

Mr. Michael Shaheen
Office of Professional Responsibility
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

5/18/90

Dear Mr. Shaheen,

We have a communication problem and it is my fault. You know about old dogs and new tricks. I'm an old dog and I haven't adjusted to words not having their dictionary meanings to our recent governments. Even familiarity with Orwell has not helped me overcome this failing with words like "professional" and "responsibility." I just can't seem to understand that when the two are put together, as in the name of your component, that they really mean cover-up and whitewash. So suffering this learning disability, I enclose copies of OIP's Richard Huff's letter to me of the 14th and my reply of two days later. If I thought it might mean anything I'd locate an earlier exchange with the FBI's Emil Moschella. They appear to have broken the silence with which they usually greet what I write because I raised a question with you about whether the FBI violated a criminal provision of the Privacy Act in disclosing records about me, when I was not the subject of the FBI's investigative interest to a third party. You did not acknowledge receiving my letter but that is your norm and part of my learning disability with the new meanings of words.

Mr. Moschella is the beneficiary of the FBI's long experience in obfuscating. His letter to me relates to what was not relevant. If as I assume he favored you with a copy he put you in a position to observe what retired FBI agents have told me are the first two law. First, cover the Bureau's ass. Second, cover your own. All you have to do is believe his gobbledegook and all is covered. Doubleduckspeak again triumphant! See, I do remember Orwell. He talks persuasively about something else and that is all you need.

assuming that you really need anything. The record does not persuade that you do.

after all, when allegations of perjury require nothing of you, does anything?

Professional responsibility does not even require that you acknowledge receipt of a complaint relating to the possibility of a criminal offense.

It is not even a felony, and when professional responsibility does not include a felony, how can it include something less?

So, in writing you, I recognize that the probability is a waste of time.

I do it merely for the record.

I have this old man's silly notion that sometimes in the future it is useful to have a record. Then history can be served and people can know who did and did not do what. and what "professional responsibility" really means to the Department of Justice and to you.

I don't think you will have any questions about my telling Mr. Huff that he lied from beginning to end of his letter.

Why should you when lying is insignificant in your interpretation of "professional responsibility"?

But in the remote and improbable event that you do. please ask.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg