

George Harner
Washington Post - Newsroom
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

9/17/84

Dear George,

The crazies of the CIA, like snakes swallowing, can't stop and without need or reason, just because they always stonewall, prolong and make all litigation costly and burdensome, and they've gone much too far and got caught up in it, a basic and significant lie, under oath. They caught it before Paul had a chance to, as he would have, because they'd disclosed in 1976 the document they swore had to be withheld in 1982 under 1,3 and 5. So, they had to try to get out of their lie, which can be interpreted as perjury if any judge had that much interest in law and justice. They did. They've lied all over again, weaseled, digressed, misrepresented-the ~~works~~ works. I've finished a second affidavit for Jim, my wife is retyping it and I expect to mail it tomorrow night. I expect also to enclose a copy for you. Depends on my wife, who is temporarily under the weather.

The copy they had to give Jim for Hoch is identical with the one they had to disclose to Borosage in '76. I filled in most of the withheld blanks and pointed out that virtually 100% of the content they'd claimed "national security" for had long been in the public domain, officially and unofficially. What lends itself to your ~~ridicule~~ ^{ridicule} is what they withheld and what they omitted from the memo itself, for which they actually claimed immunity as a "predecisional" document (b5) which it cannot be but is an incredible self-indictment if you take them at face value and make on they were providing information for decision-makers.

I think you could have a lot of fun, do a lot of good, regardless of today's scheduled vote, and have a fine and worthwhile Outlook piece.

Your morgue might well hold more than I remember/clipped for which they claimed b1 "national security" and of what decision-makers ought to know and have if they were to make any decision. Like bugging Dan Martin's bed, which blew the whole operation. And Hoover/DeLoach using that to convince LBJ that the JFK assassination was a CIA conspiracy. I sent you that some time ago and it is an exhibit in my first affidavit, the one I suggested you ask Jim to send you. (If my wife is OK I'll enclose a copy of it, too.)

Actually, the CIA itself disclosed what it withheld in almost all instances, as did the DJ, FBI, at least two committees, Church and HSCA. Yet they tie up the courts and overburden them and requesters with gross, deliberate and otherwise pointless lies. And as recently as the 10th swear to the same lies to continue to assert b1 and 3 (required by law). They even represent, under oath, that political assassinations are both an intelligence source and an intelligence method. One of the nuts swore to the need to withhold the little they had in the record on the CIA's plots against Castro because it could endanger the national security by causing a rupture in diplomatic relations - which haven't existed for 25 years!

I really think you'd enjoy this one.

Best wishes,

"an exceptionally great damage to the"

The kind of thin I had in mind:

The CIA took a scholar to court in 1982 to prevent what it described as ~~serious hazard to national defense~~ security—the "rupture" of ~~diplomatic~~ diplomatic relations - with Cuba.

It also swore to Federal District Judge Aubrey Robinson, who still has the case before him, that it is required by law to protect an "intelligence source" and an "intelligence method."

The CIA's sworn-to ^{secret} "intelligence source" is it plotting to assassinate Fidel Castro.

The CIA's sworn-to ^{secret} "intelligence method" is it plots to assassinate heads of state in general.

"national security"

The information the CIA swore to Robinson that it had to protect, as recently as September 10 of this year, was published in the Washington Post (and other papers) years before Dr. Paul Hoch's Freedom of Information suit was filed and The CIA, using a variety of its executives and experts, has sworn over a two-year period that it was and in the interest of the nation's security must remain secret.

The same information was disclosed officially by the CIA itself, by the Department of Justice, by the FBI, whose records hold the raunchier details, by the Senate Intelligence Committee and by the House Select Committee on Assassination.

On learning that the information the CIA withheld is described by it as immune under FOIA because it was to be used as the basis of decision-making, another scholar in the field, ^{Dr.} Harold Weisberg, of Frederick ^{Maryland} Maryland, prepared an affidavit

in which he states that the supposed decision makers would have been more completely and accurately informed if they had ^{been} provided with clippings of what the Post published. years earlier.