

DA Appeals - vvv

Dear Mr. Flanders,

5/31/80

When my wife handed me your letter of 5/30 and its enclosure she said, "This is all about you."

You included, from WFO 121-3454, pages 16, 17, 18, 19 and 33. Of them you told my wife, "Department of State material in our document pertaining to you is bracketed in red." But as she told me, it pertains to me, not to her.

So how come neither WFO nor HQ provided this in response to my PA requests?

You failed to inform her she can appeal so for both of us I do appeal, by a carbon to Mr. Shea.

On page 16 you claim a non-source is a confidential source in (Obliterated) refused to furnish a signed statement or to appear before a loyalty board."

share

I am amused by the FBI's inaccuracy on page 17 and I ~~share~~ it with you on the off chance that anything as grim as these matters can amuse you: "It was noted Mr. WHIS-
BERG worked on a report entitled 'Activities of FRANCO Agents in Other American Republics, I Argentine.'"

No such thing. But I did prepare a report I was told was to be used at the UN on the influence of the Spanish Falange in Latin America, not Argentina. It resulted in the only adverse criticism I remember of my work of that period, and it was all the fault of the FBI.

That Division got a new chief, a caricature of the stuffed-shirt college professor. He read my report, called me in and pontificated, "No scholar worthy of his salt would use the FBI as a source." And honor bright, Mr. Flanders, I did correct the FBI's errors, like calling a University of Pennsylvania doctoral candidate doing his thesis on the Falange a member of it.

Please don't fret because he had another criticism. I quoted a previous United States presentation about the Falange to the UN and he didn't like what I used. No wonder - he wrote it years earlier. (Guess he wasn't much on checking footnotes.)

On page 18 two paragraphs are entirely withheld, but there is no claim that nothing in them is reasonably segregable. The claim is 7D, as it is for the name of an agency in

the second paragraph on that page. My recollection of the legislative history of the Act is that the claim is for persons only.

The withholding of the reasonably segregable appeal is intended to apply throughout.

Your people may have known what was wanted of them but they got carried away a bit in "The investigation conducted by T-7 . . . went on to show that WEISBERG formerly worked for MAURICE HALPERIN ^{also} and that besides having worked for him, he was friendly with (obliterated)." The exemption claimed here is new to me. It is "Other."

I know you people are happier stretching the Act, but do you get kicks out of creating new exemptions, too?

If you intended 7C, how come for those others and not for Halperin?

I was a lot friendlier with a number of FBI SAs than with Halperin. I never got drunk with him but I did with some DAs. In fact I can remember but two of my fellow employees with whom my wife and I visited back and forth and of them one was a prominent Republican.

T-7 is a State Department component. Do you suppose that they didn't know I was its employee, not Halperin's? In fact I knew Halperin only through his government employment, as my superior.

(Your file on him is not up to date if it does not include his anti-Castro books.)

You should be able to provide a legible page 33 rather than writing over the one line not excised and I ask this, with disclosure of the reasonably segregable and without extension of 7D.

Please remember also that more than three decades have passed in asserting any claim.

Given the success of your campaign to frustrate the Act I do not expect you to entirely abandon it by reducing what is unnecessarily forced on the overloaded and understaffed appeals staff, but it would be kind of nice if you cleaned this up on your own. For once.

If you had to begin with it might not have occurred to my wife to file requests with field offices, as you nudged her into doing, she tells me.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg