5/21/17 repulse - Cum une

3/8/82

Mr. E. Ross Buckley, Chief FOIPA Unit Criminal Division Depriment of Justice Washington, D.G.

Dear Mr. Buckley,

Thank you for your letter of the 3rd and the enclosures.

You begin by saying that, "This is a final response to" my request. I disagree. I have filed numerous appeals and under the Act response to them is required. You have copies of them. I do not recall hearing anything from the appeals office, although with the passing of all this time my memory may be faulty.

I have no way of knowing whether all feferrals have been acted on. I presume you do. I would appreciate being informed.

Unfortunately, some agencies have adopted such vague Letters it is not possible to know what they refer to. In some cases I have received covering letters that are totally uninformative. And I have more than one request. In fact I have another request before your division that is without compliance, for the records on or about me. But your letter of the 3rd does not identify the request. This could lead to future confusion.

The Attorney General designated the JFK assassination as an important historical case and it is one of the more important of them. My earliest appeals noted the withholding of information that was already disclosed on the claim of privacy. My appeals also noted that some persons had become public persons in the JFK assassination inquiries. Yet as recently as the current batch of records you provide includes the withholding of such names on privacy claims. This considerably diminished their value as important historical records and inevitably will lead to misunders standings and possible harm to the immocent. This is particularly true of the Clay Shaw case in which almost no names are not publicly disclosed and in which you currently withhold them. Have you forgotten that there was a long and well-reported trial sandwiched between much leaking and open public statements by all parties, including the federal government and your "epartment in particular?"

If you are not going to respond to what I addressed to you will you please clear with the appeals office andiet me know who is going to do what and when?

Some of these records are of considerable historical importance and their value ought not be diminished unnecessarily. I also believe that the Department's interest is best served by cleaning these matters up once and for all. Otherwise the "epartment will be plahued far into the future.

Sincerely.