

Mr. Frederick D. Hess
Criminal Division
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

4/12/81

CRS-2548

Dear Mr. Hess, Enclosed with your letter of April 7 was your originals of those letters identified as 1959. The list covering the other enclosures ends with 1938. This makes it appear that it was not your intention to enclose any version of 1959. I take these to be your originals because red tape is placed over names, which are visible to the eye as they would not be to the machine. If you desire the return of these pages, please send me a frank addressed to the person you want to receive these pages.

I can only wonder if the Department has looked ahead from its 70 claims in this matter, about which I've written in the past without response. If it is to be consistent with what was done with #1865 I believe it must initiate a series of very large and costly projects.

In #1865 you withheld the address of a Congressman's office from the copy of the response to him. While the immediate purposes of the Department in denying the people the addresses of their elected representatives is not clear, it is clear that this withholding must be only the beginning.

Unless all other printed and published lists ~~and~~ directories ^{are} ~~are~~ withdrawn from circulation, including libraries, media and other offices and private homes, this withholding is meaningless.

And if all these lists and directories and indices are withdrawn, with what will they be replaced and at what cost? What will happen to the American who goes to one of the Houses to see any Member? How will the guard be able to direct him? Or will he be prohibited from doing this?

In C.A. 75-1996 the Department produced Mr. Shea as an expert witness. On cross examination he testified that in that historical case (the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.) he testified that there had been such ~~inappropriate~~ extensive and improper use of this exemption that reprocessing would be required. In this instant matter I've written often about what I believe is improper and unnecessary claims to exemption, without ~~any~~ ^{any} response. I tell you again that you people are creating unnecessary costs and problems. The one I cite is merely one of a number in the recent records. Another is the withholding of names that the government publishes. Why do you persist in these things?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg