Mr. James K. Hall, Chief
FOIPA Section
FBIHQ
Washington, D.C. 20535

1/28/85

Dear Mr. Hall,

Please take me literally in my thanking you for your evasive, nonresponsive, untruthful and stonewalling letter of 1/24/85. I think it will be of value to me and of interest to the court in a remand in which the FBI claims it is not necessary for me to file suit and that it complies with my requests in chronological order.

It certainly is helpful, too, for you to assign the current 254,713 number to my 1975 request with which you still have not complied and which is the subject of the letters you cite.

With regard to your polite lecture relating to request numbers and my failure to include them, thank yourself for the extra work created by the FBI's refusal to give me those numbers even when I wrote and asked for them. The FBI thus created the situation that prevented my keeping records in accord with its numbers. You'll find some of this and your then representations in the case record in C.A. 7501996, the case to which I refer above. Your then staff also refused my verbal requests, intended so I could keep track by other than subject filing, which is what I am now limited to - by the FBI.

"Efforts have been made to understand and respond," you say. I am so sorry that your comprehension is so limited, that you cannot understand what I wrote, not by any means a new FBI claim. Excuse me if I seem to be acting like a school-teacher with a stupid child, but I certainly do want to know what it is that you cannot understand, so I'll repeat some of what is in those letters and ask you to tell me precisely what it is in my language that you find incomprehensible.

After recounting some of your stonewalling history on 11/17/83, paragraph 5, I wrote, "Instead, having accused you of deliberate dishonesty, I offer you the means of proving me wrong. From your existing records, I ask that you provide copies of all search slips as well as lists of records thereafter provided, the same with regard to my appeals pursuant to which searches allegedly were made, and of Jim Lesar's special request of the Director and the Attorney General long before you disclosed any of your fabricated defamations, together with all records relating to what the FBI did when it received those communications."(Emphasis in original) I then said that I was going out of my way not to "blindside" you and that the FBI had disclosed records reflecting the existence of those still withheld relating to me. Please tell me what it is that you cannot understand in this and before I mail my response I'll ask the eight-year-old child of a friend if she can understand what I've written. If she can't then I'll keep rewriting until she can. Fair enough? Can you understand what an eight-year-old can understand?

In your citation of letters, and it is apparent that you do understand dates, you manage to omit when I brought this old matter up again in the recent past. It was on 9/26/84, to Mr. Huff, who sometimes displays a comprehension level equal to your own. After recounting the history of noncompliance with my request for records relating to me and citing an identical (means exactly the same kind) earlier illustration(aka example) I refer to what I described as another such "gross and deliberate lie" by the FBI to which it has given distribution. The correctly identified FBI record "states ...that I entertained Soviet officials at my farm." I provided my source for your distribution by your file and serial number. Please tell me what it is in this that you cannot understand and I'll get to the little girl before mailing my response.

The fourth paragraph of that letter includes hints about the source of your

"gross and deliberate lies" And that also is not without possible relevance in C.A.75-1996, which includes a request for all records relating to any kinds of surveillances on me. It is fairly obvious, as I indicated, that one of your language -problem agents misrepresented a phone conversation in which I was engaged at the request of our government. (As you would have known if you had provided the copies of the interceptions of my related correspondence, clearly within your mail interception program testified to before the Congress.)

You people appear from a long record not to be at all concerned about untruthfulness to courts, and from a long record, probably much more extensive than I know about personally, you've been getting away with it. Maybe you will continue to and maybe, just maybe, at some point some judge will have had enough. So, and I repeat I am not blindsiding you, the record I cited and the earlier one, of which I provided a copy, leave it beyond question that the FBI lied to the judge in claiming it had no such record as is reflected in the one I cited.

And I can only wonder if this is why the FBI has such great difficulty in understanding. If this is why you do not provide the requested search slips. Or the records of distribution and uses. If this is why you give a 1985 number to the request of a decade ago.

I am not a lawyer and I do not know whether, if you were to provide this existing, relevant and withheld information it would qualify as "new evidence" in my field offices case and the directive to the FBI to search and process all records relating to "critics," of whom I am senior and certainly well known as such to the FBI. There you swore to a search that disclosed nothing at all, remember? Your own supervisor?

You say also that you tried hard and "those efforts have failed." Can it possibly be that you provided partial compliance with that request and can't find that file? Has the FBI's indexing failed it? Didn't the appeals office refer my appeal to you, and didn't I protest that it, not you, is the appeals authority?

Maybe your comprehension really is limited. I suggested that with a copy of the search slips (assuming that you do not lie internally) I could identify the existing and withheld records. And you do not provide copies of the search slips. But then, you have had experiences with providing them, too, haven't you? With them blank when there are many records, with them listing relevant records still withheld, things like these.

I fear that more than your inability to understand is involved. I provided a copy of your own record which refers to underlying records and you represent that you can't provide them? Not even when they are correctly and uniquely identified in your own records? I sorrow for the FBI you represent!

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701