

*John F. Kennedy*  
Privacy Act request appeal

Harold Weisberg 8/26/79

The FBI suing me for libel to "stop" news and my writing - records not provided  
JFK assassination records appeals

Attached are 62-109090-4473 and 4474. (The 109090 file indicated when the first record was typed is one of at least two other files in which there are not recorded copies.) While I am certain that I have appealed regarding matters raised in these records it has been so very long ago my recollection of the points I raised is no longer clear, so when I came across these Serials while reviewing records for another purpose I decided to send them to you as a reminder and to be sure I had not forgotten what struck me on rereading.

I am pretty certain that I informed you of giving now retired Shaneyfelt a written waiver of the statute of limitations when I first learned of this scheme to "stop" me. He has not responded in any way.

Quite some time after my earlier appeals I had a letter from a retired PHIA in which he expressed the belief that at about the time of the FBI's JFK assassination investigation what I believe he referred to as "the palace guard" pretty much controlled Hoover and particularly what he knew.

I find myself wondering whether this is such an FBI "palace guard" adventure because at the beginning of 1967, the time of these records, there was considerable criticism of the FBI's investigation. So much of it came from what I first brought to light that the Attorney General convened a panel of forensic experts to examine some of the evidence so severely criticized.

The reason this occurred to me is because Shaneyfelt originated the idea of suing me only when the legal research concluded that I could be sued and the decision was left to Shaneyfelt he chickened out. If he was not going to do it if he found out that he could no (other) purpose appears to be served by coming up with this scheme.

It appears to be quite unlikely that the FBI was willing to proceed with a libel suit in which factual error of this nature is attributed to my second book merely on Shaneyfelt's word that it is not accurate. Therefore there should be some records in support of those (his) allegations, something that satisfied the Legal Research Desk.

If Shaneyfelt, meaning the FBI, had filed such a suit only to withdraw it or if the case had gone to trial and on the basis of fact Shaneyfelt/the FBI did not win the result would have been an FBI disaster of unimaginable magnitude.

It is not reasonable to believe that if the FBI was giving serious consideration to any suit before researching the law questions/of fact were not resolved. No records of this nature have been provided. From this I believe it follows that the whole thing was really a plot against Hoover in which there was no serious intent to file a suit or that other records exist and are withheld. The internal content of these records indicates that my book was studied but no records of that, no notes, even opinions of the FBI's reviewer(s) are provided in either the JFK assassination records, where they do belong, or in response to my request, to which they are relevant.

The proposal was routed to a number of high FBI officials (aka "palace guard") and it reached even higher, from the initials added, ~~it~~ yet there is no record provided in which any of them makes any comment on the close to unprecedented and the potentially disastrous proposal.

Legal Research concluded there was a cause of action and even encouraged it by stating that "The danger seems considerably greater if he is not stopped now." It also raised the spectre of adverse influence on Shaneyfelt's career as a professional witness if "he took no action in this case."

There are not nearly as many initials when Shaneyfelt chickened. (4474)

In checking some Commission file records, 62-109090, I came across this Not Recorded Serial of 3/1/68 for the Director. I have recollection of the Extension of Remarks in the Congressional record by the UnAmerican Willis because Carlos Bringuier, an FBI source from the most extreme of the Cuban-American right, picketed a gathering of the like-minded as an excuse for distributing copies he apparently obtained from Willis. I was in New Orleans at that time.

While the legend at the bottom of this sheet refers to inclusion of it in subject-matter files no filing under the assassination caption or number is indicated. It is

indicated that the original is in a 66 file. I cannot relate that file number, as best it can be read, with no or any of the others about whom Mr. Willis' comments were regarded as important enough to warrant the Director's personal attention. With Lane then a current security case this does appear to be abnormal.

Just what did warrant the attention of the Director's personal staff ~~and what~~ ~~is reflected with quiet eloquence~~ is reflected with quiet eloquence in another record I chanced upon at the same time, 62-109080-607, attached, along with 608. Even DeLoach is among the six to whom copies were sent, along with "cover memo" not attached. (Unless it is the Jones memo of 7-5-67.)

This young college student was indexed.

But those named by Willis were not? The record provided includes no indexing indications.