

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701  
10/2/75

Mr. Gene Wilson, FOIA and Privacy Coordinator  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Before I convey to you personally and for the Agency a little of what is on my mind after reading your letter stamp dated September 30, I will wait until what I regard as an unnecessary, stonewalling date of October 20, as you ask.

I am reminded of a letter I recently sent the Attorney General. Beginning in 1966 I started asking the FBI for a copy of a published press release. Finally I asked a lawyer to ask for it for me. He was told to tell me the only way I could get it was by use of FOIA. I filed the request, allowed twice more time than the law and then filed an appeal. For a press release? Is there no shame in government?

Here you are asking for more time to respond to a request I first made in 1971. I repeated to your general counsel 10 months ago today the same request, in person and with the assurance that I do have copies of some of what you can't not find in your files. He then wrote there is nothing. I filed an appeal and you now elect to treat that appeal as an original request. Putting it, apparently, at the bottom of the stack and shamelessly explaining "we have been deluged with requests." Can it be otherwise when one dating to 1971 still hasn't been answered and with the gross improprieties now not completely secret. (Yes, I do mean that all are not yet exposed.)

You extend assurances of your concern "over the fact that we have not responded earlier to your request [sic]" When you do get around to it, I would like to know if you have any others this long unanswered, going back to both 1971 and January 2 of this year. This is not rhetorical. I have been patient but if I have reason to believe that whenever I get what you will call a full response it is less than that and have to take other steps I will use other and less well known provisions of the law.

You do not refer to my invocation of the Privacy Act in your letter. I did do this.

You refer to but one request. To date I have not had even acknowledgement of several long past due referrals from the Archives under the law. I have referred to these and CIA has not responded.

Now I take you literally. You say one "component," whatever you may mean by that, says it will respond by an unspecified day of the week of October 6. The last working day of that week is October 10. You also represent this as the last, "the one remaining component which has failed to respond." And you then say that if they delay response to you to as late as the 10th you will still require 10 more days to reply to me? You really need another 10 days just to respond after more than four years?

I do not intend to get involved in any of your sometimes complicated semantics. Mean whatever you may by "component." I made no request in any such terms. My request covers any asset, part, proprietary, affiliate, front, person, agent, informer or source of any and every kind and nature.

Now will you please tell me when you or another in the Agency will respond to these months-old referrals from the National Archives?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Dear Jim,           CIA: FOIA, Privacy, their 9/30/75           10/2/75

Attached are Gene Wilson's latest CIA stonewalling, received today, and my response.

Separate from the smudges on this copy are other smudges on the reverse side of his letter. They do not coincide with typing on the face. I do not attribute any special meaning to this. I merely note it.

They have to be really uptight to ask for an extra 10 days merely to review whatever more they expect to collect. If anything. If nothing, why ask this extra 10 days? And this is in addition to what his letter says has already been completed, whether or not it yielded anything, which he does not say.

There are several reminders I want to record.

There are other FOIA requests of which I know, FOIA and other, in which they have to have come across files on me. We know they did on Bud. They have to have in response to the Hunt demand in that recent case. Inevitably there are others.

There is no reference to the mail here. We must not forget that.

No reference to persons and organizations where they've had interest. We don't know how they file, of course.

No reference to subjects in which we know they have interest and files. Like assassinations, Garrison, etc.

No reference to publishing, to which we have a connection.

No reference to my writing, in which we know they have an interest. (I know where they bought my first book, for example.) And how they followed what I said about it.

I regard his latest as an exceptional letter, as I regard the open lying to our faces as exceptional.

We also know they have files dealing with my Archives requests for CIA material and we know that the Angleton people were involved in that. We do have this in writing.

All of this is separate from any checking they did with other agencies, which gives them correspondence with or memos about me from these agencies. On my writing alone and my (completely innocent) foreign correspondence they have to have checked with at least the FBI. They also have to have records from other agencies.

And my initial request was prior to the date of any claimed destruction of any of these kinds of records.

I think it best that we give them this extra time and I think they look worse for asking for it. Especially if they fail to come up with that of which I have copies or proofs.

Best,