

Route 12, Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

December 24, 1976

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

Dear Mr. Pruden:

Your letter of the 17th and its enclosures came Wednesday. I do thank you for the care taken with the packaging. I want all the records. Those you sent and those you did not send. My check for \$9.40 for those received is enclosed.

I have merely skimmed these records, but it is obvious that they are incomplete. There is, for example, nothing on the firing or what lead to it. Nothing on the conferences with the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter. To my knowledge the late Judge Arnold, Justice Fortas and Paul Porter were all personally involved, as were others of the firm. It simply is not possible that the Department has no records on this entire matter. As my request states, I want each and every one of them, whatever their form or origin.

What is represented as the investigation is not and cannot be. It refers to other records not provided. There are still other existing records of which I know that are not provided, either. In my belief this is not accidental. It is deliberate withholding of what will still embarrass the government. I believe a proper search for all the relevant records, as well as an honest study of them, can be quite helpful to the Department and its employees. I am more than merely willing to help the Department in such a study. I would hope that it would never again want such acts, so deliberately dishonest, so crooked and phony an "investigation," inflicted on it, on its employees or on the people both serve.

One illustration I do hope you will take seriously is the contriving of an entirely false representation of what happened when I undertook to write a book about the Dies committee. Before explaining that, I want to underscore the wisdom of our founding fathers in their intention to guarantee due process and the right to face accusers. Without the deliberate denial of these rights to me (even though one of the records provided recommends a hearing), none of this could have happened. Therein, I am certain, lies the reason for there being no hearing. It is dangerous as it is subversive of fundamental American belief to conduct the affairs of government with extralegal concepts and procedures. The Dies case exemplifies this.

So also do the inferences about my beliefs, all of which have become national policy and are today the prevalent beliefs. It is not only the right of Americans to hold and express beliefs - it is an obligation of representative society to function.

My belief was that the Dies committee was not only evil, it was illegal and unconstitutional. The Congress has since agreed. As a writer-investigator, I undertook to meet my obligations and exercise my rights and obligations under the First Amendment in researching and writing a book about that committee. It, knowing it could not survive accurate exposure, then undertook to entrap me. Although it is a matter of public record, there having been a judicial determination of fact, your records do not reflect this. Instead, they hold the ex parte self-serving misrepresentations of that committee. The least of these deliberate deceptions passed on by your own spooks is that I was a Communist, based on the committee's record of another one of the same last name and first initial only. However, the date and city clearly established this could not have been me.

It is worse than mere nonsense to have records stating that I conspired with a Silver Shirts in knowingly buying forgeries from him. Long before your spooks hoked up that one, it was positively established in fact that I had not bought anything from him. He was unemployed, said he was hungry, and I let him have a few dollars. Quite the opposite of conspiring, I took him before a notary public and had him execute an affidavit attesting to the ownership and authenticity of the records he provided.

There was a grand-jury investigation. He, not I, was indicted. Rather than let him stand trial, the committee made a deal in which he entered a plea of guilty, Dies made a plea for leniency, and he was given a suspended sentence of two years on two counts: uttering and forging and false pretense. The plea on behalf of his agent was not at all unusual from Dies, whose alt ernative was to be exposed as having suborned the perjury and engaging in an effort at entrapment. The forger and perjurer was in fact in the Dies pay, as my investigation also made a matter of public record.

Your "investigation" shows none of this. It cannot be a simple oversight. It was reported in the newspapers referred to in the files.

While your investigators did search the financial records of the Senate, which proved me truthful, they deliberately avoided those of the House and thus the proof that this forger and perjurer was paid by the House.

The result could not be more prejudicial, more deceptive or more deliberately dishonest.

This leads to other dishonesties - really lies - in the same records. These are made to indicate that the FBI had no records on me. The FBI conducted the prosecutorial investigation in the Dies case. It interviewed me and many other witnesses. It had extensive records I had provided. But the pretense that the FBI had no records was indispensable to the deliberate false representations about me by your spooks who were out to frame a case and wound up with one they did not dare submit to a hearing. The FBI had many other records on me. One example is their interview of me, incredible as it may seem after his conviction for felonies, when that same Dies agent was under a security investigation for a defense job. An agent actually drove all the way from the far Southwest, as I recall, New Mexico, to ask me if I considered this felon a security risk.

The FBI had and has other records on me despite the knowing lies of your investigators. They are lied about because they establish other than what your spooks wanted to phony up. The FBI also conducted a security investigation of me after that Dies case and I was cleared. In addition, I gave it records of plots against the government, quite the opposite of my being subversive. It has failed to respond to my request for the return of these records under FOIA after much more than a year. You know the Act provides ten days.

Consistent with this there is the repeating of the Dies lie that I was fired by the Senate for allegedly leaking secrets. This was impossible for I had no secrets. However, this also is proven false by the FBI's investigation; therefore, the need for the same lie that there are and were no FBI records.

I was the custodian of the public record. It was my job to make that record available to all and I did that job conscientiously. Those who received the record included reporters. Customarily I provided galley proofs in those days before xeroxing or the stenographic transcript for examination in my office. There was a regular list of those to whom such proofs were mailed, the names coming from my superiors. Among those who came to my office for how were the correspondents of all the news agencies. One of these agencies syndicated a story based on a set of the galleys of a hearing. The Daily Worker was one of its subscribers. Based on this there was the lie that I had "leaked" the "secret" to the Daily Worker. The actual reporter was an ONI man.

What was really involved is a Senator's embarrassment. He had not in fact held that hearing. A pretense of one was typed up, the sole purpose being to save the cost of the court reporter and the transcript. It was no more than a pro forma dumping of subpoenaed documents into the public record that as of the time of the alleged leaking was actually being printed for public distribution at the Government Printing Office. A leaking of the public, published record is an obvious impossibility. The truth could not have been avoided in any decent investigation so your purposeful spooks made a dishonest, incomplete investigation. Had they consulted the Library of Congress, as you can still do, they would have found this in that committee's hearings under what I recall as "Special Conference Committee." These are also available to you, or should be, from the United Mine Workers.

After I moved into the country I deposited all of those hearings I edited and the hearings of a number of other Congressional committees in the library of that union through its editor, whom I knew. The purpose was to make all of these public records available to scholars regardless of their interests. I presume this American concept would somehow be regarded as subversive by your investigators, but the fact is that archive, if poorly kept, is in current use by authentic scholars. The last report I had of this is recent and from a Professor of History at Washington University.

Now, when my fellow victim in the Dies matter was the legislative representative of the United Mine Workers, there is no honest investigation that could have avoided the records of that union. This professor has recently provided me with a record of which I had no prior knowledge from the late John Lewis' correspondence files. It is quite laudatory and establishes exactly the opposite of the false and defamatory reports, copies of which you have provided. Again the motive for a noninvestigation is apparent: they were determined to frame with false charges and to avoid any and all contrary proofs.

So again I underscore the denial of due process, the refusal of any hearing by your spooks even after an unsigned person recommended it.

I can do this with each and every item of what I regard as obscenities, the records you have provided. But my purpose is not to argue a case after three decades. I will, of course, want this record of refutation with the defamations in the Department's records until you provide what is still withheld and I can undertake a more complete effort. My purposes include making the Department aware so that it will not again engage in such indecencies or again permit paranoid political preconceptions to be substituted for actual investigations or permit fake investigations to be presented to higher authority as honest or complete investigations. There really was no end to the speak dishonesties. Another is soliciting and representing me as being unqualified for my job and even to not having written the articles my employment statement stated with complete honesty I had written. There are suggestions I did not do that writing based on the lack of a name on the stories.

I am Jewish. Haltar Annenberg, your former ambassador, the publisher of that magazine, then the third largest picture magazine in the country, is Jewish, as is the man who was the editor. They wanted me to adopt a non-Jewish name. I refused on principle. They therefore omitted my name from what remains the most definitive series of articles and investigations of which I know of Nazi cartels and their interference with our defense efforts.

The praises heaped upon my work were not unknown to your investigators because they report a careful check of all those issues of that magazine. It is my recollection that these published voluntary praises of my work included prominent Members of both Houses of the Congress, the White House, and even J. Edgar Hoover. I gave testimony to the Congress on this work.

The most cursory check of government files would have established that official actions followed my articles. Yours reports include Rohm & Haas, with "Plexiglas"

misspelled. They were vested, as was the subsidiary Resinous Products & Chemicals Corp., after my expose appeared. I recall another, Sehering, the German drug house whose American operation was then in Bloomfield, New Jersey. I am sure there were others.

Any perfunctory investigation would have established the opposite of these nasty inferences of subversion. I gave government agencies photostats of all my investigations. Again quite the opposite of these inferences of subversion, at the suggestion of the Department of Justice I became a voluntary and unpaid agent of British intelligence.

This was before the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union. That should be a definitive enough addressing of these rotten inferences as it is an explanation for their omissions.

Mine were unusual competences. They were not college-taught. I was hired initially for them and they were used. Therefore, I was employed at doing for them what the overeducated and underpractical Ph.D.'s could not do. I did it with regularity, in and out of OSS, for the Department when I was and was not part of the Department, even for the White House when all the intelligence agencies and departments had failed the White House. Were there any point in it, I could still provide countless specifics. It is all exactly the opposite of the fakery palmed off by your spooks as an investigation. I am taking this time to show the Department how it can and should avoid the kind of terrible thing it did to me and others.

You can easily check the first such assignment of any magnitude. I was in charge of the economic part of the Department's preparations for the following of a policy later changed. It was the case against the Peron dictatorship as Nazi-dominated for use at Chapultepec; as I recall, Nelson Rockefeller was in charge of the American delegation. He elected not to use the case against that dictatorship. I can add much more on this, including the preparations for the San Francisco organizational meeting of the United Nations.

The same sort of thing is reflected in the FC note saying I was to be denied information about the Franco Falange. I had been assigned to the preparation of a paper on the antiAmerican and antidefense influence of Franco's Falange in Latin America. You might want to wonder now why FC would want its information not to be available in the preparation of the Department's policy statement.

So the paranoid spooks with their irrational fears - had I been a Communist, which I have never been, it would not have hurt to let me have information on the Falange for guidance of the Department - were able to adversely influence policy. I am sure you have not forgotten that Franco was Hitler's ally and Hitler was our enemy.

The records show that the ivory-tower type who became division chief wanted only "scholars," meaning those loaded with degrees but no know-how. I'll never forget his two criticisms of that paper. One is that I drew too heavily on FBI sources. (No, they were not denied me and for all their errors were the best.) The other that "no scholar worthy of his salt" would refer to an earlier United States statement of policy - one this stuffed shirt had drafted himself and forgotten he had drafted.

This appears to coincide with the making of an ally of the enemy Franco.

Naturally, the spooks followed up with inferences that are without any foundation about my excellent efficiency rating. These inferences extend to allegations of some impropriety about my associations with my superiors, those I would never have known had the government not put me to work with them. There are no such inferences about my friendly associations with those of the opposite end of the political spectrum - such as a Dominican who was friendly with Trujillo and as I now recall was related to him.

There are sneers about an alleged association with what is called the "Gregory" case. What this may be is not specified because your spooks have to be secretive in their own secret papers. I can think of one with which I believe the man you made my boss was supposedly connected, the case of the economist Gregory Silvermaster. I know nothing else about him except that one of the students with whom I had lived years earlier had him as a professor in a graduate course at a Washington university.

This is not even guilt by association. It is guilt without association.

A neighbor whose name is hidden did not like me and that is credible and credited, without any indication of whether the neighbor had any knowledge or whether there had been any dispute. But the White House speaks exceedingly well of me and that is entirely irrelevant. I can't be a solid, loyal citizen if those in the White House who knew and worked with me say so. After all, they only had personal knowledge of my services to the government. By this point in your files those who knew of my belief in the Constitution also are not worth crediting. The attitude of the spooks to it is clear enough, as is that of the Department they were able to manipulate into a total abrogation of all my Constitutional rights. So completely that even now I am told there is not even an administrative appeal from the diktat of your spook Mikeas.

I dispute that here and now and I do appeal it.

Having an apartment full of books is actually presented as sinister in your records. The sick woman who was represented as my landlady is sufficient authority for this. Her husband, who was my landlord, is not referred to. I do not know what happened between her and your spooks because you are careful to withhold their actual reports. But if you want her wedding furniture, I can provide it. She first loaned it to my wife and me and then sold it to us for next to nothing. This is what she was until your people started working on her. After the Dies gang and the FBI which provided you, from what you have given me, with no records.

So I am subversive because I had books and received lots of mail from government agencies. Have you heard of a correspondent who did not get press releases? Did your demon investigators check your own files to see the reality, that a large part of this mail was State press releases?

You now have no questions about what agency went through my garbage and you are trying to tell me you have no records on it after such an investigation? Did you ever hear of the First Amendment and about illegal searches and seizures? But then there is something wrong with me for believing in the Constitution, so perhaps I should not ask this question.

There is an obvious explanation: I was not a bad person and my garbage produced nothing proving I was, so the results are suppressed.

Can you still believe that the FBI had no files on me? You did not include one I have referring to a single FBI record on my wife and me 31 pages long! I did ask for and I do want all records.

A mail cover was not enough, so you have "landlady's" report on my mail and ^{not} you also have no record from the agency that supposedly arranged both?

It was impossible for the "landlady" to cover my mail. The mailman put it in a locked box recessed in the wall. It also is impossible that I had any mail from the Communist Party, a statement attributed to her. With the official mail cover, there would have been proof of this and there is not. The reason is because it never happened so your spooks threw this in for further prejudice.

How many agencies were there in those days to go through people's garbage and put mail covers on them? There was no CIA, although your later records show reference

to referrals to the CIA. There was no NSA, although there is a later reflection of NSA interest in me.

You also provide me with no record of your making this not available to other agencies. I do ask for such records and I do believe they exist.

I did work for the OSS, which was run by a conservative Republican, who saw fit to decorate me for my services. You investigators did not turn this up. They checked my college files away but not the local OSS records on my work? Naturally. If they had, they would not have dared their innuendoes and slurs substituted for and accepted as fact.

You supply me with secondhand and incorrect records saying my wife and I were both fired for subversion. This is utterly and deliberately false with respect to both of us. However, this is also still another reflection of your knowledge that the records you supplied are not and cannot be complete. This may or may not explain a four-month delay in sending me the Dikens letter and its two-few attachments.

What venomous falsehood! I can only wonder how common it is when your paranoid called investigators are cloaked with immunity and total secrecy. However, you have now stamped some of these false records as unclassified. If you distribute any of them in or out of government, it will be over my objection and if I learn of it I will see if I have recourse.

From this I think you can understand my sincerity in asking for all records of any and all distribution of this wretched fabrication and any and all other files. There have been subsequent and entirely improper official investigations of me because of my writing. I have some records of them. The investigations did have access to these miserable falsifications.

The records you have provided are ample proof of their own incompleteness. I believe neither you nor your staff are so unsophisticated this was not apparent to you-

I am aghast at all of this even though I lived through the McCarthy era. I had thought we had outgrown that evil. Yet the Department is still practicing it with me. It refused me any kind of hearing to disprove these defamations, but it all was available to all others in the overgrown and overpowerful federal spookery, which has its own ways of leaking such defamations.

This file is so incomplete it does not even show that you fired me! Your files falsely show that I resigned because of all that awful stuff.

Not only do the files have no record of the firing, they have no copy of any of the news accounts.

Who besides the Department knew of the firings? Who could have leaked it to the then ultra Times-Herald? Later there were major stories of entirely opposite character in other papers, particularly the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune. You have no copies of these in the files, for me now or to have shown to the other spooks over all the years? Can you really believe that these stories were not in the files?

From this, which is incomplete and from a hasty skimming, some of the other insanity is more credible. It has to do with my subsequent career after the Department did all in its power to make me unemployable. I became a farmer, a successful and world-famous farmer. The Department even asked me if I would go to Russia to teach them how to raise better chickens. As I now recall, the name the call was from was Hillis Lorrre or Lawry (phonetic). You provide me with no records on this. It was after I had challenged the Russians to "peaceful competition" in poultry - at the desire of the USIA.

Can the Department's filing system be this selective?

It had no case to make out against me then to keep the Congressional Neanderthals happy, another matter you do have on file and have withheld from me. If those parts of the files on me have been purged, look into those on the Secretary's appearances on the Hill, into the appropriations hearings, especially of the House. Particularly under the name there of Harold Barger.

Having no case, one was manufactured, possible because it was all in secret.

Years have passed so perhaps you can bring yourself to check the names of the ten of us. You will find all but one, a case of mistaken identity, are Jewish. One was married to a Jew. In my group all were Jews, I the only one married to a non-Jew.

Your records as provided do not show it and I am certain you have and are withholding records relevant to it, but it is I who organized those who joined in with me in fighting this anti-American authoritarianism that was practiced against us. It is I who conducted enough of an investigation to be certain of what happened. Whether or not Departmental spooks or the like-minded inspired it, the demand for what happened was from the House Appropriations committee. The demand was made of the Secretary who was later called a traitor by Joe McCarthy, without his President taking public offense.

Once they had gone through all of this with me, your spooks had to take vengeance on ailing Secretary Dulles who was my customer when I farmed. Prior to his fatal illnesses, he suffered from the gout. My birds were among the few foods he could eat without regrets. He relished them so he used them in his wheeling and dealing, as his wife used them also in her entertaining. I was consulted regularly so I could serve better.

Whatever their reason, and self-justification is an obvious possibility, your vengeful spooks pretended that I presented some unspecified hazard to the Dulleses and their guests. They suggested that the Dulleses stop dealing with me. Not that if I had intended them harm and if that was even possible there had not been a very long period in which I could have made the attempt. Not that if such a thing were possible and if I had been a subversive I could not have poisoned every official at the SEATO organizational meeting. Or countless ambassadors. Or Winston Churchill. The one part of the diplomatic set in which I had absolutely no customers was that with which your spooks seek to connect me.

What a coup it would have been, would it not, for me to off President and Mrs. Eisenhower, as I surely could have long before this indecency in your records.

Throw in the President of the United Nations General Assembly, too.

I held many secret with which I have been secure. The Dulleses were not unique among my customers and I never once solicited the business of the famous as I never used their business in any of my literature. I never traded on their names. The famous sought me out because of the quality of my product. I was, officially, the best in my specialty in the country. My wife and I were both national cooking champions.

If there was a uniqueness with the Dulleses, it was Mrs. Dulles' total dedication to her husband. His gout did trouble her. She would not leave town without posting his diet for that period on the wall of the kitchen diagonally opposite its door to the street.

He was also unique - and your spooks were deficient where it could have made a difference - in that from the food orders his comings and goings could be charted. He also was inclined to go off on his own and to make promises he had not cleared in advance. Once when Mrs. Dulles was away this required an intercontinental radio-

telephone call to have those of my birds he wanted awaiting his return.

Can it be that, aside from the self-perpetuation of a harmful species, your spooks are completely incapable of thought? Can they possibly believe that, if there had been anything that could have impelled me to seek to harm the Dulleses, I could not have done it dozens of times before their insane recommendation?

This worried them, but the security of the Dulles' home did not. Is this rational?

However, it perhaps explains an otherwise inexplicable note I received from one I believe was Mr. Dulles' cousin and Mrs. Dulles' secretary, a Miss Thomas. Before she left Washington, she did write to tell me how well I had served the Dulleses.

Many years have passed. Maybe the Department can begin to understand that this kind of political paranoia is self-perpetuating, I think more dangerous than any foreign enemy.

You have other records on me as a farmer, on my private foreign-aid programs and on international and favorable reactions to them. The Department sent a photographer to my farm to photograph me with some of the prize stock I was giving away. It also sent officials to a little affair in my honor in the Ghanaian Embassy over one such project. Other pictures were taken then. These include the Ambassador, my wife and me and your officials. I was told these pictures were widely distributed in Africa. I want all of this, pictures, too, every one, and copies of the use the Department made of its "subversive."

Your spooks could not find this? Could it be because while the Ghanaians were thanking me they were also burning your installations - and those pictures and accompanying stories were used to offset this?

Or could it be because my wife and I were actually building relations and friendships with needy countries, entirely unselfishly, showing the world that Americans do care - and your paranoid poisoners in secret would not dare let those above them know it?

Only in part have I taken all this time to file a record contradicting those deliberately contrived and utterly false hatchings of the spookeries. This refutation is far from complete.

In part it is to let you know that you do have records called for by my request and that I do want each and every one of them, regardless of source, form or content.

It is also to remind you and through you the Department of Santayana's wisdom, that he who does not learn from the past is doomed to live it.

At my age I cannot.

I would hope the Department would not want to, enough to look into this matter and cleanse itself once and for all. I do not need or want a clearance from you. I have lived a life on which I am content for my reputation to stand. My work is going into a university system archive. All the defamations, all the fabrications, all the nasty slurs and inferences you have provided will be included. If you do not respond to this letter, that also will be included and people will then be able to judge.

I have cold comfort for you. My efforts to obtain their files on me from the CIA and FBI go back to 1971 with formal requests under the Act, further with informal requests. Neither dares comply because both have misused dishonest records as the Department did. Both have violated law and the Constitution with me and my work. The FBI has known me since 1938, when I spent four months in the field living and working with its agents. The CIA knows me from its records from before there was an OSS. It has given me only a few of the records. These include my "disloyalty" by having provided President FDR with material for one of his "fireside" chats. The Department has records on this, by the way. The FBI has not provided a single piece of paper. Do you think it is

anxious to disgorge its garbology, its mail cover on an exposé of Nazis and interferences with defense preparations and other such abuses your files as given to me do not reflect? Or that it took so dangerous a "subversive" into its trust? Or that it was once part of the Dies effort to frame me and prevented my leaving its offices until I signed a false confession? Or that they did not terrify me and I did not sign that confession and all their falsifications thereby came apart and their bedmate Dies was exposed?

The cold comfort is that the Department is not alone. All those who sneak around with uninhibited power to corrupt and do corrupt in secret cannot face their own records. Therefore, all have to suppress their files or, like you, release them selectively after deliberating that so long.

The law requires that all these records be produced. The law is not being obeyed. It is being violated. Tell me what is "subversive," if you please.

Yours truly,

Harold Weisberg

Mr. Pruden

10

P7S. I have recovered somewhat from shock and have gone over these records with more care. I append this postscript to add specifics.

There is absolutely no doubt that the Department's authoritarian-minded so-called investigators deliberately framed a fake, a deliberately dishonest investigation. I can add many particulars. A few follow. Some of it may be ordinary error, but in such matters even that is unpardonable. It quite obviously underscores the necessity of careful review if not due process.

One example of error is in the reflection of other records. One where it cannot be just error is in the deliberate misrepresentation of my employment record. I was explicit in identifying the news syndicate for which I was a feature writer. I did not say I was a feature writer for the Wilmington papers, although as all reporters do I occasionally wrote features.

It is deliberately false to say there was any investigation at the News that proved I did not work there, as many other records show I did. The fact is there was a front-page article on how I made it possible for the paper's Salisbury, Md., correspondent to win that year's Pulitzer Prize. Because I made it possible and did the rewrite, the managing editor was angry that I was not included in the Pulitzer, thus that story.

Your investigators' error had one purpose only - to make me look bad. But in no instance does any of this show a single lie by me.

The same is true of the persistent repetition that I was identified by the Dies committee as a Communist in the ILGWH in New York. At that time your investigators knew very well that I was not in New York but was in Delaware, in college days and working on a morning newspaper nights.

These are typical of much of the files that were provided. These records refer to many others, even to where they are. There is no excuse for not providing them.

There is also the persistence of the grossest impropriety and political prejudice. Those characters did not know it but the administration to whose political philosophy I subscribed was the "New Deal." This is used throughout as an epithet, almost a code word for Communism. Bracketed just about always with whether or not I was a member of the union. Is either grounds for even suspicion? I put it this way because all of this is nothing but suspicion, where any investigation at all would have proven it false.

These files make the deliberateness clear. Getting me filed was the investigators' intent all along. It is even stated the previous year.

It is obvious that for the most part those interviewed were selected for predetermined results. Almost without exception. Exceptions are two of those I used as references. The interviewed neighbors in the area in which I lived are not typical. Your people selected the undereeducated, the backward-minded, and then misrepresented.

The same is true of fellow employees in the Latin America area. None of those in OSS's other division were interviewed. Some were famous. Your investigators do not hide the prejudice of the ultra-rightwingers they selected. I distinguish between them and authentic conservatives, one of whom I can spot easily, George Rohrlich. These dictatorship-minded types considered all others Communists. But even then the sneaky stuff had to be worked in, like Rohrlich first being quoted as saying that we worked closely, which is not true, and then that he never saw any of my reports. True. He had no business seeing them. I could go on and on on this alone. It is an outrage in self-perpetuation of the authoritarian mind and preconceptions.

Even the end of the wretched business is dishonest. There is the report to the late Mr. Peurifoy, whom I knew. He rose in the Department, but I knew him as so wild a young man I'd never trust him to drive my car. He even endangered people on the stairs. In fact, I think his wildness killed him. This last report in the files admits that "those interviewed during the course of the investigation spoke favorably of subject from a loyalty standpoint." It nonetheless states, my emphasis, that

"considerable information was disclosed which reflects unfavorably on his loyalty." There is no "information" to be "disclosed."

What does this boil down to? "Two informants interviewed ... reported there was some question in their minds concerning Mrs. Weisberg's loyalty, and that they had heard rumors" connecting us both with Communism. However, "They could furnish no details in this regard." Or they did not even remember the alleged rumors.

This is followed by the same lies about my supposed leaking, deliberate lies, the Dies lies.

Then I was allegedly reported by the FBI "to be a friend and contact of persons identified as being active in the Gregory case." But of this alleged "contact," a word with special meaning in security and intelligence inquiries, "the nature of the association was stated to be 'not known.'" There is only one reason the FBI reported "contact" and "association" and did not know its nature - it did not exist. It is a reference to my working with two people who were strangers to me until the government put me to work under them.

On this and this alone "It is therefore recommended that he be removed from the rolls of the Department."

Not on fact. Not one allegation that was checked. Not one rumor that could be remembered enough to be reported or connected with any single claimed source. Not one FBI record.

But deliberately contrived error is included.

I told you I believe the Department even today has much to learn from this. While I meant it in a larger sense, there is confirmation of what I said of pressures in some of the brief handwritten notes. What, for example, were men from the appropriations committee doing looking at these records long after I was gone?

Incomplete as are these records, they show that what a Secretary may know is controlled by the dark suspicions of small minds. People who understand neither loyalty nor basic American principles are turned loose to control the Department and the lives of individuals and to judge all others by their own at best dubious concepts and their own anti-American standards.

Even this is not enough for their need for even more power, their lust for vengeance against an imagined fear. Initially, permission was required to see these files. Then there was no need for permission. It is stated that anyone can see them. All this libel, all these dirty, deliberately manufactured lies, all this falsehood? And it was shown to others who had no business seeing it or wanting to see it. What right did the FBI have to inquire into me when I was a reporter after I left the Department? Or NSA when I was a farmer?

These files were removed on other unexplained occasions, after I left. More times than Mr. Dikaos' deceptive recordkeeping lists. The internal evidence proves this and if he is the professional he supposedly is, he knows this and knew it in reviewing these sheets. Had there been a post-firing review, that might have been proper. But there could not have been any real review without speaking to me. Nobody ever did. In all this supposed investigation, I was not spoken to once, by anyone. That is an investigation? That is common decency? That is the Department's American way? Do not your speaks know anything about American law, our Constitution, our supposedly inalienable rights?

There is no sane mind imposed on this mindlessness? These records show that before any investigation, the year before I was fired, they wanted me fired. There is the handwritten note asking "Discharge ltr. to applicant." (I was not an applicant, although all the records so deceptively state and all these interviewed were so informed. I was an employee and had been for several years.) Three months later another handwritten note, "Nothing can be done until CSA reports are in." (I would like to be

informed of the meaning of each of the designations, such as CSA, FC, CON, etc.) The next month there is the result of the Civil Service investigation, "No derogatory information."

Is there nothing in the Department other than the stormtrooper mind? No reviewing of any of this? No hearing? The stormtroopers dominate everyone?

There are evidences of disloyalty in these files, but not by me. Of some interviewed and by the investigators. The Department and the country did have a policy and these were the Department's employees. That policy was of disapproval of a murderous dictator who seized power by overthrowing an elected government. We withdrew our ambassador, which is pretty strong action. Developing more proofs of enemy control within that dictatorship was one of my assigned duties. So your people went around soliciting the views of those who favored that dictatorship. In some cases they were inept or unthinking enough to include TE - as indication of my "disloyalty."

These investigators did not ever recognize who the wartime enemy really was. I was assigned what even now I would regard as a vital job for the information of the Department and its ambassadors, a job at which I was experienced and those loaded with degrees and in some cases with the doctrine of the extreme right were not. The handwritten note is less than accurate but it makes the point, "see Nazi infiltration in Spain and South America - the SO says NO." The "no" is doubly underscored and emphasized with an "x". It was not only Nazi and it was neither Spain nor "South America." It was also the Franco Falange and it was all of Latin America.

I say the Department has much to learn from this incredible record of anti-Americanism. Ask yourself what harm there could have been to the country from this if I had had a pipeline to the Kremlin.

The harm to the country is from small minds imposing political preconceptions on what anyone in the Department could know, from desk analysts to the Secretary.

There was a time when I handled what came to Washington from captured Nazi foreign office files. Even then there were those who did not want Department officials to know what they revealed. I was once called back from leave to inform one of some subcabinet rank where the captured files were because he knew he was being lied to about their nonexistence. Those Nazi files showed precisely what this one on me does. The same thing happened when only what the original stormtroopers wanted reported was reported. Policy people were misinformed.

You should be able to realize that there can be no personal gain for me in my taking all this time. The terrible thing that was done to me and to others cannot now be undone. You can make no meaningful restitution to any of us. But you can learn. You can see to it that nothing of this anti-American nature, hurtful to the country and the Department, too, can ever happen again. You can see to it that "security" is that and nothing else, certainly not the imposing of a stormtrooper mentality on diplomacy and information essential to diplomacy.

Yet the signs are that it is still in control. There is no possibility that Mr. Dikeon is both qualified for his post and, having reviewed what he writes me about and ~~you~~ sent you for me, does not know much more than what I report about both the incompleteness of the file and the deliberate dishonesty it reflects. Instead of doing his job under the law, which is to obtain all the files, he sends me proof that he has not. This is not enough. He obliterates what clearly pertains to me, withholds other admitted records and tells me there is no administrative review of his dictat. This is where it all began, the lack of any review of any kind of what turns out to be false, fabricated or nonexistent.

I cannot and I do not accept this. Your spooks have their concepts of loyalty and Americanism, I have mind. Mine includes what they never agree to, that they, too, have to live within the law.

Mr. Dikeos tells me if I do not accept his diktat I can go to court. If you know anything about me other than what the spooks tell you, and this files does contain an indication of it, then you should know what when I have no choice I do go to court. The record might be informative. In the one case I lost out of seven filed, the Congress cited that case as the first of four requiring the amending of the law. Without this amending, you and I would not now be in correspondence. In that one case the FBI is now delivering withheld reports to me at a rate of more than 500 pages a week. They expect this to last almost a year.

I would think that the last thing the Department wants is for this to go to court. If it wants me to, I surely will accommodate it. If I did not, I would not consider myself loyal and would be unfaithful to any concept of real Americanism.

The contempt for law and regulation in all of this after 30 years is still staggering. Your spooks can't even declassify in accord with the prescribed provisions. Your office supposedly reviewed this so it either knows no better or cares no more.

If you will turn to Document 4 under Tab A you will find your carbon of the letter Mr. Malmstrom wrote for Mr. Lyerly. The letter is partly false. As a result of noncompliance I did file suit against the Department. It was C.A. 718-70 in federal district court in Washington. The Department of Justice was codefendant. I was awarded a summary judgment. There is no single record of it or even reference to it in all you sent. It is covered. And I am told I have been provided everything - and if I don't like it to sue you. Do you want this to go to court?

An idiot could not have made the search required by the Acts and not know that your people are in deliberate noncompliance.

Tab A also discloses that, instead of responding to my perfectly proper request for copies of regulations, Mr. Malmstrom consulted the spooks about my alleged past and then was not responsive. The law requires response and I do expect it now.

I would like to be able to hope that the Department that conducts our foreign relations is capable of learning simple lessons. I am trying to help it. I am without power or influence, but I am not without determination. Whether or not the Department is willing to learn, I do not want it to continue to be lawless. What I can do toward the loyal, American end of stopping this lawlessness I will do. The amended Act has punitive provisions for deliberate violations. This letter specifies deliberate violations. The choice of compliance or noncompliance is the Department's. I expect and I ask prompt compliance. This matter is months overdue under a ten-day law.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Route 12 - Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

December 22, 1976

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

Dear Mr. Pruden:

I am the wife of Harold Weisberg to whom your letter of December 17, 1976, is addressed.

Included among the documents you furnish is an original letter of August 19, 1976, addressed to Mr. Weisberg by Victor H. Dikeos, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, which was never forwarded to him. That letter specifies the documents which Mr. Dikeos' office is willing to release in full, those from which deletions are to be made, and one which is to be withheld in full because it relates to me.

This I resent. I hereby ask for the release of that document, #23, in full and without any deletions, under FOIA/PA, as well as for any and all other references to me.

In going over the documents which you have furnished, I am outraged at the number and extent of the deletions. It is certainly not within either the spirit or the letter of the Constitution that unnamed and secret sources should be allowed to make statements of any character whatsoever which are to be incorporated into an official file on any citizen of the United States and that the origin of such statements should be concealed from the subject. Particularly am I outraged that any agency of government, which my taxes help support, should not only condone but should aid and abet such a practice. This is biting the hand that feeds you.

If I as an individual have anything to say about anyone, I do not need assurance that my identity will not be revealed to that person; rather would I face him and state my knowledge. Opinions may not be based on fact; they are often based on prejudice. Government files on any citizen, if necessary at all, should be confined solely to fact, not hearsay, not opinion, and definitely not on an examination of his trash.

Sincerely,

Lillian Stone Weisberg