

Mr. John Hartingh  
FBI FOIA Unit  
J Edgar Hoover Bldg.  
Washington, D.C.

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

Dear John,

I am so angry, so shocked I hardly know how to write you.

I've been so tired I've been falling asleep sitting up. I've just returned from a tiring trip I could ill afford, it was made necessary only because of FBI dirty tricks, impositions on me. I cleaned up most of the accumulation of mail, too time to write you a letter addressing problems I think can be worked out amicably, had someone who was here mail it when he left because this is a weekend and I want to eliminate problems rapidly - I've even asked Jim to ask for a delay in the scheduled state call to ease the pressure on you and the Bureau - and then I came to <sup>you</sup>oble again in Section 72.

I came to Serial 5314 and I stopped. I will not now or ever again look at a single record from him. he is totally, completely unsuited for this kind of work. He may be the most loving of husbands, the most devoted of father and the most perfect of agents in tracking down the most dangerous of felons but he will never be able to handle FOIA work.

In 5314, which is far from all I can address in this section's first dozen pages, he has actually withheld the name of one quoted by name in the ~~magazine~~ magazine that had the world's largest circulation. Look printed more than Life, if you did not know it. And claimed the privacy exemption plus 2. On review it was not written back in. If there was a review.

Not that the amount of time required for what was written back in over all these pages does not in itself constitute a kind of non-compliance through unnecessary delay.

His is so much too much!

In these few pages he has withheld the names of witnesses who were subpoenaed and whose names are public; the name of the woman who laid Ray and whose name is public; the names of public officials when their names also have been published; the names of those arrested and publicly charged in the Alton bank robbery (about which the Bureau leaked much it knew it was false just to hurt Ray); and all about Onebrake even when the record states it received extensive international publicity.

This after his supposed boss, the Attorney General, states that policy is to disclose all that can possibly be disclosed without serious hurt? There is NO possibility for any hurt in anything he withheld. He was supported in withholding the names of agents whose jobs were public, liaison. While these names are of no interest to me this kind of abuse of the Act and of me simply must end.

I'm getting old, I am tired, I'm not in good health, and I have no intention of putting up with a single more page of this without some meaningful, dated assurances from you. I will take your word. I do not want hassles. But believe me if I have to crawl into the AG's office with this or roll into the courtroom, this is going to stop. Period. I wrote about this long before our discussion of these problems. I then was given no indication of this utter irrationality.

How many of these pages would you want to have to reread? These are senseless.

What kind of supervision does this represent? What kind of Departmental review?

What kind of arrogance is this with a case in court and in the face of all the judge has said?

From last September on I think I've leaned over backward, very far backward, to get this over with and to avoid all I could possibly avoid, to have no stinks, just to get a reasonable amount of compliance. This is what I get in return, and after all these

2

letters and all the time they represent? In my shape and all I want to do and can't get to?

Right now this makes me feel particularly unclean because I used a coast-to-coast prime-time TV appearance I had turned down twice to defend the Bureau from indecent accusations against it. Because of the pressures I was under I phoned Jim, as he will tell you. He decided me to go to New York, for all the effort it was for me to go to Dallas, and not to complete that for which I want there just to use this opportunity to inject an semblance of rationality into all of this insane business.

To come back exhausted and to this?

No, friend, and as Poe's raven said, never more. This is that much too much.

(If you have been given the UPI story of the 11th it is not what I said or believed, was corrected by one Dallas paper and I've asked UPI to note a correction for the record. The actuality is that I said what did happen, that the dogs would get Ray. I violate no confidence when I tell you I told him this in 1971 or 1972, when he made an unsuccessful effort. I know that country from the 1930s, when I was there for the Department and with the Bureau.)

I just don't know what I can do that I have not done to try to be helpful, to try to give you people time to work out your problems. But they grow worse, not less. Despite all I've done to alert all of you.

To the degree I can I avoid personal attention. It means nothing to me and I don't have time enough for what does have meaning to me. I turned CBS down, as Jim can tell you and my files will show. I turned ABC down twice last week, as Jim and others know. But this can change. I did not have to defend the Bureau against outrageous charges. I could have said I had no personal knowledge. But this, too, can change.

What IS going to change is what is represented by the noble atrocities in Section 72. On this I am not going to compromise as I have through all these months because I do recognize how foreign all this is to the training and indoctrination of agents. I am stating terms. If they are not met, which means that I have your word they will be met - and I will not take John Dugan's - I'll see you in court on the 30th.

I did agree that I would await completion of delivery of the rest of the HQ Murkin file before there was a review and rectification of the unjustifiable withholding. You still have my word on this. I did not agree to the outrages I find in Section 72, which is subsequent to that meeting. What I did agree to is that the volume be reduced to eliminate anything like this.

There is a calendar call scheduled for the 30th, the one I told you I suggested to Jim he have delayed to make things easier for you. By a cabron of this if we do not consult before he receives it I am telling Jim not to ask for this until he hears from you. I will accept your verbal word, it need not be in writing. I want an immediate replacement of all of Goble's work beginning with Section 72, which I've laid aside and will waste no more time on now. I want this by someone who is not processing any of my requests. (Remember, this one is not more than eight years overdue. So don't bull me with any backlog claims or pleas. Besides, you people have done this to yourselves.) I will want your personal word on this not later than 6/24 so I can prepare if I do not have it. I will want an assurance that by 10 days after you learn of this I will have a non-Goble replacement of Section 72 and any other Sections he has processed. I am not going to waste any more time going over any of his work henceforth. If I find the same situation in any Section processed by anyone else

I'll have the same expectation. If this happens before someone is here who can mail this I'll enclose it. It will be my expectation that from this moment on all decisions to withhold will be in accord with the Attorney General's recent statement of policy, not to comfort the ghost of a departed one.

(You are in no way responsible for it and the Bureau is not involved but since we last met I've actually had another part of the Department withhold Lee Harvey Oswald's serial number - after what is supposed to be his entire military record was released by the magazines and printed in facsimile by the Warren Commission. Man it is coming out of the roots of my hair!)

It appears that you and others in the Department, not just the Bureau, either do not want to believe that all I want is compliance or believe that endlessly I will accept non-compliance.

There is nothing I can do about what is in the official mind.

I would like to avoid any unnecessary fights, any scandals, any moves for punishment under the amended Act, a question I have already asked Jim to have in mind. I want no publicity or I'd have had it. I want no more than to do the work I have undertaken without unreasonable official interference in it. What I am complaining about is, after some 20,000 pages, a shameful official interference. Unprincipled, unjustifiable, indefensible.

Here, more after all my patient efforts, I do draw the line.

Not without knowing the Bureau's power or its disposition to use and misuse that power. I went through that beginning when I was a kid and two agents restrained me in an office to get me to sign a confession to a crime I did not commit. They finally backed off, not I. When the Bureau and the Department persisted for political reason I took the grand jury away from them. This is one of the reasons when I wrote you earlier today I said I want all relevant records available simultaneously, not the Bureau distortion that pretends there was nothing earlier. Why do you suppose the Bureau said it had no files on me?

In New Orleans I went alone and unarmed when my friends (for real) in the police did not want to go and the Assistant DAs would not go unarmed. (This is really an understatement.) I live in a woods without even a watchdog because I cherish the wild animals they would drive away. I have gone through with scheduled TV appearances after bomb threats that drove prominent public officials away, doing their stint and mine. If I was not afraid of great power before what kills people and can kill me do you think I am now?

I do not delude myself about what I can do. I suggest that you and yours not delude themselves about what I am willing to try to do. I want only compliance with the law, no more. I also will now accept no less. I want and seek no fuss, no attention, just what the law says is mine so I may do the work I have undertaken. I believe there is a fair chance the courts will give it to me. If not then the Bureau might want to consider that when I had to be hospitalized the staff director of a Congressional committee with FOIA jurisdiction asked to take me to the hospital. Maybe today this means nothing, but if I have to learn I'll make the effort.

What I am trying to tell your people through you is that I have had it. I will accept no more of this wretchedness. If I have to abandon what I want to do to try to end it that I reluctantly I will do. I believe the terms I have stipulated are reasonable, after an incredible history of all these years more than reasonable. If I do not know how much time I have left I'm damned if I'm going to spend it as with what I think is some patience I have been in this case.

If the Bureau stops all this dirty business for which there never was an excuse I'll go my way quietly, as I have been quiet, and do what work I can do. If it does not I am prepared for whatever may be required. Nothing personal. I regard you as the best I have met in these FOIA cases. Whether or not you have been able to supervise, I have been forced to decide that I'll go this far in attempting to accommodate, no farther. Sincerely, H. Weisberg