

Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
5/1/75

Colonel Donald W. Richardson
Director, Plans & Resources
Hq. of Special Investigations
Dept of the Air Force
Washington, D.C. 20314

Dear Colonel Richardson,

If what follows is not clear please ask me about what may seem not to be. I am recovering from pneumonia and pleurisy but I do not want to delay response to your letter stamp dated April 25. The government has been less than honest about this from the first and I am anxious that honest responses begin.

My inquiry was not limited to whatever may be the jurisdiction and functions of the OSI. It was for all information/files of the entire military establishment. With AF this means the entire AF, not OSI only or your part of OSI only. It was also for all sources, which is to say whether or not of OSI origin.

Your letter has built-in limitations that in themselves avoid the obvious purpose of my inquiry and seem designed to evade full response. If this is not the case, it will be an easy matter for you to make an unequivocal record. One example: each of your paragraphs is restricted to the moment of your writing the letter, "maintaining," "is maintaining," "may be maintaining." The operative part of each of these paragraphs is thus limited as my inquiry was not.

This becomes less innocent when I tell you what any inquiry has to have disclosed, I know the OSI had at least one file on me.

If you did not personally make this check and if you did not personally limit it without reason or responsiveness, I respectfully suggest that the Air Force and I will both be better off if you shake up those who did.

However, you do say your office "maintaining" what you describe as "records of investigations conducted by other agencies on matters of Air Force interest." Now I have also been involved in litigation with the Air Force, by filing a claim for damages against it and by its being party to two suits in which I successfully sued for damages done us. Less than two years ago files did exist and I made formal request through the Department of Justice for one that, if the Air Force delivered it to the Department of Justice, the Department of Justice did not turn over under discovery and as required by, I believe, court order. In addition, I did see another file and it is my belief that file holds evidence of fraud. I do know its contents. In view of all these and other conditions, I do hope that you, personally, and the Air Force, will please take a more serious view of this entire matter and will begin with honest, forthright and full responses.

The actuality is that ^A must be identified in quite a number of Air Force files not on me and that I am confident I can identify at least some of these.

In addition, because the first of these suits did establish a new legal principle, it seems incredible that this was not "of Air Force interest."

Over and beyond all of this the Air Force asked me to cooperate -and I did cooperate - with its efforts to identify violators of regulations. Because this was done on the order of the Secretary, would it not seem to be a safe assumption that this was "of Air Force interest" and that records do exist?

bcc: While he says he is referring to "DADE" these initials have been typed on the return address of the envelope, making it read "AFOSI/DADF."

Sincerely,