

Mr. Tom Samoluk , ARRB
600 E St., NW, 2d floor
Washington, DC 20530

4/10/95

Dear Tom,

When Jim Mesar and I had a chance to speak briefly yesterday evening and I told him I'd formed a good opinion of Jeremy Gunn and of you his response was to tell me that you believe that I had bombed you.

That did surprise me. The only direct communication we have had was when you and Jeremy ^{and a few short letters,} were here. Nothing that could be interpreted that way then happened. Then I wondered if the letter not written to me by Marwell to whom I had written could have been written by you. But as I remembered it that letter was signed ~~w~~ by a woman named Sullivan. All that I could think of eliminated all other possibilities but one, that it was you who chose which of those I described as nuts, paranoids and those with other emotional problems, self-seekers and those with books to promote or seeking self-promotion for other reason and ~~that~~ ^{those} who are certifiable subject-matter ignoramuses, which includes most of those who testified, and those that believe the board will do nothing if it does only what it is charged to do, see to the public disclosure of existing records.

If this is the reality, I have no apologies to make for anything I said. I am aware that the board is to hear what the people want it to know but I am not aware that this requires it to give a forum to all or that it is prevented from asking for the submission of written statements. *Not give witnesses all that public attention.*

I can think of no reason to change or modify a single thing I said and I am not unwilling to name names, although I avoided that.

If you or anyone else believes I was offended by the letter Sullivan wrote for Marwell, that is true but that was minor compared with how I felt ^{about} ~~about~~ what it reflected of the board and how it interprets its mandate and is undertaking to meet it.

That Marwell had time for all this strange assortment of those who could only further prejudice any prejudiced members of the board and not have the time to reflect any consideration of what I'd taken the time to write him for the board also was not encouraging to the belief that the board is determined to meet its mandate ^{or} ~~or~~ to do that with the vigor, determination and means required.

It is now five months since I first ^wrote the board. It ^{then} had not disclosed any address for itself. As a result I addressed the wrong member of the board c/o the National Archives. I had the wrong name because of those you gave public attention to sent ^{me} a mailing with the wrong name of the board member who had addressed him and others the month before then.

I had a response from Marwell dated December 8, 1994. He thanked me for the information I had provided and assured me the information I provided "would be very useful" but only when ~~when~~ ^{the} Board begins the actual review of records and the search for

additional documents." I then wondered if he meant that there would be no organized search for any documents the agencies did not provide voluntarily until after it went over those it did provide without compulsion.

Under that date I received a ~~separate~~ separate letter from Marwell in which he corrected me for the error I refer to above long after I had learned the fact and written acknowledging that and explaining it. In that second letter, I wondered why he found that necessary. He also assured me that ~~all~~ all "members of the board are committed to ensuring the broadest possible release of records relating to the assassination" and that it "intends to reach out to members of the research community and make use of the expertise that you and others have acquired."

While I wondered if he had the remotest notion of what most regard ~~as~~ as "research" I attributed that to his newness in the ~~field~~ field. He closed by indicating that the board would be in touch with me in the near future. *which has not yet come,*

Neither of these letters ~~was~~ ^{what} ~~can~~ can be regarded as any kind of meaningful response to what I had taken the time to inform the board about in my letter to the ^{wrong} member and with the copies of the letters I had written the CIA director that were attached.

I raise a number of matters I regard as serious in those letters to which I ^{will} come and to which I have had no meaningful response. One was the use of ^{their} disclosure by the agencies who do not like my factual and entirely unrefuted ^{will} exposures of them to ~~defame~~ defame me and to undermine my work. I pointed out then and later (only to have it still entirely ignored) that I am old, in impaired health, and that until the withheld records contrived to defame me and ^{var} ranging from deliberately distorted to entirely false were disclosed I could not invoke my rights under the Privacy Act to file corrections.

I wrote Marwell about this again January 20 after learning that records ^{justifying} ~~assassina-~~ ~~ting~~ my fear had in fact been disclosed. It is only ~~three~~ three months later so perhaps it is too soon for me to expect Marwell to pay any attention to that.

On a number of other occasions some of which I did not date I continued to try to be helpful to the board and sent it some documents.

During this time you and Jeremy were here. You personally observed that the physical limitations I had already told the board and Marwell personally about are quite real. You saw that I have trouble moving, that it is difficult for me to use the files in my office, that I must keep my legs up when I am not on them, am not to stand still and cannot safely use the stairs to our basement where most of my records are. I told you how they are arranged and you spent what time you wanted with them, alone. I think I told you you could have copies of any you might want and I believe that while you were doing that I selected for copying or made copies of them without awaiting your return of some records I have accessible in my office. You did get copies of them before you left.

They, like everything I have given the board, is to inform it, to indicate where

undisclosed and relevant records are stored ^{at both} in the agencies. I was as open as I could be, too ^{at} what time you wanted, volunteered what I could think of, offered to be tape in anything I said and as I ^{have} ~~had~~ written, was willing to state everything I said under oath and subject to the penalties of perjury.

~~How~~ you can interpret any of this as bombing you I do not see, But before getting to who did the bombing and of whom, a little more for context.

A friend who was working in the Archives got me, rather got and sent me a copy of what the index ^{of} discloses of records on me. I wrote the board about that. I informed it that there were a great many relevant records not in that index and that there was not a single one that was provided by the CIA. As I recall there were six only that origina-
ted with the CIA disclosed by other agencies. There were other agencies that had such records that ~~did not provide~~ a single page of them. ^{Like state. And} ~~we~~ remember, if I am to be able to make proper use of the Privacy Act to file corrections of the innumerable slanders, lies and intended other defamations of me and ^{of} my work I can do that only if the board sees to it that all of those records are disclosed, not only those selected by the agencies, the FBI in particular, are available to be addressed. ^{Before I die.} This is what I first informed the board five months ago. They are without any doubt assassination records because of the mis-uses made on them by the agencies.

I asked a student to obtain copies of a few of them for me. I told her to tell the people at the Archives when she had them the index ~~of~~ pages of which I want ^{ed} copies that the Act provides for free copies. As of then the board had not ^{seen} to it that those people know that free copies are provided for in the Act. ^{They insisted on paym out} She paid for them and I was embarrassed when she refused to accept repayment.

FOIA requires response to requests under it. It is five months since I ^{write} the CIA most recently about its withholding what with^{out} any question at all are assassination records, with copies to the board, and I am still without response. Or even acknowledgement. If the board has made any effort to see to the release of those records many of which I informed it about it has kept that secret from me.

Finally, after four months, without taking the time for doing it himself, ^{Marwell} ~~he~~ had Sullivan write me. I can only wonder how she could have asked of me all she did knowing full well if she had paid any attention at all to what I had told the board repeatedly about my limitations from the simply enormous amount of work she asked of me in the name of that man who is too busy except for seeing to it that the attention he gets the nuts undermines what the public ^c know about. Those who ^s seek the disclosure of assassination records. In each and every instance I provided the board with more than enough information to describe those withheld records and to simple^{ly} ask for them. Which, obviously, was too simple for the board to think of or too foreign to its concept of how with the limited time it has it can get assassination records released in full, its mandate.

4
I failed to date my response to the Sullivan-for-Marwell letter of March 9 but it was delayed only slightly. Only a month having elapsed Marwell has not had time to respond. Or does not intend to. Maybe Sullivan is also too busy finding ways of asking others what the board is supposed to do, not private citizens for it.

Illustrative of the Sullivan/Marwell approach to response is their 6. which says that I only "suggested" that there are records withheld that I need to be able to use the Privacy Act. I did more than merely "suggest" this. Then I was told that "No mechanism is provided in our legislation for providing comment on or for supplementing information contained in records that are part of the collection."

What recess of what great mind that came from I can't even guess because I neither said nor suggested any such thing. My only recourse, obviously, is the Archives, possibly with copies to the agencies. But in this Sullivan and Marwell perhaps achieved their high point.

Their 1 says I "suggested" which is not at all what I did, that "the CIA Office of Security opened ⁴ files on me." I was then asked for "file numbers, dates opened or any documentary evidence there is that there are such files," I had already provided all I could with the exception of a copy of the disclosed CIA record reflecting that I am within two such files, the record that was withheld from the CIA's ^e general counsel in favor of an inadequate and deceptive response of which I have since provided you with a copy. And how anyone with any knowledge of CIA disclosures could even dream that it disclosed its file numbers or the dates on which it established files I can't imagine. It never did these things.

But if the board had the slightest idea how to function or the slightest intention of having those records to which I referred disclosed, was anything more required of it than picking up the phone and asking the CIA? (I have since provided that records, to go along with as I recall a few others. No acknowledgement of receipt.)

When I could not have been any more explicit in telling the board that the index check I had disclosed that the CIA itself had not transferred a single record I was asked "exactly which part of my correspondence" with the CIA has and has not been already sent to the Archives. Not a single page, which I told the board, citing my source, is not fully informing it? Can what I wrote have been read at all?

In 3., which merely sneaks up to the remote edge of what I told the board, I was asked for "documentary evidence" of the Kraeger publishing company's "tie" with "the government." I had told the board that this was disclosed by the Church committee ^{7/22} and had been published in the papers and in a book I identified. What more is required? Not that here also you could not have asked the FBI. CIA By phone.

In 4. I am again asked for what should be readily ^{1 able} available to you from the Justice Department, "records regarding my FOIA appeals." I was then asked for a list of them.

Where you were here I told you and Jeremy where they are in the ^{bas} ~~statement~~. If you

even glanced at the file cabinet to which I directed you you know that it is filled with them, three file drawers stuffed with them. And at 82 and inform and unable to use the stairs, all specific and repeated in what I wrote, I am asked to make a list of them for you? (plural) I believe that when I referred you and Jeremy to them I told you they were that extensive, detailed and documented at the expressed desire of the then appeals officer who said he was a "history buff" and wanted the record for his history to be as full as possible.

"Why did the board want only a list of them? Could it not have asked the FBI and/or DJ for copies of them? While in 4. these are referred to only as my "FOIA appeals" those relating to the withholding of JFK assassination records are in a separate file cabinet. All three stuffed drawer of them relate ^{to} with the withholding of JFK assassination information. ^{only} should you not therefore want all of those ^e appeals and all the documentation attached to them transferred to the Archives? So why ask me for what it was impossible for me to provide and extremely burdensome for anyone to provide ~~what that~~ when what you wanted was their disclosure? *should have wanted, any way.*

I think this is enough other than what I take to be criticism in their concluding paragraph, "It is always helpful when such requests are precise precise, documented and clear." Then, "The clearer your requests are, the ^e easier it will be to respond." This because you "would like very much like to be helpful to you," "meaning me. The board's record on this and that letter in particular reflect the exact opposite.

The major point I made is that there is a prima facie case that the CIA interfered with my being published on the assassination and violated my first-amendment rights in ~~violating~~ violating the limitations placed upon it by its charter. I spelled this out in some detail. I included that I took a deal for ancillary rights to the Littauer & Wilkinson literary agency which liked the book and then killed that deal, while offering to represent me and the book in England. I told the board that this coincided with the time that CIA officer E. Howard Hunt used that office as his secret cover office. When it was possible for me I had ^{made} done what the board could have done more easily, a search of my source on that being Hunt's cover address ^{while} he was in the CIA. The copies of those entries I ^{later} sent the board, again without any acknowledgement, were obtained for me from a local library. Which does not begin to have the resources of the ^{the} Library of Congress. I ~~was~~ also informed the board that there was a disclosed CIA foundation, ^{the} Littauer Foundation, like the literary agency, in New York. I am certain I also told the board that as I learned at the time of the Watergate scandals, ^mMax Wilkinson, my supposed agent, was also ^{disinformation} Hunt's. I understand that you have learned that Hunt was part of the CIA's assassination campaign to use its assets to negate and undermine the work of those of us who did not support the official assassination mythology.

I believe I gave the board additional relevant information about this and about Hunt.

I know I told the board what I had been told ^{about} interferences with my being published in England and in Germany, of the interferences with my mail relating to that, all with names. That was when the CIA's disclosed record state that it had ordered some of its offices abroad to use their "assets" to this ^{end} that was during the ^{period}, as I told the board, the Church committee exposed the fact that the FBI was intercepting foreign mail for and delivering it to the CIA. I am certain I told the board that I had a cable from my agent in London reporting that all my mail for about two months was delivered the day he sent that cable. I am likewise certain that I told the board that the letters ^{from} the German publisher who wanted to do Whitewash telling me that never reached me and that when as a result the manuscript was mailed back to me it never reached me.

If none of this is even referred to in that Sullivan-Marwell letter that tells me how very much they want to help me. In what is described as a response to what I wrote!

You are an information officer. Can you think of any request you, meaning the board, could have made of the CIA that would signal it more than ^{this matter} that you are very serious about its compliance with the law? Which is not one of its strong ^{NTS} points? Or that after what I wrote Woolsey tells it more clearly that you are not all that serious when you are silent about it? Or what ^{public notice of this would have done to affect compliance?}

With this record, the immediately above in particular, and you tell me you want very much to help me, how would you take that if our positions were reversed?

When I took all the time I did to help Marwell and in response he writes me as little as he did and then turns it over to the Sullivan who wrote me in his name as she did, were you in my position ^{how} would you take that?

When she is so ignorant of what I wrote ^{what is} or no better, so utterly indifferent to it, how would you feel if she asked of you what she in Marwell's name ^{asked of} did to me?

And then I hear from Jim that you believe that I bombed you!

As I said at the beginning, the only thing I could think of that you could have had in mind is that ^{has} perhaps you lined up those the board heard in its hearings. In ^{connection} with what follows bear in mind the assurances I was written that all ^{of} the board want full disclosure and ^{are} allegedly impartial.

The Boston Globe's story reports that one of those you heard in Boston urged you "to pursue reports that the windshield of the President's limo" was switched after being pierced by a bullet and that Kennedy's gunshot wounds were altered as part of a cover-up. "If this does not qualify for what I referred to as at best nuttiness, then this is what the AP's story says about those it refers to as "assassination researchers," that they "suggested everything from looking into the archives of the late Nikita ~~Khrushchev~~ Khrushchev to finding out whether the president's autopsy ... was captured on a tape recording."

The only "reports" that the windshield ^{was} both pierced by a bullet and then switched were made up by those described and treated as "researchers."

It took a really imaginative "researcher" to see that you could subpoena Eussian records to be made public as United States records.

There were more than a dozen people in the Bethesda autopsy room and a rather large number of others in its amphitheater. Not one of them reported any taping. As only those who know nothing at all about the established fact do not know.

Dumping this kind of worse than trash on the ^mmembers of the board who have only a couple of ^{monthly} days of involvement in your work does not convince them that all questions about withheld records are nutty and baseless and that ^{all} these "researchers" are really crazy? (See page 11)

With regard to the board's alleged openmindedness Kermit Hall commented about the doubt about "whether John Wilkes Booth killed President Lincoln." ^{Relevant?} He is then quoted as saying, "Basically, the conspiracy theorists will always be able to find questions to ask that cannot be immediately answered," ^Wthus he is saying that you have heard from "conspiracy theorists" only and by inference that we are all crazy and irresponsible. ^{the}That "lobe story also states, "Some of the agencies felt they had disclosed' all records that they had said ^{John Tunwell...} Now they are finding records they weren't aware that they had."

Both parts are untrue. They reflect how little prepared Tunwell is to meet his obligations. The FBI and the CIA in particular were well aware of what they withheld and they are not only now just finding them for the first time,

Open-minded Hall, according to the assurance to me, is also the board expert on the constitution. His concerns in that area do not include the violations of our constitution and of my constitutional rights from the record above only, and it is not complete. The Tulsa World of March 21 quotes him as saying, "In the absence of an official record, an unofficial record develops. Speculation fills some of the void. ...We're not likely to find that Lee Harvey Oswald ^{was one of} seven gunmen four of whom were on the grassy knoll. ... Under the circumstances ^{it is} highly unlikely that we will wind up with some ~~one~~ body ^{other} besides Lee Harvey Oswald ... a bungler who got caught."

The story adds to this reflection of your magnate and his impartiality with other fine impartiality, "Hall said he personally is in general agreement with ^{herald} Posner, whose recent book, 'Case Closed,' is "'pretty devastating' to conspiracy theories. That said I'm going into this with an open mind. If we find that a memo says that J. Edgar Hoover ordered Kennedy killed we'll put it ⁱⁿ there."

He is so openminded he said this a year after the truth about both Posner and his book was available in the bookstores. (I'm ^assuming it was not sent to him to read by the staff. I hope this is not an unjustified assumption.) That he apparently know/nothing about any available contrary information and, in fact, that he had no interest in ^{warning} if there is any is an eloquent testimony to his open-mindedness. ^{and intentions} And how does or can he know at the outset that there is no "official record"?

What he said demans the job he and the rest of you undertook It in fact makes a joke of it and it ridiculus all ~~that~~ ^{who} have addressed the board in a serious effort to help it. In fact it makes a joke of the whole thing. It and more raise a serious question about whether he should have sought or accepted the responsibilities he assumed and whether or not he should continue in them.

But subject-matter ignoremus that he is I do not know where in the hell he gets off referring to me the way he does in lumping us all together and making so many biased and ill-adv^{is}ed as well as false comments.

I was sent a letter by a historian who took in Hall's appearance on the Carol Luper show on WSYX-TV in Columbus, Ohio. The historian who wrote me said Hall said that "a great service could be done if the results confirmed that Oswald did it alone. ... He pretty much took the Newsweek line that, yes, There was a cover^{up}, but that was not to cover up the results, meaning that Oswald did it, but for other reasons that had to do with security and protecting each agency, etc's interest."

How "open-minded" can he be? ^{Or more ignorant?} And this is not all I've been told. He's been overheard leaving a hearing making deprecating remarks to abother member of the board consistent with these demonstrations of his ^{mindedness he} open-mindedness~~he~~ is impelled to boast on all possible public occasions.

If this is open-mindednes may God protect the nation from bias or prejudice!

And if this is how he reflects our professors of history, especially in the area of his reported expertise or speciality, our constitution, is it not to wonder how our history is taught and what is in the minds of those subjected to it? Or can be? (See page 11#2)

As I told you and Jeffrey when you were here, I know that little time remains for me and that I want to use all of it I can in recording what I can of our history of which I have acquired the knowledge I have. I showed you the volume of what I have ^{put} on paper in recent years. It is not small. I also told you what I am working on that is not complete, what it means to me if not ^{also} to the country for it to be completed, and that I spend every minute I can on it. As I think the volume alone reflects, There is not much time I can spend on this work that I do not devote to it. I do nothing else except what I must. This has been true since at least early 1992, when I began this more recent writing. Yet I have taken the time I've taken in an effort to help the board meet its obligations the full and honest meeting of which can mean much to the nation. It is obvious that typing and handwriting are Not easy for me. Nor is it, as you have observed, to have to keep my feel elevated when I am not using them. The amount of time I have taken for correspondence alone in trying to help the board is not inconsiderable.

And what do I have in return? Aside from your saying that I bombed you!

Not a dmaned thing other than unreasonable requests and insults. That Sullivan/Marwell letter is both.

Aside from your meeting your obligation to get the full defamatory record relating to me and all the underlying records I have not referred to but can and have suggested so that I may help perfect the record it is your obligation to ^{get disclosed,} perfect by using the Privacy Act, there is nothing you can do that can mean anything to me personally. I cannot get to the Archives to look at any disclosed records and because I am alone in not doing any theorizing those whose life is theorizing have little interest in sending me copies of disclosed records they get.

And I have asked nothing of the board that is ^{NOT} its job. *To do.*

I see it as bumbling, not having the slightest notion of how to deal with those who have suppressed information for three decades and have developed techniques and skills in that anti-American record; as unwilling to accept help when it is offered and instead makes a public record of all the assassination nuttiness and irresponsibility, ~~giving~~ giving the country, the media in particular, ^{the very lesson} that it is representative, and that there is nothing else.

Jim tells me that the board is responsible for the FBI's disclosure of CD 1359, those FBI records relating to Solo, the Childs brothers. Big deal that! Big deal, too, as the Post publicized it, that Castro said the shooting attributed to Oswald was impossible. The Post regarded that as important. But the same Post and every other paper in the land ^{fund} it not worth mentioning that the best shots in ^{in fact for the Warren Commission} this country, under vastly improved conditions, would not ~~attempts~~ duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. The Commission published that and I published what the Commission published in 1965.

So you have ^{this} great ^{my} accomplishment to your credit. Along with the disclosure of the Names of the Childs brothers and their status as FBI symbol informers-which had been disclosed at least 15 years ago!

Of all you could have asked the FBI to disclose this is the most important matter?

If I remember correctly the board was so impressed it issued a statement ~~praising~~ praising the FBI for disclosing it! The same FBI that has withheld it improperly for all the time time it did, at least 15 years if not more.

Why does this tell the FBI how determined ^{my} you really are to see to full disclosure! Especially when it knows very well what you have displayed no interest in. I do not take your time or mine for ticking any of that off but it is quite a bit of information.

This calls for no response from you. Unless, of course, you want to. But in thinking about it after Jim told me you feel that I bombed you I decided to make a record of ^{this} that.

Without some meaningful demonstration of the board's real interest in meeting the obligation it (collectively) undertook I plan to write you no further. I stand prepared to meet the promises I made but from the record thus far ^{for me} it has all been a waste of the little time I have for me. If there are questions I can answer I'll answer them. But from Marwell on my letters to Hall and his boasted of "open-mindedness" it does seem to be a real waste of my time on those who are not prepared to do what is required from them to

obligations all accepted if they did not seek.

So I will volunteer no more.

I guess I should add in ~~fair~~ fairness to the board and to myself that I am really disgusted by all of this.

By the likes of that ~~is~~ subject-matter ignoramus Hall pontificating, deprecating, insulting, missing no opportunity to record his biases he refers to as open-mindedness, and by the fact that he as a professional ^{historian} ~~historian~~ believes he prepared himself for the obligations he undertook by reading the most deliberately dishonest and wrong-headed of all the sycophantic literature ^{we} and accepting that as his bible a year after the truth ^{about it} was in the bookstores.

By the board's loading itself and its record up with all the nuttiness and irresponsibility possible (which puts it in a position after it ends its work to boast that it listened to all who wanted to be heard) while doing nothing about viable leads to existing assassination information and instead of using that information refused to do that and instead ^{made} unreasonable demands of me, regardless of my limitations, and at that ignored what could mean something and if done in a timely manner could have established in the agencies that have ~~practised~~ suppression for all these years, including by charged and unrefuted perjury, its seriousness of intent.

By the ^m ~~members~~ of the board ^{at} making ~~no~~ effort to learn what they must know to be able to meet the responsibilities they assumed, Other than by ^{the} reading the worst trash on the assassination by Hall who ~~then~~ then regarded it as the only and the very last word. On this, for your information, I referred to Posner as a shyster who cannot tell the truth even by accident. He then proved that by pretending to respond in his paperback reprint to what I published about him. Which is ever so much less than I wrote about him. What he actually did is prove me right all over again. The ~~only~~ pretended response he ^{to any thing} made was in saying that with Case Open I had finally found commercial publication. It was my 12th or 13th. As he knew. He also inserted a long and less than fully honest footnote to relieve what I exposed, his cribbing the work of Failure Analysis and representing that it was done for him. Hall's unquestionable authority indeed!

I hope it is possible for the board to do what it is supposed to do. I do not expect that. And I do hope I am wrong in this. But I think I am not. Oh, there will be a few things, like CD 1359 and the CIA disclosing all it did under the historical-records program it ~~it~~ ignored for all those years. and thus avoiding the indexing ^{including} required by the Act.

This is not by any means all. There is what I gave the board, ^{including} proof of repetitious perjury about the President's autopsy. But it will have to be enough.

Sincerely,
Harold

Harold Eiseberg

In reading and correcting this 4/11 it seems apparent to me that whatever may have been in any board or board employee mind in scheduling all this public attention to irrationalities, particularly after the board's first experience with it, if it could not have done more to tell the country that all those interested in the JFK assassination and its investigations are crazy.

Nor could it have done more to cover up the improper agency^c withholdings for 30 years. And its correspondence with me reflects no serious intention of doing anything about.

Whatever was in anybody's mind, the net effect of the board's giving all the public attention it did to all the irresponsibles, the ignoramuses, the certifiable mental cases and the self-seekers was propaganda for the errant agencies whose lawlessness was the direct cause of the creation of the board that was to correct that.

2. It is obvious that Hall was not in a position to know whether or not there was an official coverup of the results, however he may have meant it. It is also obvious that there was precisely that and I have given the board the proof of this. Included in what I gave the board is proof of perjury to effect that coverup. I have told the board of the coming publication of official proof of additional perjury to make possible the coverup Hall, sublime in his ignorance, said there was not. When saying anything like ~~that~~ that prostituted his function. I regard this as outrageous.

I feel this deeply. + mince no words. And if necessary I am quite prepared to add much to this.

~~Ag~~ I am aware that those who are conspiracy theorizers have long placed great importance on disclosure of CD1359. But the board's judgement in getting that disclosed rather than other withheld FBI records ^{is} part of what I mean by its lack of seriousness in what it is doing and how it is doing it. Off the top of the head, of all the FBI has and has not disclosed as one example, CD 1359 holds information more important than the FBI's blocking the chairman's appointment of his own preference as Commission general counsel? Than its records relating to its "adversarial" relationship with the Commission? Than its preparation of "dossiers" on the Members of the Commission? Than ~~only~~ its staff when appointed and again when the Report was issued? Than its preparation of "sex dossiers" on the critics? Than disclosure of the tape it has of at least one Oswald phone call to the USSR embassy? (Which the CIA claims was destroyed with all of them.) Than the transcript of that call? Of all its Warren Commission files other than its "liaison" file? (I identified at least one other HQ Commission file in one of the ^A ignored appeals, by its file number. The field offices have companion files ^{with} other numbers.) Than its undisclosed records on the threatening note Oswald left at the Dallas office several weeks before the assassination and of HQ's ordering it destroyed as soon as Oswald was killed? With thought I could come up with more. The point I am making is of more than the judgement represented, value judge-

ment. It reflect the total lack of preparation to make value judgements or ^{of} any organized effort to be in a position to make them. Of any planning to be informed about the established fact rather than what in public it always refers to, "conspiracy theories." That and its getting CD1359 disclosed ^{can} be interpreted as an intent to make a record if can later cite to claim it fulfilled its obligations when in fact it did not and in the absence of any proper preparation it can be alleged did not intend to at the outset. Witness in addition Hall's repeated public statements that are so prejudicial and reflect ignorance.

I informed the board about just about all of the above and my knowledge of them comes from the FBI's own records.

You are aware of all the FOIA lawsuits I filed and that in them I made myself subject to the penalties of perjury in alleging both perjury by the FBI to withhold records I identified and provided FBI records proving that those withheld records existed. Obtaining this information from the DJ, the FBI, the court records or from me was less important than being told to look for the nonexistent limo windshield? Or the nonexistent autopsy tape? Or the existing and withheld autopsy notes are not worth seeking? When they also were the subject of perjury and of its suborning?

I gave the board or informed it about the proof that Oswald had a high security clearance in the Marines. Has the board taken any steps to get all such records disclosed along with all the records of the ONI Oswald investigations - of any and all its Oswald records? These are less important than CD 1359?

I believe that nothing was known of the contents of CD 1359 before its disclosure. Whether or not this is so, that is more important than for example the CIA's interferences with publication about the assassination for one example of many? Or of its illegal activities relating to the assassination?

I could enlarge on this but there is no need to.

But I do ask a question.

Instead of merely phoning the CIA and asking it for the records the existence of which I assured you I had ^{documented} you asked me for proofs when the board knew they were not accessible to me. ^{Later} I did obtain and send copies of some. These include the CIA's Office of Security memo stating it had me in two undisclosed files; the misleading memo it substituted saying that I was not the "subject" of any surveillance, which leaves open surveillances of which I was not the subject, like of mail and phone calls; and of proof that Hunt used as his New York office that of Littauer and Wilkinson, which killed a deal I took to it relating my first book, which was the first on the assassination. What if anything has the board done since getting these proofs it could have gotten by a phone call? It has informed me of nothing.

HU