

Mr. John Harting
FOIA/PA Unit
FBI

J. Edgar Hoover Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
6/18/77

Dear John,

Jim phoned me last night to indicate some of the contents of the records he received from you yesterday. I've been wondering when we would reach them and how they would be formulated as well as how complete they would be. From what Jim told me fidelity lacks. These reflections of me are but one of a series of new problems I want to raise with you. I believe they can all be worked out, making no problems.

First of all I have no intention of insisting on the withholding from others, even those who do not like me, of records of this nature. I do have every intention of insisting that this not be done partially or prejudicially. The record Jim happened to notice is of this nature and I do not want it now made available to others. When all these records are complete I imagine the situation will be entirely different. With compliance it will be.

I think you are aware that my most recent efforts to obtain the records on me are now almost two years old and that I have not yet received a single word, leave alone sheet of paper, in response to that request. In the King file you are coming across some only. There will probably be more.

Your founding father was interviewed at some length on the matter of the State Department firings that on examination may make you wonder about a pogrom. The reporter was the late Bert Andrews, a Pulitzer of the New York Herald Tribune. I know what Mr. Hoover told Mr. Andrews in part from the story Mr. Andrews wrote and in part from what he told me when he called me in to discuss it with me. It does not coincide with what Jim told me. If belatedly we should come to Mr. Hoover's memo on this as well as copies of the story. It was syndicated, including to the Washington Post.

I have tried to be forthright and informative with you. That is my present intent in cautioning you about the potential for embarrassment for the Bureau in this. I do not seek any such thing. I want only compliance, as you might have had reason to note. So I am telling you that in connection with those firings the Bureau lied. It claimed to have no records on me. From a source other than the Bureau I have these records in my possession.

This is but one aspect. It can get pretty hairy. If it does it will not be because I have not cautioned you. It is in any way mishandled, leaked or made available out of context I just might want it to get this hairy.

One facet that may amuse you is that while the Bureau listed my wife as somehow subversive based on her interest in cooperatives and consumerism (I have the results of the mail cover not from the Bureau) Mr. Hoover once sent her and her then dinner companion a bottle of Cherry Heering when he and as I recall Mr. Tolson were dining at the same place. I was then overseas in the Army.

If you have any questions please ask. But until I have all the relevant records I am not waiving any of my PA rights. When I have them all I intend to make them public.

This leads to what I recognize is not within my province. I have suggested it to Jim. He may or may not have had time to take it up with you. You are a supervisor in Operation Onslaught. I doubt anyone figures in it more than I do. At least should. My suggestion is that all these requests be assigned to you. I do not suggest this because it will be fun for you but I do believe that it will, in the end, serve the Bureau's interest as well as mine. I have no reluctance in explaining this if you'd like. Or your superiors. In short I think it is one way of avoiding what I will not avoid if I have no alternatives.

For one thing I am no longer a young man of 62. My physical strength and endurance are not what they were even last year. The kind of weather we are having is hard on me. When these requests are up to nine years old and I feel this way - which is separate from what the waste of time now means to me - I am not going to try to be patient with those whose past do not lead me to believe patients will serve any and except that of stonewallers.

For another thing the neighbor with whom I was able to travel to and from Washington has been switched to the night shift. This means the bus, never good or comfortable and awful with tourists crowding it. The last time we met 10 people were standees. It would have been impossible for me.

This is not the major reason I have suggested to Jim that he suggest to the judge that the next status call, I believe set for 12 days from today, be postponed until about two weeks after your initial compliance from the HQ King files. The major reason is to avoid an unnecessary status call and the waste of time for the judge, us and you and your counsel. If all involved agree to this I suggest a conference over what lies ahead would serve all interests.

This transportation problem impels me to ask you about the delivery of these records. There is not only the present problem of Jim's getting them to me, there is also the amount of time this has already required of him. I would like to be able to work out a different arrangement. I have a Washington account on which he only draws checks for you. I would likento remove this burden from him, too.

There are other ways in which these records can reach me, safely, the mail being least dependable. If you use them we have never had a problem with nited Parcel. Most of the mail gets through but if the records are to be intact a better package is required. The CIA insures or registers it.

There is also a Bureau resident agency, under Baltimore. It has been some years since I was in that office. I understand it has been moved. Wherever it is it will be no problem for me to drive there and receive packages and deliver checks if this is no problem for the Bureau. Or we can mail the checks, not giving the local agents any extra work. However we can do this I would like to relieve Jim of any bookkeeping burdens. My wife is affeciant in such matters. While the CIA trusts me the Archives does not. I maintain a non-interest account there (without which they'd still be making money out of the JFK assassination) and would be willing to deposit any reasonable sum with you to assure you and the Bureau.

Mention of the Baltimore F.O and the local residency reminds me that my earlier request as well as the one you are working on cover what I gave it through SA Ronal Lichten-ger in late April 1968, two pictures, one of a picture and one of a sketch. Nothing has been provided on this.

The way it seems to work you have no connection with what the Bureau calls the earlier request. Despite repeated contrary affirmations non-compliance is extensive. I would prefer not to have to press this in court. Without compliance and admission of what we might call error I will. I would hope that this might work out amicably.

Peace! It's better.

Harold Weisberg