

Route 12 - Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

November 29, 1976

Miss Jane F. Smith
Director, Civil Archives Division
National Archives and Records Service
Washington, D. C. 20408

Dear Miss Smith:

Illness and age have not completely obliterated my memory, although it is not what it once was. So I delayed more than four hours after receiving your letter of the 26th before checking my files. In part, this is because I find it repugnant to have to try to keep government officials honest. In part, it is because I am of a different generation.

It is not at all that I do not believe in complete equality for women. I do. Nor is it that for one of my generation I did not practice this belief before World War II, from doing the grocery shopping and cooking to washing diapers in a household of three women when I was childless.

Rather is it that I am depressed when I find that a woman has gotten ahead by practicing those vices once the monopoly of men.

You are the Director of the Civil Archives Division and I believe in equality. I will address you as though you were a man and as in almost 64 years I do not recall ever addressing a woman.

You are a liar.

You lie for career and political purposes.

You lie about a matter before a court of law and after I remind you that it is a matter before a court of law.

This disgusts me all the more because you lie about public information relating to the assassination of a President and with it the nullification of our system of society and the subverting of our basic institutions.

Your first sentence is a total and deliberate lie. It reads, "This is in reply to your letter of November 21, 1976, concerning the copies of Warren Commission documents released by the 1975 review."

In my letter to you of November 21, there is not a single reference to this 1975 review or those documents. I wrote you about and only about C.A. 75-1448 and whether the defector mentioned in the January 21, 1964, transcript is the one of released CIA records. I explained this in full, from referring to my previous letter of November 5 on this to asking for an explanation if there were anything improper. Half of my letter is what I describe as a layman's explanation.

My concluding sentence is, "This matter will again be before the courts shortly. I do hope you can stop this stonewalling and either respond or explain why you refuse to."

Your response was lies, contempt for the laws and your obligations, and still another attempt at deliberate deception.

I did write another letter on the same day, but not to you and not for the first time about noncompliance with my request for all the records released in the 1975 review.

In response to that you also lie in claiming that the Archives could not copy these records for me "because of the large amount of reference work we have on hand at the present time."

Miss Jane F. Smith = 2

My request is close to a year old. The request to which the Archives finally responded is of several months ago. (The law says 10 days.) During this more recent period, Dr. Angel wrote me that the Archives does not have a backlog. To my knowledge, others have received prompt service.

Moreover, when I wrote with some passion in 1966 that the Archives has assigned a corporal's guard to the JFK assassination files, Dr. Rhoads protested. He told me there was not and never would be a manpower shortage on it.

Perhaps it is because JFK was not our first President ever forced out of office that makes the difference. The press reports that the Archives is assigning 100 people to the processing of requests for such things as copies of Nixon's tapes.

Of course there is a difference. For the martyred President, there was the parttime service of two people. For the crook, the perjurer, the subverter, there is the advance planning of more than 50 times the manpower.

Perhaps you would now care to get from your library its copy of my second book and read the epilogue to which Dr. Rhoads objected.

Of course, it is only an accident that it took all this time - months - to fill my request. It also is no more than another accident that the Boxes were mislabeled. And now, before my wife or I can get to it, some kind genie, a warm and tender spirit that resides in your official remembrance of the martyred President, will come and recheck those thousands of pages for us and erase all the file-folder identifications made with trust in your identifications and then write the correct ones in.

Right now I'd settle for one of those gremlins you have assigned to my requests for all these years, just so we would not have all this wasted work to do.

You can't resist a cheap shot at loading even a short letter with the self-serving. I have no attorney in the matter of the 1975 releases. There is no need for one. Yet you say "Copies... have been delivered to Mr. Lesar, your attorney."

Mr. Lesar is also my friend. You have stonewalled me on this shamefully. When I expected other friends from Washington to come here over the weekend, I asked Mr. Lesar, as a friend - and particularly because the Archives had not responded to my letter asking if you could begin to make packages not guaranteed to be wrecked in the mails - if he would obtain these for me so they could remain intact.

You do not, however, even respond to the letter I did not write you. In that I make perfectly proper requests, more so when you admit the Archives' "error" in misidentifications. One illustration is my request for what I am sure the Archives has, "an accurate list identifying each record fully, by box and page number within each record."

Attributing motive to your duplicity presents no difficulty. You work for the Archives and for the executive branch, which continues to cover up its initial cover-up. Your future depends upon your protecting those who have already deceived a court if the released CIA records relate to the man of the 1/21 transcript. If it is the same man, there is no basis for the withholding. Then the deception of the court and the denial of my rights are deliberate.

Obviously, if the same person were not involved in both, it would have presented no problem to you in merely informing me of this, which is what I did ask in my letter to which there is not a single word to which your letter of the 26th is relevant.

I want you to know that I am asking Mr. Lesar, who does represent me in C.A. 75-1448, the litigation over which I did write you, to present this correspondence to the court.

With a curt bow and a swirling cape,

Harold Weisberg

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

National Archives and Records Service
Washington, DC 20408



November 26, 1976

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 12
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This is in reply to your letter of November 21, 1976, concerning the copies of Warren Commission documents released by the 1975 review.

Copies of the documents in Box 2, as well as copies of the two documents (322g and 442) in Box 6, have been delivered to Mr. Lesar, your attorney. This completes the copying of the documents released by the 1975 review for you. We are sorry that this could not be done faster because of the large amount of reference work we have on hand at the present time.

You are correct in saying that the heading on the slip that you received, "Box 2 FBI parts of numbered documents," applies to Box 4 rather than to Box 2.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jane F. Smith".

(MISS) JANE F. SMITH
Director
Civil Archives Division

Keep Freedom in Your Future With U.S. Savings Bonds