

Mr. John Hartingh  
FOIA/FA Unit, FBI  
J. Edgar Hoover Bldg.  
Washington, D.C.

5/20/77

Dear John,

As Jim asked me to do after I wrote you, I would not go over any more of Goble's work, I have finished Section 72 and have gone over Section 73.

While I cannot say I've noted all the unjustifiabes, this not being the reasons I filed for these records, I think I've noted more than enough. And I don't mean just the continued withholding of the names of elected public officials, things like that. In what I believe will be sufficient cases I will have copies to give the Court.

It is clear that I have been lied to about the use of indexes, beginning when Tom Lenehan was the supervisor and continuing through what I've just gone over. There is virtually none that is withheld that Huie, Frank and I did not write about years ago. Some has been with emphasis and frequency in the news for the past nine months. This is to say that if the indexes were not used I fail to see how anyone not a hermit in the Himalayas would not know about it. The names of subpoenaed witnesses were withheld, the names of those filing petitions in court, the names of those on whom court papers were served, and when the names were in some cases written in the claims to exemption remain in the worksheets.

Let me give you just a couple of examples of what you may not be willing to believe. In 5390 there is the claim to both 7(C) and (D), with the withholding of what has been public for years, the names of Giesebrecht and Appel. D.A. Jim Garrison's name also was withheld. Now there never was any privacy question because there is no attention either Giesebrecht or Garrison did not seek. Other serials have harsh comment about all of this and much more in The National Enquirer. Can either (C) or (D) possibly apply, even with what there was not, a law enforcement purpose? After all that play in the scandal sheet alone?

I can fillin many of the withholdings in 5387. McFerrin and Redditt and Richmond are all very, very public, going back to my book, which appeared more than six years ago. Ditto for the black firemen and more. Then there is the Bill Garter material. You'll see I'm right. (And he has been dead for years.) He was interviewed originally in Greenville, Miss., because he then was also an editor on Hodding Carter's paper. If I did not have his files, even the drafts of his manuscripts, all of this is all very public, as is what he wrote for TIME magazine. And were this not true your own SAC spent a considerable amount of time telling all of this and much more to the Memphis reporters (names also removed) who told me years ago. Even the details of his death, a consequence of what is reported, are all public. So where is there any privacy? Same for the produce company, as I recall L., L., and L., with the one in control Frank Liverto or Liverto. Here public knowledge and publication are certain. I am not sure but I think so also are the driver of the gold Cadillac and the trucker of strawberries. But were it not, and I'm trying to make a distinction between what I'm certain about and what I'm not, what is the need to withhold the name of a man who trucks strawberries from Hammond, La., to Memphis?

In this I am addressing what I've called an unregenerate attitude entirely unsuited to the Act and compliance, as I do in what follows.

The names of Ed Redditt and Officer Richmond are still withheld, as are the names of Inspectors of the Memphis police. Inspectors are not known publicly? While this also goes back to Frame-Up my God this is all in the record in this case! I put it in the record. So is a letter written by Director Kelley. The letter makes the Director a liar or proves that he was lied to over all of this. While the mind-set I've seen not changing can account for this, cannot also deliberate misuse of the exemptions to withhold what is embarrassing?

And except for James Earl Ray's attempt to escape there has been nothing that received as wide attention relating to the King assassination for nine months. The fabrications and

improvisations and exaggerations of this story are really what got the House assassins committee established. So it is all before the Congress and in the press the attention ranges from a long story in the defunct minor Washington paper Newsworks to not fewer than three coast-to-coast broadcasts on ABC-TV alone. The number of personal appearances, radio broadcasts and various kinds of news attentions to this must run past a thousand. When Prentice-Hall because with an investment of not less than \$150,000 before editorial and manufacturing costs on Mark Lane's book (which has been out for a while) what else would you expect? Redditt himself appeared on a New York TV show about this more than a month ago. He was to have appeared at Lane's 5/7/77 press conference at the National Press Building. The press release announced it but a family death prevented it. Redditt's privacy is in question here? And the FBI knows nothing about this when Mark Lane, including in these coast-to-coast broadcasts, has been saying the FBI killed Dr. King?

If it had not been for all this FBI stonewalling I'd have had an accurate book written long ago. I suspect it has more concern about accuracy than overt fabrications, which in private and where it counts it can destroy. ~~xxxxx~~ Quite aside from which there is benefit to it in all the confusion created.

All of this withholdin was withheld on FBI and Wainlan Shea's reviews?

Here also b2 was claimed. Neither you nor anyone else has responded a single time to my many citations of the exact b(2) language. I repeat it because it is among the questions I now have no choice but to ask Jim to present to the Court: "related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency." It can't possibly apply in this serial and I'm reasonable certain it does not apply in a single claimed instance. You people have this long success in rewriting the law, in this case writing "solely," you have to be forced to face it despite my desire to limit what can be a burden all around. You'll never stop if I do not make the effort.

I am asking Jim by a carbon to present this and the claims to b(5) and 7(D) to the Court. Perhaps some of the b(1) cases, too. The National Enquirer is 7(D). My experience of the past is that b(5) was not once claimed. It appears to be one of the new dodges under the amended Act. Maybe that, too.

I would much prefer to avoid all of this, all the distraction and time it means for me and the extra work it means for everyone but there is no choice now. For months I've not had a single response to a single letter, not a single denial of a single specific. And the same abuses continued. Without a single rectification in about 16 months.

If Jim is willing I will ask for an evidentiary hearing at which I will demand that the judge be assured all the claims are valid. I will also ask to testify to those to which I can testify, the above being a minor sample. I will ask that all those involved be called upon to testify.

You may not be aware of the record in this case but one of my allegations is that I have been singled out for special adverse treatment. Your counsel, Mr AUSA Duggan and SA Blake of your Office of Legal Counsel, can fill you in. You also have just about all the transcripts if you want to read them for yourself. This case goes back to 1969. There are others of which you should now have personal knowledge that are older, without response. You do know of others long overdue in which I've already proven to you the FBI's records can't be trusted. (Euphemism.) Can you think of any alternative, at my age and in my situation, that despite my distaste for this is not less desirable for me?

The earlier letters say I would be willing to take your word. I would still if I had any reason to believe you could avoid being even more removed for this. It is apparent you have been removed from supervision. Under these circumstances, with all the good faith in the world you may not be able to keep your word. If this is to be avoided I will want it all spelled out in acceptable writing by one in a position to assure his word will be kept.

It is probably only an accident but I was given no copy of Serial 5531.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg