thought a bit more about this man who struck me as a strange one. While Vard had a discussion group interested in the assassination, including some former types, a request of Legal's earlier "Citizens Committee of Inquiry," for an apparent reason, if my recollection is correct, Kefauver started another one, I think called "The 22 of November Brotherhood." When he appeared to be without any reason this struck me as additionally strange, so did his appearance and what he said.

Although Kefauver's name is withheld from the article it is not withheld from the caption.

I do not know whether the other attachments are relevant or not. I know of one possibly related "item."

Some records leave it without any doubt that suspicion of how the FBI refers to Kefauver, as a source or informant, he was providing information relating to those who did not agree with the official solution to the JFK assassination and he was present at a meeting I attended. No record indicating this has been provided by any FBI source. It is relevant in the JFK case and its relevance to my RI requests, of all FOIs, can't be questioned. I therefore again ask for a proper search of all relevant files, including

the San Francisco office and especially political files. These political files should include those on informants, like the noted 134 file, those on Cuban activities, the etc. (I remind you again of my appeal relating to Tom Sanders to which there has been no response) and any on critics, of which there clearly are a number. (The FBI characterized me as dangerous to national security.)

I am also reminded of the interception of a group intending to go to Cuba in about 1967 and spying on this that led to their interception. I was introduced to one of these people in the San Francisco area and asked him to try to obtain information relating to the JFK assassination. It appears obvious that the interception of this group was made possible by an informant, known or styled, and that Father was in a position to do this.

As I remember it I had a major interest in getting a copy of a speech Castro had made about the assassination. I had obtained a partial transcript note from a radio broadcast. Some time later this person appears to have gotten to Cuba and made a request for a copy of the speech for me. I received a printed copy from the Cuban government under conditions that lead me to believe that the FBI, particularly in New York, was not unaware of this. In response to my SA request the NY office did not claim to have to withhold any relevant record(s). It did not acknowledge having any.

(Oddly, if my recollection is correct, when I gave this Spanish text to someone to translate into English I never received it back.)

In an earlier appeal also relevant in both cases I provided you with information showing that an FBI operative/informant had attempted to interfere with my work and had undertaken to hurt my work and reputation. Much time has passed and you have not acted on this appeal.

My initial SA appeal is now three years or more old. I would like to know when I may expect action on it.

For any NSA exemption to be appropriate there must be some law enforcement purpose. If the FBI persists in the fiction that its JFK work was of this nature I would like to know what law was being enforced with regard to critics of the official solution to the case, including me, of course. Otherwise the exemption can't be claimed.