

Mr. John E. Huston
Office of Legal Counsel
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

7/12/50

Dear Mr. Luman:

Thank you for your letter of the 7th and the enclosures.

For the record, the letter to the editor of Commentary is not an intra-agency memorandum and you make no other claim to exemption, although I presume you had 7E in mind in withholding the news, in violation of the Attorney General's directive of 5/5/46, Department policy, and particularly after they have already been disclosed.

Withholding David Blumenthal's news from a letter he wrote for publication is stretching it a bit, isn't it?

Although his letter is not the only reflection of partisanship in OLC, it is a very clear one, and it is exaggerated by his ^{own} virtual display of ignorance of the conclusions and evidence of the Commission (on which he worked) and whose record he quotes at some length. Not that he isn't imaginative, as in writing about the bullet allegedly imbedded in the Lincoln's windshield.

Of course I have serious questions about the propriety of OLC spending tax money in so partisan a venture, especially because I am one of those "others" whose work he hardly reflects but does criticize. It required quite a bit of tax-paid time to locate all these citations and the time of the typist.

When OLC is overtly partisan on this controversial subject, how can the people regard it as impartial in its decisions, again I say particularly as they relate to me?

That its records are partisan is illustrated by the fact that it still withholds pertinent records pertaining to the JTH case and to my PA request, after many years. (You see more than three years overdue in this limited compliance, five under PA.)

Records in my possession establish that OLC has non-exempt records not provided. However, if you decide to claim exemptions, you are still required to account for the records and make specific claim to exemption with regard to each withholding, are you not?

Don't know

In this mailing you provide what appear to be Original Division records, then
its stamp, initials and a name written on. If so, may I please have the OIG explain
any restriction in information. There is public interest in the names, which the
Department has been disclosing and the Department's policy in this case in particular
does require.

I believe I have written OIG before about its non-compliance. May I please have
an explanatory statement in which I am informed when I may expect the records that
should have been provided so long ago?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg