

Mr. John S. Pruden, Director  
Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center  
Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20520

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701  
4/23/77

Dear Mr. Pruden,

By another of those coincidences that are mere happenstance and in no sense the result of prior consultations your unsigned letter stamp-dated the 21st came today with two others on the same subject after, naturally, plenty of time for the consultation that there was not. No need to deny it. It just happens regularly.

If the situation I do not hide seems foreign to you then you have not walked all these years in the Indian'soccasins or you have a different concept of the United States. Especially basic, traditional belief.

Because I will not acknowledge agreement with his traditional authoritarianism to him I do not respond directly to Victor "the dick" Dibben whose letter stamp-dated March 18 or more than a month before yours you enclosed. He never sent me a copy of that letter and for mere mortal what he did in not sending it is illegal. But then he is not a mortal, he is an official and an official dick at that, each making his insane.

This is not to say that I am unwilling to confess a personal debt to him. I'll explain it so you can convey my appreciation should you have the inclination.

He begins "On November 23, 1975 you requested access to your records with (sic) the Federal Bureau of Investigation..."

At that time I was not long out of the hospital. Only three days earlier I had returned from a debate with David Belin, of whom I presume you have heard, in such condition that when the airlines looked at me it single-loaded me and sat a nurse next to me on the flight. The date just happened to coincide with Mr. Belin's abrupt change of position and his public demand for an investigation of the JFK assassination. Not that he had not been part of one, which is another story, or a reinvestigation, quite a story.

Because I was not in the best of shape when I made this request of the FBI I withheld my carbon of it. The FBI never acknowledged this request. Nor did it in subsequent correspondence under a repeated request acknowledge the first one, the dick's one.

Under either and with the FBI's maxim claim to a backlog its processing of this request, of which as yet I have no official acknowledgement from it, is extraordinarily tardy. Even for the FBI. Except with me.

I am not going to contest the dick's dictat that his refusal to send me a Department document is in accord with regulation. Total experience to now is to the contrary. In each and every case of FBI referral the FBI has asked the agency of origin to provide me with copies that in no single case the FBI has provided. Surprisingly enough in each and every such case the agency of origin has originally denied the existence of any such document if not any at all.

Now if you would care to inform me in your official capacity that the agency of origin is not supposed to provide records I'll look forward to any citation of law, regulation or accepted practice you can provide, you having provided the letter that in more than a month your law-and-order dick did not. Law = 10 days except for insane dicks.

Now if I were a ~~single~~ suspicious person I'd suspect you and your dick are trying to whisker me. Instead - note an inconsistency.

He wrote me five weeks ago, although I did not learn it until today, that you "will" notify me about what you have not notified me.

The dick says the FBI told him of only three documents "originated in full or in part in the Office of Security, Department of State." From this I take it that your dicks send to the FBI what you do not consider worth keeping yourselves and your dicks can't distinguish between full and part. If the latter is perhaps the highest compliment that from personal experience I can pay them it does say that there are your record you have not provided me. They are called for by my requests, I do ask for them and I also ask for two explanations: why they were not supplied and why their existence was either lied about or not disclosed, take your choice.

Five weeks is more time that the law permits, as is the time of exactly 15 months since this request of the FBI. I'm a little impatient. I'd like you copy and I'll await the FBI's. If you would have a statutory right to refuse this I ask what it is.

But the dick's version is not the same as your letter says. And you, while saying in the first paragraph that these are to be released, tells me in the second of a right to appeal. But from the information headed "appeals produced" you enclose I cannot appeal because you have not made a denial. I therefore ask that if you were too timid to specify a denial - or too ashamed - that you forward this as my appeal unless you now provide the records you also have not provided.

You are cute if not wise clever in closing by informing me of my right to amend. You even enclose a memo on how to do it. The problem is that without knowing anything about the records not provided in this whipsaw arrangement I am without basis for even claiming a right to amend. I can't do a single thing your enclosure requires of me except what no longer makes sense to do, prove that I am me. Naturally enough you know this because you are also the amending authority.

If this is the way the Department deals with foreign powers the conspicuous lack of diplomatic accomplishment is explained. But I am not a foreign power. I am an American citizen. The law says you must give me these records without delay, within a time frame that has already expired or give me some citation of applicable exemption and you have done neither.

You are not as imaginative as other agencies. They merely invent exemptions.

But you did enclose one of the three documents referred back by the FBI, the 7/11/47 letter from John E. Peurifoy to the Attorney General. (Naturally the Department keeps no copies of its letters to the Attorney General, particularly not of such content.) Fortunately from the personal knowledge of him already and without knowledge of this reflected in my letters I do not have to wonder if he was, as he signed himself, the Assistant Secretary, or as you describe him, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security. From the personal account I have already provided if there is no accounting for his having reached either rank it is apparent that for other Department employees it is a blessing there was not more than one to knock them down.

Despite the unjustifiable markings in his letter it is a self-representation of a man who was with others as he ended up being with himself. If you are now aware, he killed himself in Guatemala, regardless of what spooks and dicks tried to make of it.

First he says the Attorney is aware of the firing of employees of whom I was one, if you have not yet provided me with any record of this. To now that is. The Department records you have provided do not include my being fired.

Then he says that not only does the Attorney General know on his own but our names had been given to the FBI.

But this is not enough. He then adds, the only purpose of this letter, that he is personally giving the Attorney General - personally - our names that the Attorney General had two official ways, those specified, plus an unofficial way, the leaking of them to the Washington Times-Herald, not mentioned.

Even this is not enough. He concluded with the offer, "Our files on these individuals are, of course, available for your use (sic) should you wish to have them."

As you should know under the since-invalidated McCarran Rider all you needed to fire me was that I retained any blood after this Peurifoy bleeding. I'm not at all sure that my death would not have been ample grounds for firing me.

There are four sentences in this Hitlerian letter, including the formalities. Each one solicits some act by the Attorney General when there was only in a sick mind any possibility of considering any act, meaning criminal action. The third sentence actually tries to pressure him, a la Otopka, to "whatever action you may consider necessary."

Now there is nothing in the records you have provided me, nothing a maniacal Peurifoy even, could consider warranting even the suspicion of any "action" the Attorney General of the United States could "consider necessary."

Can there possibly have been any such records on me and any official of the Department permitted destroying them?

If there are and were no such records on me how can the Department persist in this infamy. Is the post-McCarthy Department of State less than the post-Stalin Soviet Union?

Even if I was the victim of the McCarthyite pre-McCarthy Department which raised the sick Peurifoy to high station from the most menial of employment and then dispatched him to Guatemala. Need I tell you what ensued in Guatemala? Besides his killing himself?

Three decades have passed. In all this time has the Department put no single person in any position of authority who has a sense of shame, personal, professional or on behalf of the Department? Clearly when you send me what you have you lack it.

You, personally, are so bitterly vindictive that you have not responded to my reiterated request of years standing for the regulations that applied at the time the Department even gipped me out of the pay that was due me. I had to cash in my retirement to survive. (I am now 64 and in less than perfect health.)

Now don't tell me that you destroyed not only whatever garbage Peurifoy had in mind but all Department regulations of that era. I am appealing this de facto denial if I have not already.

I have asked for and have not been provided with copies of the Department's records on the news attention to the leaks that provided all the supposedly secret names. Blood was not enough to the Peurifoyian Shillocks. Now don't try and tell me that with this that was entirely without precedent, this that involved the blackmailing of the then Secretary by Congressional Nazis there also remains no single record. And is any Secretary blackmailed that such? This is a denial I appeal if I have not.

Instead of responding to this perfectly proper request you resort to the obscenity of pretending otherwise, of obliterating all the names but mine for all the world as though they had not been leaked to the Times Herald. And been an international sensation, personally ruinous to those it was the Department's intention to ruin.

The one vestige of decency is your refusal to sign your name.

With this new insight into John Peurifoy I remind you of my personal conversations with him to which, fortunately, I have referred earlier. I believe this kind of political paranoid made records of them. I want those records or any records of their destruction.

I also want all records of all searches in compliance (sic) <sup>with</sup> my requests preserved. I am not dropping this matter here or now.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg