

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

301/473-8186

10/10/72

Mr. Dick Harwood, National Editor
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Dick,

I told you of my FOI requests of Clawson. Today I got a reply from John Dean. A copy of my response/appeal is enclosed. If you want his letter, I'll be glad to send it to you. I read it with Bob Woodward, who does not interpret it as I do.

Dean says, "The information which you seek has been turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and is a part of its investigatory files. Since any of the material provided to the FBI could be used as evidence in the criminal prosecution of charges against Mr. Hunt, the Department of Justice has requested that none of it be publicly disclosed prior to the completion of that prosecution."

I have read the indictment with care. None of this is relevant to any of the charges. All I asked is the days Hunt worked for the White House after March 29, 1972. He is not charged with working for the White House. Dean's real purpose is to contrive a means of refusing to give me what was without the waiver public information if the investigatory-file exemption alone were to be invoked (he'd have done better with another). In doing it, he has just about said the White House is tied up in this whole mess. How else can it be relevant to the existing indictment? Dean does not hold out the possibility of further indictment of Hunt. His language is "in the prosecution of charges against Mr. Hunt" and he refers to "that prosecution".

I think there is a story in Nixon's profiting from renting back his own property to the government and in getting free the benefit of all improvements. I understand he gets \$200,000 for San Clemente alone but pays on it only \$100,000 a year. Pretty good deal if he gets paid \$200,000 a year for staying at his own house, all travel and other expenses also paid!

And I'd be surprised if a simple check on property records wouldn't show something very wrong with his purchase of the former Homer Cummings property on Forrest Lane right after that po' boy Checkers speech. The reported price was \$50,000. I knew the house and grounds. They had to have been worth immeasurably more, even then. Unless there have been changes on Forrest Lane, this property was on the turn-around dead-end circle, on the right going in from 49th Street, the only way in.

Your fine recent editorial (which couldn't cover everything) didn't note that all the alleged denials of what the Post is said to have said are denials of what, unless my memory is at fault, the Post did not charge. This has become standard government semantics.

The reporting is great. I hope you can keep it up.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg