8/13/73

Dear Mr. Richardson,

Your Department's regulations concerning requests for "public information", as I remember them, require response within 10 days. This is the 15th day since on July 28 I appealed to you, under the law, from Mr. Archibald Cox's denial to me of copies of that which had already been released and publicized.

Your Department has a consistent record of rejecting my requests for public information. One about which I have done nothing, was for a press release! Three I have taken to court, the first of these resulting in a summary judgement against your Department. In the third your Department was forced to certify to the court of appeals that your predecessor is a liar. With your address to the Bar association in mind, I shall address that one, to determine whether you made a delayed Fourth of July speech.

What I~~m~~ seek is not only not secret, it was published internationally. Mr. Cox, whether or not he was right to refuse my request, violated the published directives of your Department, directives controlling the responses of all agencies, in not forwarding my request to you.

Because the need of a writer is for information with all the speed possible and because the requirement of the law in response is for promptness, to save you time and in the hope that you will comply with the law and your own regulations without further delay I repeat my request. It is for copies of the released pages only of the grand-jury testimony of E. Howard Hunt in the Watergate matter. I also asked when and where I could examine the addressbooks taken under search warrant from those convicted and for an o.k. for copies of any pages I might want. These also were released. Some pages were reproduced in facsimile. They were introduced into evidence. And this, by the way, is the second time the Department has refused me evidence introduced in court.

In the third of my F.O.I. cases, no one of which should ever have had to go to court because I have been careful not to seek what is properly withheld (and if you doubt my sincerity in this I can show you excisions I made in what was released and should not have been before I published it) there was false swearing by your Department. I believe this constituted perjury and its subornation. There was a deliberate misrepresentation to the court, a deliberate deception. Yet later in this same suit your Department alleged to the court that the courts, in general, are without basis for assessing tech[illegible]cal matters involved in suits of this nature. So, I am asking you to make a personal investigation and, in the spirit of your speech, to do what you promised to do in such cases. When I asked Mr. Mitchell whose record in such matters is no longer secret who prosecutes the prosecutor in time I got a non-response from Mr. Ruckelshaus, who was chief of the division I believe committed the crimes.

Earlier, on receiving reports that FBI agents were interfering with my rights, including under the First Amendment, and defaming me, I asked Mr. Mitchell about this. I repeated my request, without answer. Some years have passed, but if you reall meant what you told the Bar, you will, as I ask again, look into this.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg