

Mr. Allan Adler  
Center for National Security Studies  
122 Maryland Ave., NE  
Washington, D.C. 20002

1/10/84

Dear Mr. Adler,

Thanks for the time you took for explanations in your 1/6. Because Lesar later told me he obtained the list from Allen, it is apparent that it did originate with you.

It is not now possible for me to review all the records I have because I am limited in what I can do by serious medical problems and by the temporary infirmity of my wife, who broke a bone last week. However, I enclose a copy of one that I believe is in point in my basic belief, that there is no deal, no agreement, no law that the CIA will abide with and that it will corrupt any amendment of the present FOIA and will use it to magnify the mendacity that has characterized it in all my cases and with regard to virtually all my requests.

I use this version of the record I received from the CIA rather than the original to underscore: the CIA was the defendant in that lawsuit, my request for all records pertaining to me was in 1971, and even after being reminded in the litigation the pertinent OS records remain withheld without any claim to any exemptions.

When book reviews are within the duties of OS, can there be anything that isn't, anything that can't be hidden under OS classification or filing? And even these book reviews remain withheld.

My interest is in the preservation of FOIA not in my own requests and I am and long have been trying to conclude the litigation under conditions that would not permit permanent suppression of what I sought and did not obtain. I want to use as much as possible of the time I have remaining for writing. But the government has prolonged all the litigation.

With regard to agencies other than the CIA, particularly DJ and FBI, I believe that while it would require much time (that I think no one will take) a review of my cases and particularly the permeating false swearing in them would be helpful in defending the Act.

FBI

In CAs 78-0322-0420 combined the requests are for all/Dallas and New Orleans FBI field office records related in any way to the JFK assassination and its investigation. The very day of the assassination the CIA Mexico City station informed Dallas that it had pertinent information and this information was flown to Dallas in a Navy plane and in the possession of FBI SA Eldon Rudd, later a Congressman. All additional information, including the transcripts and paraphrases of the CIA's tape and photographs remain withheld, after appeal, even after interpretative disclosure in another disclosed FBI record. (Interpretation: negative on identification of Oswald.)

The same information is within my requests of the CIA beginning in 1975 and still not complied with. Most remain entirely ignored. Even what is later disclosed to others remains withheld from me.

Also illustrating that the CIA's word (and compliance with law) simply cannot be taken is what it did in C.A. 75-1448. The very day the government's appeals brief was due it disclosed what it had withheld and provided this sworn explanation: it had to disclose to me what it had disclosed to the House Select Committee on Assassination. Since then I have not received a single additional record after these two were disclosed. Examination of these disclosed records reveals that there was nothing in them subject to classification and withholding and that the withholding was to prevent embarrassment (and what I assume, to harass me and keep me tied up

in litigation, the latter an explicit FBI scheme put in writing on two different occasions and approved on highest levels).

I am aware that 1984 is not 1973, when all public interest groups of which I knew also were seeking compromises to avoid gutting of the Act. The only people I then had contact with were the Nader lawyers whose negative attitudes toward me did not change when I turned out to be correct and a prophet. But my view, which may again be a minority view, is that the only way to preserve what remains of the Act is to refuse to compromise on anything, to fight vigorously, and to expose these people. I believe that if there is any amendment it will turn out to be the means by which the CIA discloses nothing it does not want to disclose.

I do not recall whether I read the S. 1324 report but it would not make any difference to me. I have been part of our intelligence and I have worked with both the FBI and DJ divisions and I have been in State intelligence, besides my not inconsiderable experience in litigation. These people have their own concepts of right and wrong, of national interest and even patriotism, and they cannot abandon or even modify them and do their jobs as they view doing their jobs. (The enclosed CIA OS record is incorrect in including North Africa in my OSS experience. I was then in the WPs and had no connection with OSS. While I was a trouble-shooter and worked for many components, I was never a spook and was always an intelligence analyst. And, no offense intended, did what the lawyers failed to do or were unable to do.)

It would be better for me if Jim Lesar provided the pages relating to the CIA's Mexico City Oswald information because of my present limitations and I will ask him to do so with a copy of this letter. However, if he cannot because he is too busy I'll dig those appeals out and send them to you. Those records are in my basement and I can use the stairs only once or twice a day. My copier is not in the basement. This withheld information also is within the CIA's attestation in C.A. 77-1448, that it could not withhold from me what it disclosed to HSCA. Moreover, it was also page-1 stuff coast-to-coast. Jim may be able to provide you with the front page of a Chicago paper he picked up in that airport when we were on our way back to Washington. The entire front page of that major tabloid was on this. The day before Jim sent the AG a telegram for me on it and we still await any response. That was more than seven years ago, too.

CI also engaged in domestic activity, withheld in its entirety from me. Those people, or some because I did not know all, shifted to other agencies (aside from retirements) in the wake of Watergate scandals (in which the CIA also lied and got away with significant withholdings). There is so much that has not come out and I am not now able to do anything about! And how it should be exposed! I am confident, for example, that you would be able to establish a CIA book non-publishing operation in addition to acknowledged program for getting books published - and that you would find E. Howard Hunt involved and with at least the two cover addresses I have established. One of these makes Helms a perjurer all over again.

Your reference to "JFK assassination files requests" is not inaccurate but it does not reflect the focus of my work for more than a decade. I have been studying and writing about the functioning or non-functioning of government at the time of those crises and thereafter. Of course this requires those records but what distinguishes me from the others known as critics is this focus.

I do hope I am wrong but I believe that it is not possible to write any amendment that the CIA will not contort to its own purposes, as it pretty much always had. And if you want any examples of what they pull in in camera affidavits, let me know and remind me to send you the affidavits it filed in the Heind case in Baltimore. I think Lesar also has them and could provide them faster. (CA 15952 there and don't ask Jim, I have them in my office.)



My experiences with their and DJ's lawyers is that nothing shames or deters them and it indicates that they will (or perhaps already) have a shop set up for rewriting the amendment the way they want it, not the way Congress enacts it.

Lawyers reminds me. The enclosure was withheld by OS from the CIA's general counsel and based on whatever they did let him have he lied to me in the letter he wrote. They could not even tell the truth about my letters to the Director. There were three. They gave the general counsel only one. And when I gave him the others it still made no difference.

The first paragraph of the enclosure also includes a typical FBI/CIA evasion with regard to surveillances, limiting them to one component and then avoiding the existing records. At the least CIA had my public appearances monitored and not from it I have copies. They used a private company, whose bills do not mention CIA and the checks in payment also do not. I have samples of both.

Please excuse my haste and jumping around. We are about to be snowed in and I expect someone who can mail this letter in town for me.

I wish I could bring myself to be less pessimistic about any FOIA amendment, but I do wish you the best of luck in what you do.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg