

Dear Athan,

9/19/84

Before I had to suspend and get onto priority FOIA litigation matters I'd stumbled upon a small box of extra copies made some years ago by a dependable young woman who then was helping me. Because these copies exist and I have no need for them, I'll not include them in the pagé tally. On the chance it may be of use, I'll add a few explanations. Also, I have found an unclear copy of the record to which I referred in telling you that The Director Is Always Right - Even When he is wrong. To be certain I do not overlook this in the future, when, hopefully, I'll find a better copy, I'll also include that. And with the interruptions I have, I'm glad you said there is no rush because next month I expect a doctoral candidate who plans to review the FBIHQ Commission file and that is where I'd hope to relocate the records relating to the rewriting of Hoover's testimony.

62-109060-7041, 7045 are not the complete record on this, to use a favority Hoover cliché, vindictive and vicious matter and even when it gets close to actuality it is in error. It is obvious that the FBI was out to do harm, and succeeded.

There is hardly a less dependable source than Edgar Eugene Bradley, but when FBIHQ got a report from Los Angeles the nature of which is indicated in these two serials it immediately ordered LA to prepare LHM suitable for dissemination. LA did that, being careful, because the allegations themselves were inherently incredible, to cover itself with a disclaimer of accuracy. What these duplicates do not reflect and happened is that FBIHQ then sent a copy to the Secret Service, its dissemination.

I don't know who Bradley's source was or if Bradley saw a chance to get a few licks in from his political position or his source lied. But there is an entirely different basis than others critics were aware of.

I had kept after the Secret Service for information it had not disclosed and in some instances had not provided to the Warren Commission. When they could see that I was building a record that I could use in FOIA litigation they invited me in for a conference to see if we could work things out amicably. They were quite explicit, they did not want to be sued, and I was as frank, telling them that I did not want to sue. At the conference were the man I'd been writing, promoted from Inspector to Assistant Director and since retired, a lawyer Tom Kelly; the general counsel, whose name is Goff; and the public-relations man, Warner. I had a list of matters that were of interest, we discussed them, they made notes, and they agreed to provide the information, in return for which I would not sue. I never believed that the FBI had any responsibility in the JFK assassination, never said I did, and made myself unpopular among the critics who did by refuting them publicly. None of the information was of a nature that could even indicate remotely what Bradley says or be used against the FBI. And you can be sure that there was no possibility that the SS would have even considered doing anything in any way critical of the FBI. Neither of us thought or spoke anything at all along that line.

As for Garrison being involved in any way, his case against Shaw was over and he had lost. I have offended him and he was unforgiving. I'd earlier had several strongly-expressed disagreements with him and the Sunday before they began to empanel the Shaw jury, which was the first time I had any inkling of their supposed case, I told his two assistants that they would lose, deserved to lose, and exactly how they would - and did. I became very unpopular.

As of 1967 it might have been alleged that I was "closely associated" with Garrison because on the fact of the assassination, which I distinguish from what he was alleging about Shaw, I did try to help him. But that actually means trying to keep him straight, not a popular project, either. (I'm referring to the GID note.)

I was fired by State, without charges, under the McCarran rider, later found unconstitutional, State apologized publicly and rehired me and I resigned. I have

no Communist background, there were 10 of us, not nine, and it was a pogrom arranged by the security office clerk who got big, John Peurifoy, as part of a purge of those who were providing dependable intelligence instead of the right-wing propaganda they preferred. You may recall that as he got higher he was ambassador to Guatemala when that government was replaced by a right-wing military dictatorship. He was so wild he killed himself with his wild driving. It was, literally, dangerous to be on the stairs when he was. I knew him then. But in any event, there were, as the FBI records themselves reflect, no charges and no hearing.

I had been editor of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee but we had no secrets, I had no secrets, I had nothing to leak and I never leaked anything, particularly not to the Daily Worker, and only a political infant would believe that I could have been close to the Daily Worker and the Trotskyites at the same time.

With regard to that meeting, the FBI made it a great success. I had been invited to speak by what was known as the Citizens Committee of Inquiry months earlier and had responded that I could do that only if I were in California. That invitation was in the summertime. Some people in LS wanted me there, which got me to California to coincide with the appearance of my second book. By then the CCI was defunct but the man who had run it for Mark Lane and probably was a Trotskyite, without asking me, got some other committee to sponsor the meeting, with Ed Keating, then of Ramparts, to introduce me. The night before an FBI informer, I mean a real symbol informer, tried to rebait me on the most popular talk show on the 50KW clear-channel CBS station in San Francisco. This character, who did not identify himself, called in and was in his redbaiting routine and the moderator, who then became a good friend, a decent former reporter, was going to cut him off, with indignation. I got him not to, to let the guy talk and work into a dialogue, it became clear that he was and intended to be a provocateur who didn't know what he was talking about and had been primed by somebody, and he did not make out very well by the time he knocked it off. As a result, there was standing room only at my appearance in the Hall of the Flowers in Golden Gate Park. Only years later did I get the records proving that the provocateur was a symbol SF FBI informer.

The "association with the Soviets" is an interesting line and is false. But what makes it interesting is an FBI internal record I have somewhere attached to an appeal Shea did not dare act on because it was clear, the FBI fabricated, and they had by then almost succeeded in easing him out, as they finally did. What that note on a different record stated is that I had a personal relationship with someone in the USSR embassy in Washington. I never had any personal relationships there, had contacts as a correspondent only until years later, when State asked me to go to the USSR to show them how to raise better chickens and the USIA asked me to challenge them to "peaceful competition" in poultry husbandry (at the time of the Nixon-Khrushchev "kitchen" debate, and later an unpoasantness when, having failed to get my first book published in the US, I went to see the cultural attache about the possibility of its publication behind the iron curtain. And what happened then, certainly in FBI files because all that mail was being intercepted and copied, is that I wrote Mme Furtseva denouncing them.

Needless to say, when the FBI, knowing exactly what bit was up to, fed this fabrication/defamation to the Secret Service they broke everything off. And I was not able to sue them, as I might have, because the FBI had me thoroughly bogged down in other FOIA litigation.

This, then, is an example of how the FBI exercises control throughout the government. Similar to some records I've sent you on how they were able to do this with LBJ.

The NR copy of my letter to ~~MEMO~~ Mitchell of 3/12/69 from 62-109060 (the original is in the FBI's file on me as a subversive, a 100 file) serves other purposes but it illustrates how the FBI defames and influences those it interviews. What it did, and

this came back to me from those involved, is ask suggestive questions, "Did you know Weisberg is a Communist?" They did not say, Weisberg is a bogood Communist." And there never was a response, other than I was informed the FBI was being informed and, of course, what I reported would not be countenanced. Instead of answering, which, with regard to the earlier letter to which I referred was required by FOIA, a character under a crook who was then an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, told me that further correspondence was pointless because I would not believe them. This may well have been close to the truth, but it is not a response to either letter, particularly not the FBIA request.

What I find interesting is the reflection of how Hoover spent his time in those, his last days, or how he was led into such insignificant matters. His note recalled me and my request for information on the King assassination. And to illustrate how self-defeating their attitude was, it left me no choice but to sue and they were forced to disclose 60-75,000 pages. And the case is still in court on their appeal. The Crime Records memo acknowledges receipt of my King FOIA request. The reference to my damage suit, for the ruin of our farm, covers the FBI's ass because they were corrupt in that investigation and then claimed they'd save the government close to ~~my~~ \$10,000.00 (which did not include all their travel and other investigative costs or the other litigating costs), they lost the case and I established a new principle of law and a constitutional right, ownership of the airspace over property to the degree it is required for the enjoyment of property rights. The first case using it as precedent cost them an assessment of something like \$5,000,000. Before the date of this memo. Or, they can't be truthful about anything. And the last sentence of the largest graf, like other stuff I showed you, acknowledges indirectly that they had prepublication rights with Blair that amounts to censorship. There isn't a word at all critical of the FBI in it and he thanks it in the book for the help they claim they did not give. The "Recommendation" is a clear and deliberate violation of FOIA, which then required response within 10 days. I got the pale copy among personal records. The other copy is from the general disclosures and is redacted. As you can see, I began with a modest request, limited to what had been disclosed, and they refused even that. The cost that results is really quite high if you include the litigating costs as well as of the disclosed records and processing them.

There is no way of knowing whether, later, someone else might have done as I did in that Torts Act suit, but it was a novel litigating theory, based on constitutional rights, and I won before a very conservative judge. I have no way of even estimating the astronomical costs of that corrupt FBI investigation. If they'd conducted an honest investigation - and some of the witnesses told me what they'd actually told the FBI and one, a simple countryman who only afterward realized how he'd been conned, came and confessed to my wife and me how he had been fixed, without realizing he was being fixed, by the FBI agent, who happened to be his nephew. I know about the \$5,000,000 award in the first subsequent case which cited it as case law, because a lawyer once showed it to me in his lawbooks. I'd not heard of it. As of my last knowledge, which is not recent, this FBI corruption created a serious problem that, after three attempts, the Congress was not able to resolve. There may well be countless cases based on that one, which was created by FBI corruption.

Please excuse the typos. I'm far behind and am trying to catch up, with stacks again all over the place. I hope to come to the other record soon and will enclose it.

Hope your work is going well. Best wishes,

Harold