

Personal records on Harold Weisberg released by FBI 1/18/78

62-109090- Not Recorded, 6/1/66, A. Rosen to Mr. DeLoach. *Section 101*

Under "Purpose," to provide info on Me and Epstein, that order, Rosen does not say that there was a major news story in the Wash. Post that the FBI had to answer. It was written by Richard Harwood. This story appeared about 5/29-30/66, across the top of the front page.

Rosen says of me that I was then operating a poultry farm. He may not have known it but the farming had been liquidated 2 1/2 years earlier.

"Bureau files contain numerous references to the Weisbergs." These references are not supplied at this point. Instead there is a biased and inaccurate account of my earlier career. It says that LaFollette said that I had been "dismissed for a breach of trust involving the release of confidential information to a news paper (believed to have been) The Daily Worker."

LaFollette might have said this and it may have appeared in a State report of 4/28/47 but it isn't true and State has not provided a copy of that report under my PA requests. I had no confidential information to release. I was directed by a superior - the record found in the UMW files only this past summer - to make part of the public record available in galley proof form to the correspondent of a labor news service, Henry Zon.

I was fired by State, I was allowed to resign when that action was withdrawn because it was unfair, and if there were any suspicion of my being a Communist, the language here skirting the direct statement but suggesting it, no such charges were ever placed and if they had been they would have been false. Here the FBI skirts the fact that I was just fired, under a rider that was later declared unconstitutional and without any suggestion of any charges or any hearing after being cleared by the Civil Service Commission on a security check and after the FBI lied to State and said it had no files at all on me.

To protect this very large and deliberate lie it has not produced a single record from its earlier files - not even when I specified what files.

My wife was investigated, interviewed and what this skirts by use of the word "retained" was in fact cleared of the paranoid nonsense.

It again uses semantics if not falsehood to imply something sinister: "Her name had been carried on the active list of ~~the~~ members of the Washington Book Shop Association and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action During 1947, and she was listed as an active member of the League of Women Shoppers during January, 1941."

The Washington Bookshop Association operated a cooperative, a book store. To obtain the discounts one had to be a member. Thus any member was an "active" member. In fact she did not participate in the affairs of the association. She merely bought books there.

She was not a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. The FBI's "active list" is more likely a mailing list.

She was a member of the League of Women Shopper, which makes her a Nader ahead of the Ralph Nader, but she never attended any of its meetings. She is certain, as I am also.

"Informants contacted during the investigation of Weisberg's wife advised that Harold Weisberg had been an associate of Maurice Halperin, who was involved in Soviet espionage conspiracy." (Sic - ~~odd~~ odd language. Does not say "a Soviet..." or identify any one. The FBI's and the State records say Gregory case, but not that he was involved in any kind of conspiracy. I'm sure he wasn't. He wasn't charged. Ever.)

I know Maurice Halperin because the government put me to work under him during World War II, in O.S.S. I knew him in no other way - ever - and then not socially. He never was my guest, I never was his. We never attended any meetings together except Division staff meetings.

This, however, represents other records the existence of which is acknowledged and

copies of which were not provided under PA. No copies have been provided to my wife under her request.

What forced the government to retract and ~~add~~ apologize for its action is not mentioned and it involves another withheld record, perhaps more. Mrs. Ogden Reid, then N.Y. Herald Tribune, was interested in the case by Arnold, Foytas or Porter. She assigned the late Bert Andrews, Washington Bureau, to look into it. It was, of course, an outrageous thing to fire people without even making charges and without giving them any opportunity to defend themselves or face accusers. But Andrews told me that he had spoken to Hoover and Hoover had told him there really was nothing against any of the 10 of us and that had any of us been his employees he'd merely have said they might not keep some of the company they were keeping. If he specified to Andrews, Andrews did not to me. It could not have referred to me because I was then spending full-time fixing up the house I'd bought in Virginia and had virtually no social life. However, there should be a record of the exclusive Andrews interview of Hoover. Hoover, of course, was in a position to claim to have no connection with any of it. To be able to and not to have his poppycock confronted he had lied to the State Department at least about me, saying he had no records. His is in the State records I've obtained (incompletely) and in those few FBI records I did obtain from HQ files under PA.

There should be FBI records of the time of those firings and rehiring, news accounts and other records. I then lived in Arlington, so HQ and the field office of that time, perhaps WFO, should have records.

There is no way of knowing what is obliterated and no exemption is claimed on the record. My suspicion is that it is something the FBI has to hide, not anything of the nature of a 7C claim to exemption.

It is true that I sued and beat the government in the first helicopter case. This paragraph is literally true but angled. I also set a precedent of law upheld by the Supreme court and to the best of my knowledge still basic noise-ecology law.

The last paragraph on me is less than faithful if it is true. I'd have to reread the letter to know. The major purpose of that letter was to ask Hoover to confront the evidence it mustered and to release all the reports on the withheld spectrographic analyses. It is not that or merely that I "questioned the results of our Laboratory examination" and this was not limited to "of the bullets." There were other materials and there were fragments and as we now know there was only one bullet tested, not plural.

On Epstein, is it one and the same Epstein if he was a Cornell student in 1955 and was taking his master's there in 1966?

Under "ACTION" it says that "Bureau files are being expeditiously reviewed" re "any discrepancies which were mentioned" in the Post article. That is not a description of 62-109090-Not Recorded, A. Rosen to Mr. DeLoach of 6/6/66. "Memoranda are being prepared setting forth recommended action in each of the above matters," the books and the article. These were not provided under my PA requests.

*Hand note attend: "On Ticker List."*