

Cong. Pat Schroeder
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

6/22/87

Dear Mrs. Schroeder,

Recently I wrote you about how the FBI files in connection with the reports that it has you filed in connection with extremist activities. I indicated the normal practise with regard to informants and told you that each special agent contact with an informant is supposedly reflected on a special informant-contact form. In catching up on some overdue filing I've just located a copy of this particular FBI form, a copy of which is enclosed.

This particular record was originally filed in the Dallas file of that informant. 137 represents in the file classification system "criminal informants." The file on this informant is 1291. This is the 26th record initially serialized in that file. It then was shifted to the Dallas file on the JFK assassination. That the informant was still on probation, unusually lasting about six months, is indicated under the date.

The redactions indicate misrepresentations, even to the federal courts, to which the need to redact under FOIA is certified. The well-known and extensively publicized SAC was then Gordon Shanklin, who met with the public and the press with regularity. The FBI disclosed the names, home addresses and phones of all its Dallas SAs and they are on file in its public reading room yet it redacted this name while not redacting the initials which assured identification if anyone had that interest. It also withheld the second part of the arbitrary symbol identification of this informer (under "Subject") although his identification is not possible from that number, which is always arbitrary and not part of a code.

The only mark I added to this page is, at the bottom, the identification of File Classification 137, for future users of these records. All other notations are normal in FBI filing.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : SAC [REDACTED]

DATE: 2/6/69

FROM : SA [REDACTED]

CI SI R (Prob)
 PCI PSI R

SUBJECT: DI [REDACTED]

Dates of Contact <u>2/5/69</u>	
Titles and File #s on which contacted	
<input type="checkbox"/> NEGATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> POSITIVE <input type="checkbox"/> STATISTIC On the above date PCI info available a copy of [REDACTED] was furnished to [REDACTED]	
The above memorandum was turned over to Supervisor [REDACTED] for placing in the Kennedy Assassination file with the previously furnished [REDACTED]	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Informant certified that he has furnished all information obtained by him since last contact.	Rating Etc.
Coverage Date <u>89-43-7647</u> <u>1391292-26</u>	SEARCHED [initials] INDEXED [initials] SERIALIZED [initials] FEB 1969 FBI-DALLAS

(Handwritten circle with a diagonal slash)

(Handwritten circle with "fact" written inside)

1377 Criminal Informants

Cong. Pat Schroeder (Colo.)
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

6/15/87

Dear Mrs. Schroeder,

If I understood what was reported by National Public Radio last evening, the FBI claims that a record indicating that you are filed under "terrorism" is not an "official" record and no copy of it is in any "central" file. While I know nothing about this particular matter I have much experience in examining FBI filings and filing and from this knowledge I say that what is reported can be (but may not be) typical FBI doubletalk and reporting of knowingly inadequate searches.

All FBI records are "official." They draw several artificial distinctions. One is between "recorded" and "not recorded" copies, the former only ordinarily being indexed. What is "not recorded" is, generally, duplicate filing. Another is filing in ticklers. The FBI never searches its ticklers on the known falsehood that they contain nothing but duplicates from the main file in question.

It would be exceptional if in this case the FBI's search was of more than the central records index at FBIHQ. It pretends, knowing, again, that the pretense is false, that FBIHQ has all the relevant field office information.

As I understand your case, the Dallas field office would have copies and ordinarily would have sent copies of a paraphrase to the Denver field office. Dallas may have sent nothing to FBIHQ because of the sensitivity, it may have phoned instead or it may have employed a "LHM" or letterhead memorandum in which the field office reported only what it intended to report on the possibility that there might be further distribution of the LHM. In this event, it would have identified the sources in the text with arbitrary numbers, like T-1, and appended a separate sheet that is not disseminated in which the correct identification of "T-2" is given - FBIHQ only.

FBIHQ and the field offices have certain files from which they never disclose on the claim of no relevance. One at FBIHQ which holds much political information is 94 of "Research Matters." This classification actually holds such diverse things as the director's correspondence and records of the FBI's lobbying and leaking and what it does not want to disclose about the media. When a 94 record surfaces on search of the index the FBI pretends that its research is not responsive to the request.

I enclose a copy of the FBI's file classifications of several years ago. It has undoubtedly been expanded but when this is done the old numbers are still used as they were. This list does not hold any terrorism listing but it has, in the past, used 157 for such information. It may today give a special number of what it describes as terrorism informants but in the past it used the numbers I have marked.

No informant is used without FBIHQ assent and all contacts are supposedly recorded on a special informant contact form. It may or may not have attachments and the attachments are sometimes removed and placed in the main file rather than the informant file. At FBIHQ there is, or at least was, a top echelon informant committee. It made the decisions relating to informers so evaluated by the FBI and in the past this has included those who reported what was or could be regarded as sensitive as distinguished from really significant.

Documents provided by informants are often kept in Form FD340 envelopes at the field offices and often they are physically separated from the main file as "bulkys" or "ERFs" (enclosures behind files.) If the field offices want laboratory examination of documents or other matter they send the FD340 to HQ with the request and indicate whether or not its return is desired. FBIHQ has disregarded this in the past and returned what it did not want in FBIHQ files. This avoided disclosure on search.

The field offices use File Classification 80 ("Laboratory Research Matters") as FBIHQ uses 94. It is common practise for the field offices to include laboratory research matters within the appropriate main files. The field offices have also had other means of defying an ordinary search and they use "dead" and "new dead" files in strange ways. One means of hiding is SAC (special agent in charge) safes and not filing. Another is out-of-channels forwarding to high FBIHQ officials.

Most of my extensive experience with the FBI comes from my work, which it does not like, and my successful uses of FOIA to obtain what it does not want to disclose. I have done most of the responsible writing about the investigations of the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King. Unlike others I am not a conspiracy theorist. My seven books are a study of how our basic institutions worked in those times of great stress and since. The FBI has not been able to fault my work on fact so, and I believe this is not uncommon, it resorted to extensive misrepresentations that amount to libel. In this it can be unrelenting and uninhibited. While it prefers to avoid direct lies, it has lied in all my many FOIA lawsuits and the record shows it has nothing to fear from the courts. So, it would not be surprising to me if with regard to information relating to you it misrepresents and digresses and, if it deems that necessary, has lied and will lie again.

If this is outside your experience with it, I report that right now in a FOIA case it refused to let me drop because of my advanced age and health impairments, it did cross the line into perjury, I have proved it beyond question, with the FBI's own records, and the FBI has not bothered to make even pro forma denial. It prevailed before the district court, it has avoided denial or any refutation before the appeals court, where I've limited the litigation to these undenied felonies, and that court, having set oral arguments for last year and had to delay them, has not even rescheduled them. I think you can take this as an indication that the perjury, fraud and misrepresentation case I've made is that solid and that it confronts the appeals court with what it would rather not face. If I were not as limited as I am I'd be pressing the appeals court to proceed.

I do think it would be good for the country and for justice and for the functioning of the Congress if a case of FBI perjury is forced and gets public attention. The records in my cases indicates that those who pull these things get promoted.

I do not know whether you want to press for this "terrorist" information relating to you but if you do and if I can help in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg