

Dear Mr. Theoharis,

12/13/83

When I wrote you earlier this morning the Washington Post had not come so I was not aware of the story a copy of which I enclose.

Whether or not you intend to seek any of the pertinent information you did not get, if you are not aware of some of the FBI's other memory holes, a few suggestions.

Aside from what he had in his office, there was a special file classification for DeLoach's operations and it could have been a continuation of Nichols'. The misleading title is "Research Matters" and the number is 94. It holds lobbying, leaking (hidden) press contacts and special files on the media, all of it, as well as persons. And organizations.

In the field offices there are indications that the 80 files are used for similar purposes as well as contacts. While the title is "Laboratory Research Matters" I have no knowledge that the laboratory or research was involved in what is filed in them.

These are not the only records that would not be searched for compliance after they were identified on the search slips. One example is having records on me filed as an applicant for government employment, which I was not - and there was not even a reason to suspect that I would be.

King assassination search slips relating to sycophantic authors had 94 files noted but the FBI refused to search on the ground that if relevant to the King assassination the records would be filed under MURKIN, as they were not.

Even the 67 files were used in a field office for records having nothing to do with FBI employees but were related to a black bag job by local police, turned over to the FBI.

I'm reasonably confident that pertinent records in New York would be filed as 66s, as you may also believe, and that the more delicate of them might never have reached Washington. This is illustrated by the refusal of FBIHQ to accept a single King tape from any field office and giving several hell over sending them.

With regard to the Washington Field Office, which might have pertinent records, particularly those obtained through liaison, they have a virtually unknown "residency" that is distinguished as WF for Washington Field, from Washington Field Office or WFO. Such records were filed WF with regard to Dr. King. The territory of the Washington Field Office, obviously, does not require a resident agency. There is, in fact, a "Baltimore residency just over the border on the road to Baltimore. In those days there was no Alexandria Field Office, but there was, I'm pretty certain, a residency of Richmond. But in those days there was no Pentagon in Virginia. The Army and Navy were both headquartered in the old Munitions Building, with temporaries for the overflow during the war.

The potentially embarrassing raw material was kept out of FBIHQ which instead got the content attributed to a reliable source.

At FBIHQ every main file was abstracted in duplicate, one copy filed in chron. sequence, the other by serial number, if this is any help. I think they discontinued this in favor of another method, perhaps computer, after I learned of the existence of and obtained more than 6,000 copies of such abstracts. They are quite valuable for those who do not have access to the FBI's indices.

The Post story concludes by stating that it is not clear what was done with such information. If I wanted to find out, I'd certainly appeal and include a search of at least the 94 files. (Some of Hoover's O & Cs that I've seen, and I've seen only a few pages, did note additional filings in the margins, common FBIHQ practise but also withheld as (b)(2), which it cannot be. Best wishes,  
Harold Weisberg