July 9, 1975

Mr. John S. Warner
General Counsel
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D. C. 20505

COPY

Dear Mr. Warner:

It had been my hope that what has become public knowledge since our meeting of January 2 with Jim Lesar present, your subsequent phone conversation with him and your letter to him of February 5, might lead you into further inquiry about the matters we discussed and that, particularly because of the problems it faces today, the CIA might become more honest about all of this.

I also write you personally because were our positions reversed I'd consider my personal integrity as well as that of the Agency directly involved and questioned.

I continue to hope that we can avoid the only alternative to all this stonewalling.

In addition, I want to eliminate the possibility that and/or the Agency are making special semantical interpretations.

If it has not come to your attention, after one of his public statements I wrote Mr. Colby about this further on May 4. I have had neither response nor any kind of acknowledgment.

The law does not place the burden of proof on me. It rests on the Agency. My obligation under the law is limited to what I have done: making a request for what is identifiable. However, without disclosing what proofs I have, I will give you further leads in the hope that they may yet inspire honesty and proper official conduct and attitudes.

Despite whatever paper you had on your desk and your language in your February 5 letter, it is not my letter of January 31, 1971, that was responded to. It was that of June 27, of which I enclose a carbon. Response was limited to the mailing of a printed copy of Director Helms' speech, mailed July 15. Both letters invoke the FOIA. There was no CIA response of any kind to that. I wasn't even sent the regulations.

As we told you January 2, I want to exercise my rights under the so-called Privacy act, too.

You denied "criminal" or "illegal" activity. I do not recall which word you used. And I can read evasions into some of your written language, whether or not you intended it. So I hope you will take from this letter my intent that my request cover any and all information of any kind, source, origin or nature, not only "surveillance" in the literal sense of shadowing and of which I was, as your records are filed or as someone may after the fact say he intended, not the primary "subject."

Obviously I am not familiar with the CIA's files and computers. I do recall that at the time its training of local police was reported, it explained this as attributable to its possession of the world's most sophisticated records-keeping system. Retrieval ought not be a problem, given the intent to locate the information I seek.

With the known work I have been doing and of which the CIA knows by having purchased my books if not by other means, the nature and description of the files that should have been consulted on my initial request and prior to our January 2 meeting include political assassinations and those persons prominently connected with interest in them, like Jim Garrison and a number of others.

COPY

You will remember that in response to your request I explained that I have copies of some documents of which I did not give you a description, had substantial reason to believe there are others, and have more than a suspicion about still others.

One example of this has to do with publishing, especially magazine and book publishing. My manuscripts were at a number of publishers with which the Agency had a relationship.

Another has to do with mail, especially foreign, and not only to Eastern European and Asian countries. This mail ranged from what was asked of me by the USIA to mail having to do with publishing. With the recent public testimony on this, further explanations ought not be necessary. However, I neither suggest nor believe that a proper search would be limited to that which is public and I do believe the opposite.

I am giving you examples only, although I believe that had my requests been treated seriously and honestly no examples would have been necessary. And I repeat I do have proofs in my possession and elsewhere. I can pinpoint more, and not about me only. Had my purposes in this included creating scandals or adding to the Agency's problems, I think it ought be pretty obvious that I would not have been this patient.

So I write again, again hoping for full, honest and proper response. I do want this letter interpreted as my effort to exercise all my rights under the laws and to the fullest possible extent.

It appears certain to me that if you collect all the information the Agency has obtained and examine it yourself, it will be apparent that there was also what I described as hurt and damage to me and to my rights.

If you decide that this should not have been addressed to you as from the past I believe it should be, then I hope you will notify me to whom you refer it. I think it is past time for my letters to receive response. (The regulations you gave me January 2 have been superseded and my request for those that went into effect in February has not been met. What you gave me was the August 3, 1972, revision of 32 CFR Chapter XIX only.)

Among this morning's electronic news accounts is the announcement of the release of the so-called Colby report. I would appreciate a press copy and any accompanying releases. If there is a charge, I will pay it.

My experiences of which you know reflect an an attitude that in my opinion is going to hurt the Agency more. I regret this. However, as I continue the work I have been doing for all these years it has become apparent that, in following a less than forthright policy without regard to what the future might hold and without consideration of the needs and practices and capabilities of others who faced similar problems, the Agency set itself up for still more scapegoating. Evidence I have collected make the possibility pretty clear in some detail.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

COPY