

Chum - V R K

Mr. E. Ross Buckley
Criminal Division
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

2/20/81

Dear Mr. Buckley,

In the records with your letter of 2/18/81 you withhold the public domain again - what the Warren Commission disclosed; the FBI disclosed; the Department disclosed; and even what you have disclosed. In fact, in this batch you both withhold and disclose the same information, which has been public domain for years, too.

From the first in this long, drawn-out processing, I have cautioned you about this and offered to be helpful to you. You have not accepted this offer. In fact, you haven't ever responded, to the best of my recollection.

I'm sorry if you are looking for trouble because you are leaving me no real alternative. There just is no excuse for some of your withholdings and less need. This is an historical case and the AG has stated there is to be maximum possible disclosure. You are straining to withhold what shouldn't be and needn't be.

At this late date there is less excuse. There has been so much disclosed there are readily available/^{official} sources ~~sources~~ if you won't accept my help.

Once again there are many referrals. Can you please let me know how many more months it will require others, including Department components, to act on referrals you made last year?

Thank you for the several pages you had not been able to locate earlier. However, you have not accounted for all the gaps that exist to now.

In the past the list has indicated separate sections for the records and I am trying to preserve them by this list. However, what is in this last mailing identifies only a single section. Is this correct?

This batch includes long records of no identified source. I believe that records reflecting the source and records used in compiling those should be available. I would appreciate these records. I am inclined to believe that some may have been compiled by the task force the Department had to buttress the official conclusions.

I question the propriety of the claims to b2 for Nos. 1641 and 1644 and the claim to b5 with regard to No. 1641. While I think you should review all the withholdings I do believe that these two are claimed inappropriately.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg