To Mr. Bresson from Harold Weisberg re: 4/17/79
Newark 105-15291 -156ff

It was the Newark office's conclusion that the "information" had no connection with the assassination of President Kennedy. I agree. But with the passing of time there are other, historical interests. Among these are what might be called disinformation. I am confident that someone in the FBI has watched the House assassins committee closely and has observed the influence of such claims on it.

This record is almost an exact duplicate of public domain information that evolved during and after one of my earlier radio broadcasts in Washington, on WWDC, when a man using the name Harry McBurney called me and later was in touch with me several times by phone. Once he stopped off in Frederick to speak to me in person. Since then I have neither seen nor heard from him.

As I recall it he told me he lived in Cherry Hill, which is near Camden, and told me I could get in touch with him through a lawyer on Broad Street, Philadelphia. This also parallels the cited records. I could check dead files for this information and information he volunteered about the woman, most of which was broadcast. This includes a characterization of her, as I recall it, her profession and how well he knew her. Again, exactly as in these records.

From recollection he said she gave him the name Gigi Shufer and said she danced under the name Cochise. Also from recollection, and I'm not entirely certain of this, he said she told him that Oswald fired her for Ruby. I believe he also referred to a tape. After more than a decade I can't be certain.

He said he was calling from his mother's home in Kensington on the broadcast. He told me he was at the Charlestown race track when he phoned for the meeting. He also told me he has real estate interests.

In more recent years there was a similar story by a woman who used the name Shari Angel. The House committee went for that one after it appeared in the Dallas press.

These disinformations have historical importance now. While the cited Newark records are of no personal interest to me if they relate to the same matter then there is no basis for the claim to exemption and I would like the records I leave for the future to reflect

the persistence of the McBurney-"Shufer" disinformation. By this I mean that except for other names there is no privacy to protect, no only source and no confidential source.

If this information is identical to that of the Newark records but relates to other persons then of course I respect the privacy claim.

On the other hand, if it is one and the same disinformation I would like the historical record to be clear.

The matter is of no literary interest to me.

On the chance you would prefer a formal appeal I am sending a copy to Mr. Shea but I would prefer not to burden the machinery without need.

Harold