

Mr. Dan "etcalfe
Mr. Richard Huff, codirectors
OIP
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

10/4/85

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Goldbricks,

Apparently I was correct in my letter of 9/26/85 to both of you, you do get you kicks from combining abuse of the responsibilities you assumed and for which I pay my share of your salaries with abuse of an aging an ill man whose work your Department does not like but cannot fault on accuracy, despite its widespread campaign of defamation of him. The 10/2/85 substitute for your response by an incompetent flunky represents both this and what I take to be a challenge I'll see if I am able to accept.

My cited letter renews two appeals about which you have been steadfast in doing anything since you assumed your present responsibilities. They were awaiting action before then and they are many years old. You must hire paralegals on the basis of stupidity because this one couldn't even comprehend the caption I provided for your convenience, "Dallas police broadcasts, Nosenko appeals." She refers to only the Nosenko appeal that is at least eight years old, renewed often enough/as my letter reminds you, and particularly was renewed this year and last. You've had the Dallas part since last December, from your own letter of that time, and you've done nothing and you've not even responded to my letter, including telling me the cost of a second duplicate of the recordings for me to give another researcher.

So, instead of responding to what was addressed to you personally you tell this refugee from a remedial reading class to send me your standard form letter and to give these ancient appeals, rather the one you do not ignore, a new number that puts it on the bottom of the massive list you and the FBI combine to create. (Which, of course, from your point of view is guaranteed to add more chaos, more phony statistics to belabor the Congress and the press with, and to greatly increase all costs, including those in your phony statistics.)

You lawyers have a phrase, perfecting the record. That is the purpose of this letter. I intend to perfect the record. Whether it reaches you or not and whether or not you'd tell the truth are things over which I have no control. But I believe that any unprejudiced court would be willing to assume that what is addressed to you personally and has the content of what I write does reach you.

You accepted responsibilities and you accept pay for supposedly performing them. Your record with me is that you not only fail to perform your assigned duties, you refuse to. I think there are laws and decisions that are relevant. Maybe we'll see.

Your letter also lies and you cannot but know it is a lie. If your in-house idiot had even read what supposedly she responded to she'd have known that she, too, lied in writing me that OIP "has a substantial backlog of pending appeals received prior to yours." Of course you can establish that I am wrong by sending me your backlog that was received prior to 1977-8. (The third paragraph of my letter states that "it is hardly possible that you have any older appeals other than some of mine.")

Unless you have older appeals mine are at the top of your list. I ask that you meet some of your responsibilities by either establishing to me that you have older appeals or give me a reasonable date by which you will have acted on these two. By "acted" I mean completed action. And I remind you that some is not subject to any withholding, as my previous appeals made clear.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg

