



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

December 1, 1978

James H. Lesar, Esq.  
910 Sixteenth Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Mr. Lesar:

This is in response to the administrative appeal of your client, Harold Weisberg, from denial of access to records concerning him by the Baltimore field division.

We have agreed with the Office of Privacy and Information Appeals, U. S. Department of Justice, to make the additional release of information contained in the attached records.

Sincerely yours,

*Allen H. McCreight / JPC*

Allen H. McCreight, Chief  
Freedom of Information-  
Privacy Acts Branch  
Records Management Division

Enclosure



(Mount Clipping in Space Below)

# Letters To The Editor

## CLAIMS DETRICK-LIKE EDITORIAL ON HOOD

To the Editor, Sir: There is an ostrich-like quality in your reporting and editorial on the firing of Dr. Thomas Hood by Hood College that results in the most serious reflections on people I am confident you did not intend.

Nowhere in your otherwise line reporting by Phil Niklaus or in our lengthy editorial is there any reference to the fact that Dr. Rose was subjected to pressure by the FBI or its director when, as a professor of American University, his class was instantaneously quit by 11 FBI agents. Yet you knew this, having reported it.

As a result, there will always linger the suspicion that Mr. Hoover demanded Dr. Rose's firing, or that the college administration spontaneously did what it conceived he would like.

Yet from what is available, there really seems to be no reason other than this incident behind the firing, various lies having been told to explain it failing to. Can it be the alleged "professional immaturity" that led so large a publisher as Random House to publish Dr. Rose, or American University to engage him? If it is "unprofessional" for Dr. Rose to have informed his students that he had been fired, can you honestly say of the blatant lie by the college president, that the reasons were economic, that it was no more than "less than frank"?

What emerges from all of this is a backwardness that hodes ill for the college, its students and the entire community. Inherent is an antipathy to fresh air, an aversion to any ideas more advanced than the horse and buggy eras, a reluctance to bring students into contact with the realities of the world in which they live, whether or not those realities are pleasant and congenial.

Aside from the right of the students to get something more than the best the 18th century can

offer by way of education, there is the right of the parents who pay a premium for a Hood education to get their money's worth, daughters who are prepared for and prepared to rear children who can cope with modern life and its new problems.

At this time of economic crisis in the community, it is foolhardy to hope that corporations will find in this pathetic relic of an outgrown past encouragement for locating here. Whether or not such ideas are consistent with the views of management, it is precisely this kind of attitude and thinking that discourages imaginative and forward-looking minds, the kind required today by industry. The kind of people who can make a success of new industry in the area just will not want to live in a community with so out-dated a perspective. This I know from my own contacts with agencies whose function it is to encourage new industries.

As for the girls, are they not entitled to the "inalienable" rights of all, including that of free speech? Are they to remain mute at what they regard as wrong? Does this make them better students, better humans? Or wives? What man in today's world wants a three-monkey's wife?

I do not believe you intended your editorial expression to be what it really is, an endorsement of authoritarianism, a preaching for it as a way of life, and a plea that students, especially girls, never question the judgments of their elders or those who control their lives.

Yet who is making the decisions, controlling the lives of these girls? Respectable liars, character assassins, cloaked in an Emperor's Clothes piety, people with, no doubt, the best intentions and what they regard as honorable purposes but engaging in public conduct that cannot be condoned.

It is a credit to the girls that they have the spunk to protest. They do us all a service.

College is the place to expand minds, not contract vision and understanding. It is where emerging young adults make real contact with the realities of life, learn what it is, and should learn what they can accept and what they feel they must reject. Certainly this cannot be accomplished except by subjecting the growing minds to all available ideas. It cannot be accomplished by the suppression of thoughts not personally pleasing to whoever may at any time be in administrative authority.

The question of academic freedom here is so obvious - for the students as for the teachers - that it requires no comment.

What we have is a demeaning Frederick variant of the "cultural revolution" we so condemn elsewhere.

Let us sterilize a polluted society, not minds and ideas.

I have no notion of Dr. Rose's beliefs. They are irrelevant. The sole issue, once the college hires him is whether he is a competent teacher. If it can be shown that he is incompetent, he deserves being fired. If it cannot be, if he is indeed a competent sociologist and a competent teacher, he has earned his job and we all need him, particularly if he holds minority views, whatever they may be.

It stretches credulity to imagine that Hood was not satisfied about Dr. Rose's professional qualifications before they hired him. And it is inconceivable that so large an institution as American University, which can draw upon all area colleges, almost all larger and closer than Hood, reached 50 miles out to select an incompetent.

In every aspect, this shameful affair is violative of every decent American concept. Hood's administration can redeem its integrity by doing what it owes the institution, the students, the

community and their immediate victim, offering Dr. Rose a public apology and contract.

Index ->

HAROLD WEISBERG  
Rt. 5  
Frederick, Md. 21701



(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)

Page A-4

The News

FREDERICK, MD.

Date: 12/28/79  
Edition:  
Author:  
Editor:  
Title:  
Character: 176-18-5  
or  
Classification: 100-27807  
Submitting Office:  
 Being Investigated

SEARCHED  
INDEXED  
SERIALIZED  
FILED  
1/5

100-27807-2

# Memorandum

TO : SAC, BALTIMORE (157-4616) P

DATE: 1/25/71

FROM : SA [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: MINUTEMEN - BALTIMORE DIVISION  
RM - MM

Mr. HAROLD WEISBERG, Route 8, Frederick, Md., author of controversial books regarding the assassination of President JOHN F. KENNEDY entitled "White-wash I" and "White-wash II" advised on January 5, 1970 that he has a source who is either currently or was formerly a network director for the Minutemen Organization and who furnishes him with Minutemen literature on a continuing basis. He advised that he has never met and has never had a conversation with this source, but he does correspond with him. He said that this source became familiar with him, WEISBERG, as an auditor through some radio broadcasts which Mr. WEISBERG has made.

This source, whom he declined to identify, advised him that there has recently been, since mid November, 1970, an influx of Canadian Minutemen to the West Coast and an exchange of Minutemen money on the West Coast. He claims that this source is currently being "hassled" by the FBI but that any material made available to him by this source is available for persual by the FBI.

He furnished the following Minutemen material which he wishes to have returned to him after it's use by the FBI:

A special notice to former network Director from RALPH C. DE PUGH at National Headquarters, Norborne, Missouri;

(2) - Baltimore  
RRL:hpc  
(2)

*hpc*

*(Pugh)*

157-4616-124

SEARCHED.....	INDEXED.....
SERIALIZED.....	FILED.....
JAN 26 1971	
FBI - BALTIMORE	



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

BA 157-4616

A special Directive regarding assignment of PSY - WAR project number 51 directed to number 103-081 from underground HQ;

Minutemen bulletins for mid-summer (July, 1969) February, October, 1967;

Notice to all members from 001200, Director of Propaganda;

"On Target" December, 1966

"On Target" May 1, 1966;

Eight page informative communication entitled "The Speakers"

Twelve copies of special bulletins from Director of Security, National Coordinator, Director of Recruiting and Training;

Two copies of network members bulletin;

General network bulletin to members of network number 1821;

Five letters from ROBERT B. DE PUGH to "Dear Fellow Patriot";

General bulletin to Directors from Executive Council (2 copies);

December, 1968 bulletin to network Directors;

Patriotic Party news letter for December 27, 1967 and October 17, 1967;

Various special reports, pamphlets, handouts, underground news bulletins and letters from ROBERT B. DE PUGH's wife RAMONA V. DE PUGH, members report forms and notices;

BA 157-4616

Bound Minutemen Instructions, text questions,  
training documents, bulletins, copies of  
"On Target" and other bulletins containing  
detailed instructions on the manufacture of  
booby traps and other explosive devices  
and silencers and weapons.

10/25/56 [REDACTED] recontacted. She exhibited unfriendly attitude and said she did not know when her husband would call.  
11/5/56 [REDACTED] recontacted without results.  
11/13/56 [REDACTED] recontacted in afternoon. Furnished no information about her husband's whereabouts. Agent advised he would return that evening.  
11/14/56 [REDACTED] recontacted in evening without results.  
11/14/56 [REDACTED] recontacted. Advised her husband did not come home previous night.  
11/16/56 [REDACTED] recontacted. Was very uncooperative and slammed door shut while talking to agent.

In view of the above it appears that [REDACTED] is obviously evading an interview and is not likely to be cooperative if contacted. Accordingly, no further efforts will be directed towards an interview with him.

Baltimore indices reflect that on 9/7/54 an anonymous source furnished photographic copies of lists of names which appear to represent subscribers to some publication. The following appeared on these lists:

" 73 10-53  
Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown, Maryland"

Other information furnished by the source indicated a possibility that this was a subscription list for the National Guardian.

During the course of the above inquiries it appeared that subject is not liked in the community where he resides; however, no specific information bearing adversely on his loyalty was developed. [REDACTED]

In view of the fact that there is not sufficient information to merit further investigation under current criteria for security investigations, it is recommended that this case be closed administratively.