

Mr. Robert O. Goff, FOIA/PA Officer
U.S. Secret Service
Office of the Director
Washington, D.C.

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
10/22/76

Dear Mr. Goff,

Your letter dated October 15 reached me today, with the enclosure you attribute to the State Department. Yesterday I received a mailing from the Archives. I then wrote them and included copies to you in what I mailed you.

Your letter and the maskings are not acceptable. You are misusing the exemptions of the wrong Act to a ridiculous extreme. Obviously all these names are known to me. Some are in the Archives enclosures I've mailed to you.

Arbitrarily you opt to use FOIA. I used PA, too. Under it you are not entitled to charge me search fees, for example. However, a total search cost of only \$3.50 is ample indication that you did not make a search that under the Acts must be in "good faith" and with "due diligence." When you have made a real search, including a search for those records the existence of which I have already informed you about in some detail, and when you provide proper copies without torturing the Acts and denying me my rights, I'll pay the xeroxing costs promptly. Meanwhile, I am turning what you have sent over to counsel.

If you do not know cause a real search to be made please forward this as my appeal, if I have not already appealed what under the law is a de facto denial.

I am also disturbed that you, a lawyer, fly into the face of the law and controlling decisions in your spurious claim to the rights to privacy where there is none and where the names of agents may not be withheld. Moreover, in this case you, personally, knew from the Archives that it was providing unmasked records. This is an agree-to device among the federal investigative agencies which are determined not to live within the Acts. Your enclosure is an example of why they dare not. It is outrageous in its factual error and its deliberate prejudices I will specify to the degree necessary to exercise my PA rights to the correct^{ch} of defamatory records such as this.

I begin by noting contradictions of fact between this memo and the Secret Service card provided by the Archives which is supposedly based on this memo.

Next I want to know by what right you forwarded such prejudicial misinformation to the Department of State when I was neither its employee nor a candidate for its employment. You may have no record of forwarding, as I think you should be able to locate, but you do have lawbooks and can cite them.

If you had not masked even addresses I might be able to direct you to those files that obviously have not been searched. This document, ~~however~~ however, does include some routing so I ask if you have had these files checked. Three different sets of files are indicated plus a number. The number can be taken to indicate that this is but one in a series of records.

Because I will be sending a copy of this to State, which is months late in complying, and to my lawyer, who is going to take this to court if there is not full and prompt compliance, I include a reminder that you have not in any way responded to or even acknowledged my telling you to search files of alleged threats because you did have me under surveillance after the fabrication of a report that I had made such a threat. I had not.

I will not take time for full comment on this 12/15/54 report. My purposes are the correcting of error under PA.

On the first page, although it is of little consequence now, there is SA Griffith's opinion (you mask his name) that my "farm is strewn with debris and is very unkempt looking..." What would you expect with construction going on? When Mr. Griffith came,

if my memory is correct after 22 years, late on a Saturday afternoon, I was covered on the upper half with sawdust and the lower half with chicken manure. I had been working on a building with a neighbor who was a carpenter. Whatever your agent had in mind by "debris," I have no reason to believe that he was familiar with poultry equipment or other items of farm usefulness. It was customary to cleanse poultry equipment by exposing the individual parts to sun and rain in addition to chemical sanitizing. Odds and ends of metal, like parts of feeders, waterers and nests, may well have appeared "unkept" to your agent or to have been "debris" when they were in fact normal farm equipment. With construction work going on - and I was then enlarging the main hen-house and expanding brooding and bearing capacity - inevitably I had lumber of various kinds strewn where convenient for use of disposal. I had what may have appeared to be meaningless, range shelters, in the pasture. I had what may have looked like junk but was chutes for the moving of concrete and means of spreading and smoothing that concrete. But by any standard, including that of the University of Maryland, my poultry was exceptionally well-kept under sanitary conditions. I am addressing more than accuracy. I am addressing your agent's competence to offer even an opinion that makes a record prejudicial to me.

At the top of page 2, again depending on memory, you have masked a name you had to know I knew, "as Donevan."

There is more poison on this page even for the paranoia of that period. I like the language "persistent odium of communistic affiliations" when there is not a single one for me and consumer-type groups only for my wife. As of then I am fairly certain my memberships or "affiliations" were limited to the Newspaper Guild and the recognized AFL government-employees union. Since then I have been a member of agricultural cooperatives and the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences only. How "odious" can I be? Or "communistic," especially for that period, when the Voice of America used me and the State Department asked me to go to Russia to teach them how to raise better chickens after what is referred to later in this memo?

Consumerism may have been communistic to the police and authoritarian minds of that era. Today Ralph Nader is a national symbol, a folk hero.

"Mr. Weisberg was allegedly dropped from the LaFollette Senate Investigating Committee for leaking news (sic) to the Daily Worker and for (unspecified and false) other questionable conduct."

"Allegedly" is the one accuracy in all of this. If your agent had made anything like the kind of investigation required when the safety of the President and an entire system of society are at stake you would have known that I was then the committee's editor whose responsibility was limited to the public and published record of that committee's public hearing and reports filed with the Senate. I had no secrets, I leaked none, if I could have I could not, and it was not the Daily Worker, either. It was a news service and the whole thing was contrived because with the most anti-communist man I have ever known, the legislative representative of that notorious "red" UMW president John Lewis, I lobbied through the Senate an extension of that committee's life over La Follette's objection. Now if you want to know how "communist" this was, you can read John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath, which covers the same ground as that committee's investigation of migratory workers. (P.S. - the then President's wife was for it, but maybe the "odium of communistic affiliations followed" her to you types?)

"Mr. Weisberg was reputedly a close friend of Vito Marcantonio, the notoriously radical representative from New York City." The part about friendship is true. That "notoriously radical" opinion is a reflection of basic police-mind aversion to representative society. The late Mr. Marcantonio was the first man in the history of this country to win the primaries of all three major parties in his constituency. He was ahead of most of us in some ways, like his espousal of what some still consider radical, like equal opportunity. I drove him to see President Roosevelt the day the President offered him a "deal" he accepted on fair employment practices, a bill he sponsored. In fact I drove him to see Mr. Roosevelt on several occasions, others having to do with the President's

desires having nothing to do with "communistic affiliations." (New York did not have its own diplomatic relations during that era but it did have a large Latin vote and the President's wife did have political enemies.)

On page 5 there is a reference to the Un-American committee having been consulted about me. It is alleged that a copy of a report is attached. It is not and I'd like it. I am reasonably confident it will not be produced because I got that committee's agent convicted of two felonies. However when I was writing a book about the late Mr. Dies and his committee, he did try to frame me, with the conviction of his fink resulting. Do you consider that an "odium" attaches to me after the Congress came to the same conclusions I did, albeit somewhat later? But how faithful is this report when it totally suppressed that? It is a matter of court record.

"Mr. Weisberg was also dropped from the State Department in 1947 as a security risk." (page 2) Is this why I find on page 5 that this is repeated but on page 6 that it says of "the State Department Security Section" that "they had no file on Mr. Weisberg"?

Do you people never ask yourselves any questions?

It is here that your report says the FBI has "a comprehensive report" on my wife and me, and she is this damergous subversive. Well, I'll bet that this report, also not provided by you or State of the FBI about a year after my request, does not include the fact that Mr. Hoover, the founding father of the FBI, sent my wife a bottle of Cherry Heering one night at dinner time. Yup, he was in "association" with dangerous people. and during the war, too. I was off in the Army. Mr. Marcantonio had taken my wife to dinner at Harvey's, next to the Mayflower, and Mr. Hoover did extend this courtesy. What else when my wife was with that "notoriously radical representative," elected and re-elected, that is.

It is not only on this page that I am alleged to be " a radical and a communist." here and elsewhere it is attributed to my "neighbors." Well, it was not only them. It was some of my relatives in that tiny community in which I was the only one of the fewer than 100 who had gone to college. Salignment is not always welcome. I was indeed, from the tone and content of this report, an authentic radical. It evolved around my being a volunteer fireman. I fostered the most communistic of innovations. They were not welcome by the bureaucracy that was self-important only because of office in that fire department. This radicalism of mine consisted of opposing that bureaucracy in its attachment to an outdated past. And winning a majority of the members to my point of view. On the genuinely subversive, like two-way radio, portable pumps and the unquestionably "red," a blood program, made even more "red" because it was in "association" with the "Red Cross." Why I even gave my own blood (read red) and have all those willing blood-typed so that in an emergency doctors would know upon whom to draw, there being no doctor in that community.

On page 3 I would "welcome the opportunity to be a purveyor to the White House and will use this status to enhance his commercial prestige." This no doubt explains why in all the literature I printed I never ~~was~~ used President Eisenhower's letters and those of his secretary; never asked to be a purveyor; and refused to go to the White House to be photographed with the President when I was told that picture would be distributed by the White House. There are other similar references elsewhere. They are ~~flawed~~ false. The fact is that there are few secrets in a small community. Mrs. Dulles' secretary customarily phoned me while I was dressing the poultry I would deliver the next day and my employes (names masked as though I did not know them) could not but overhear this and my directions to them to meet the Dulleses desires.

Here you do say what is not the fact from what I have been provided, that the FBI report "accompanies this report." (Page 3)

At the bottom of this page you mask the name of my wife's cousin, naturally unknown to me, "_____ helps Mr. Weisberg in the outside work of feeding and caring for his chickens."

4

On page 4 I kept the chicks I obtained from Wisconsin "in incubators until they are sufficiently matured." "Matured" is hardly the word. Over-ripe would be far short. In no time flat they have stunk to high Heaven. Incubators are for hatching, not rearing. And strange as it may seem, once hatched they had to be fed. ⁱⁿ incubators?

On page 5 your people can't even describe a Senate committee. I was not in any "Investigative Branch" of the one I served. It had no such thing.

Here I also am credited with a "brief military service?" Even my hospitalization of about four months I would not consider "brief." And I did not give myself the medical discharge, strange as this may seem to the Secret Service. The Army did.

After this, it says, I "entered the State Department and was employed by them as a Research Analyst." well, I did not break in and I did not apply. I was transferred with that part of intelligence that was transferred. But you did go a little bit fast. I was decorated. How did your impartial agents miss that?

How also did they miss my criminal life? I did violate a law. It can't be that this missing FBI report missed that. I was an unregistered British agent - after the Nazi-Soviet pact and before the attack on Pearl Harbor. "Odium" indeed!

The ⁴/_{top} of Page 6 is truly contemptible, no doubt account ⁱⁿ for the masking of the bottom of Page 5. The fact is that when I lived in Washington it is I who went to Hyattstown from Washington every Saturday night to see to it that my mother-in-law and the aged father for whom she cared were provided with groceries, which I paid for; and that in need they had medical care. This ~~was~~ was my regular practice from before my wife and I were married. It continued until I went into the Army, when my wife did it. When she was not engaged in other such subversive activities as spending nights after her regular work typing letters home for those ~~soldiers~~ soldiers who could not write or whose injuries prevented it. My wife's grandfather, a retired builder, regarded me as so much of a "radical" that he let me have his antique tools, not his sons or his grandsons. If you want to see some of his wooden carpentry tools, be my guest.

Well, we are almost at the end of this obscenity. And what do we find? That there is "no derogatory information concerning Mr. Weisberg" in the police, Civil Service and other files. It does not report an existing police record, or my voluntary registering of a pistol. This I can understand. It would diminish that bit about my wife's family considering me so "radical." That pistol, which you say ~~you~~ should interest you, is a functioning collector's item from my wife's grandfather to me.

On even the last page I find reason to wonder why so many Presidents have survived Secret Service protection. It was unable to get even the simplest fact straight in its report on my marketing. In practice my frozen supply, still fresh, was a reserve to assure that I could supply any demand. My demand ranged from birds as small as 3/4 lbs. to 10 lbs, for waterfowl nature assured would be seasonal, and for capons, including the surgical, which this report eliminates. As the norm what I delivered on Wednesdays was so fresh it was alive Tuesday mornings. It was not possible to have every size available every week. This was the main reason for my reserve at the Southern States locker plant. I also had a reserve at home in my own freezers, also not mentioned in this definitive inquiry on which the life of the president could hang. And the only time I permitted anyone access to my lockers was when my customers' needs did not coincide with my deliveries. Even then it was ~~was~~ a rarity.

I do want this in rectification of the wretchedness of this "report" wherever it may be filed, as your records should show if you keep records. I solicit any factual challenge of any of my representations.

I also solicit an expression of decent human emotion, of shame that such secret and baseless defamations can plague the innocent. After all these years! I also want you to know that while I do not want to join the Secret Service in a suit if you have not complied with my perfectly proper request before my lawyer can file an action I will join the Secret Service in it.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg