

Ms. Mary McGrory
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

8/1/85

Dear Ms. McGrory,

Recently I wrote to thank you for an excellent column on official mendacity. I do not recall whether I then referred to my own such experiences. My purpose in writing now is merely to inform you, by which I really mean give you an inkling, not in the expectation of a column and please believe me, without any need for you to take time to respond.

To now I've kept four on the Post fully informed, with copies, I know that the Post has no interest. So in what I'm sending out now I'm sending one copy of what I'm filing only, to an editor.

How these people could have been so careless as to use the name of the Boston United States Attorney instead of the one for D.C. I do not know but I'll now see how they react, if at all.

What I actually told the judge, who is as unworthy of that role as any I've ever known or known about, is that if the FBI and DJ are not guilty then I am and there must be a trial. We have both sworn in contradiction about what is as material as anything can be and thus there is perjury. And I know of nothing as unlikely as those people trying me for anything. My work is accurate, documented and in all ways quite correct.

These terrible people with whom I contend - and I regard them as terrible even though I believe they go to their churches and love their families - are to me subversives and I believe they represent a real threat to our security, in terms of our basic concepts and beliefs. Or at least those that made ours the best system of self-government and freedom man has yet devised, ~~despite~~ despite what officials do to it. And there is virtually nothing they will not dare to hurt anyone who tries to make it work as it is supposed to work. They've been out to get me for years because Congress amended FOIA in 1974 to open FBI, CIA and similar files because of me. It remains to be seen whether this time they've gone too far. To now they are getting away with it. But they have yet to face the decision they will face, what will they do about my absolute refusal to pay the judgement they got by fraud, misrepresentation and overt perjury, if not also its subornation. I've not paid it and regardless of what the judge does or does not do in the near future I'm not going to. I presume but do not know that they'll have to come out to Maryland to collect and I would like to believe that some kind of proceeding then would result. Strange as it may seem to a non-lawyer, to now there's been none. (I'm also asking for a trial before this prejudiced and disgraceful judge.)

To make this comprehensible, in 1978 I filed ^{four} FOIA suits when the FBI did not comply with my FOIA requests. At the request of the appeals office, because of my subject-matter expertise, I provided not less than two file drawers of information relating to relevant records that exist and were not provided. (In all, in this and other requests, I provided the appeals office with two full file cabinets of material, a considerable effort and a great burden and cost, but the subject-matter is historically important.) Then, instead of doing what the Act and regulations require and in an effort to at once frustrate compliance and in effect rewrite the Act, the FBI demanded discovery, defined as "each and every" document and fact I have relating to the information in question. After getting all I sent and without making and attesting to the searches, as required. I refused, for a number of reasons, all valid and recognized and everything I said, under oath, was simply ignored by both the FBI and the judge

and he orderd me to provide all over again what I had already provided. When I refused they got a judgement against me and when I refused to pay it they asked for and got a judgemen against my lawyer, who had tried to talk me into some sort or pro forma compliance with all this corruption. (That part, which endangered all always, has been overturned.) This conflict they created leaves me without counsel.

Meanwhile, while all this was going on, the very FBI SA who is supervisor in this litigation and swore that information in question did not exist and that if it did the FBI needed my "discovery" help to locate it, as supervisor in another case filed by a friend of mine, disgorged a large number of FBI records establishing the existence of what he swore did not exist and making it beyond question that all the reasons given to get this "discovery" order from me are and were know to be false and fraudulent. With samples of what he disclosed, under Rule 60(b), I've moved that the judgement be vacated. The FBI/DJ response in the form of an Opposition ignores all I filed but one point and then misrepresented it and based itself on childish semantics. I'm now filing my reply to their Opposition.

The SA who provided all this stuff to my friend actually swore in this case, to get the "discovery" which would have been so incredibly burdensome to me if I were to try to provide it or would get the suit dismissed if I didn't, actually swore, while engaged in this eruption of the relevant to my friend, that my "discovery" would enable the FBI to prove that it had complied with my request, precisely while disclosing what proved the exact opposite.

Aside from the deliberate abuse of an aging and unwell writer whose sin is accuracy and reasonableness in his exposure of official, particularly FBI, wrongdoing, this is an assault on the right of the people to know what their government does, theoretically assured by enactment of FOIA. I regard what they are doing to FOIA to negate it as a separate subversion. And of course I regret the total lack of interest by the press. Which really has much more at stake than I do. (At worst, but as of now, three of my monthly Social Security checks is all that I lose.)

I can't get to Washington to try to locate a lawyer who would not be afraid because I am able to drive for only 20 minutes at a time and cannot use public transportation. (Believe me, the cause lawyers are terrified, and not without cause. If one of them represented me in this he'd have to worry about his other clients as well as his own future, the courts are now to that degree reorganized. With less than minimal reporting by the major media.) So as of now I'll have to continue to be my own lawyer. I regret this because the possible precedents can be enormously hurtful to others, including the silent major media. Even wealthy corporations.

I hope this effort to encapsulate makes sense. I'm too deeply involved and currently fatigued to really perceive. But if any of this interests you or anyone you know I'll be glad to send copies of anything I have. This administration is, among other things, out to restrict access to information to the degree it can get away with and there is, from my experience, nothing too outrageous for it to try to get away with.

Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg