

Mr. David Marwell, executive director
ARMB
600 E St., NW, 2d floor
Washington, DC 20530

4/22/95

Dear Mr. Marwell.

Those who write me self-serving letters, like yours of the 18th, generally do not serve their interests that way. To the degree possible for me I am trying to make as much and as meaningful a record for our history as I can. So I therefore ~~let you know that I was not willing~~ to accept your invitation to add to this record.

As I remember, and checking the file is awkward for me, what you refer to as "My letter to you of March 9, 1995," was not written by you at all. I recall also that it asked me to do for you what you should be doing for yourself and had not done and do not report having made any effort to do after I sent you what you did ~~not~~ ask me to "clarify" further.

Are you now telling me that you, individually or collectively, could not understand it when I gave you details of government interferences with my publishing on the JFK assassination? Or is it your position that what the agencies did to and about us in not information about that assassination?

You could not understand when I told you that I had been informed

1) that John Sparrow, warden of All Souls, had killed publication of my first book in England?

2) that he had, as a British reporter told me, a history of working for intelligence?

I've just been told that recently disclosed CIA records reflect his connection with it.

You could not have asked the CIA anything about that? Or is it would not?

Or, if you really wanted to ^{do} the job you sought and accepted, you could not have asked further to learn if the CIA gave him any assistance in his Times of London Literary Supplement ^{article?} Or thereafter having that, already published, republished in the United States as a tiny book? It is not easy to imagine that with all else Sparrow had to do he had the time for the research required. That included reading and being familiar with all the books he criticized with direct quotations from them and being familiar with all that the Warren Commission published to be able to cite that selectively. ~~Or if you give me that~~

(I add, now that I've heard some such records have been disclosed, it might be good to check them under the names of two other British publishers, Frewin and Wiedenfeld and Nicholson. When no book on the assassination had been published and the respected Washington bureau chief of the Times of London recommended Whitewash they rejected it. The publisher who use Sparrow was Collins. and given my history with Fischer AG in Germany, it might be a good idea to check headquarters and station records on that.)

Are you telling me that you could not understand ~~with all the time you had to spend on the assassination~~

to my London agent
that on my second book my mail, (which included chapters of it as I wrote them, were delayed as I now recall a month or more and that he sent me a cable telling me all my mail for a long period of time reached him in a single delivery?

That the Church committee brought to light the fact that during that period of time the FBI was intercepting foreign mail at the post offices and delivering it to the CIA?

That Fischer ^{AG} wrote me asking to publish Whitewash and that those letters did not reach me? ^{Ever.}

That not having heard from me it returned the manuscript- and it never reached me?

Can it be that you could not understand what I wrote you ~~what~~ what seems to be a prima facie case of sub interference in the United States, where all domestic activity was prohibited the CIA, when I told you that;

I had taken a deal to the literary agency of Littauer & Wilkinson at 500 Fifth Avenue in New York because that magazine wanted to deal with me through an agent?

That ~~was~~ Wilkinson read the manuscript and phoned me that he liked it?

That he then offered to represent the book in England but said nothing could be done with it in the United States?

That years later I learned that a) Wilkinson was E. Howard Hunt's agent; that ^{and listed} Hunt used his office as his own office; that Hunt had a tie line that made it appear to those phoning him there were talking to him there when he was in some CIA office in Washington; and that the Church committee brought to light that there was a Littauer foundation in New York that was a CIA foundation? (When the boy scout who leads you across intersections was not on duty I got and sent you Hunt's own Who's Who listing that gives Littauer and Wilkinson as the address of his office. That needed "clarification")

I told you that ^{Proper Publishing's} ~~his~~ employee who handled such matters liked Whitewash very much and recommended to ^{who} it to Frederick Praeger, turned it down. I also told you that the Church committee brought to light that Praeger was a CIA publisher. This needed clarification before you could ask the CIA anything? *There then was no other assassination book for a year.*

^{to Hunt} But then that letter you say you wrote me made no reference to Littauer and Wilkinson or to Praeger that I recall.

I told you that the CIA Office of Security disclosed, probably by accident, that it had me in two files and did not send that memo to its general counsel in response to my request. I think you should be able to understand that. I told you that the CIA's general counsel told Jim Lesar, who I think is no stranger to you, and me that he had been told I had filed no requests at all. So maybe you can think that perhaps there is a connection of some kind in the Office of Security not sending him the memo I told you I had and then did not have access to and my assassination work. Then I did send you that memo. And you have not even acknowledged receipt of it, leave along tell me you were doing something about it.

Resumed 4/23: There are days and times and conditions under which some of us older people cannot do as well as we'd like. I had some trouble with this so you also can. If you want to. If you want to understand it you can and will. Your record with me and on not even trying to bring to light what ~~is~~ ^{was} assassination information in any definition is such that were I to ~~re~~write this it would make no difference to you anyway. And I can make constructive use of the time it would take.

I had written friends in academe that I would waste no more time on you ~~except~~ except in response to specific questions.

But yours is so obviously a self-serving letter I could not ignore it if I did not spend all the time on it I could have.

I really do feel sorry for you, individually and collectively.

Under the best of conditions none of you was really prepared to meet the obligations you assumed. Under the best of conditions it was a very difficult job for anyone.

You began in ignorance ~~whatever~~ ^{accomplishments} your scholastic and professional ~~ac~~ ^{accomplishments} and preparations may have been. That you could not help. But that you did worse than keep yourselves in ignorance was your choice. For that you alone are responsible.

How you did - and did not - do you work was also your choice. Nobody else has any ~~respons~~ responsibility for it.

At least one member of the board has repeatedly expressed preconceptions and prejudices that should have led him not to accept the responsibilities he assumed.

All members of the board should have realized they could not meet their ~~respons~~ responsibilities, including to themselves, on a parttime basis, by devoting so little time to their responsibilities to the nation on the board.

That it is a part-time board spending but a slight fraction of its time on board work - and all began without any subject ^{matter} knowledge or expertise - magnified your responsibilities.

So, in the end, in any evaluation of responsibilities and how they were or were not met, there will be greater attention on you.

and you, personally, whatever your prior experiences may have been, have not reflected any understanding of the realities and of the environment of what you undertook.

It is not at all difficult to make the case that you began intending not to succeed, whatever may be in your mind or whatever you think your intentions are.

When I was sent a copy of what Mr. ^{Funheim} had said I wrote him about that, without response and without my letter being returned. What he stated includes a lack of understanding of these realities.

6

So I am, genuinely, sorry for you, individually and collectively; and I am sorry for the nation because you cannot and will not have accomplished what it was possible to accomplish of what you undertook.

I regret, too, that you reveal so much in treating the disclosure of CD1359 as so momentous.

With all there is that has real significance that with your powers you have done nothing about.

HLL

The false record you seek to make in your 4/18 lingers on my mind. You are saying for the future and to explain away your present and its failure that what I gave you is of no value; that you have devoted "significant effort" trying to understand or make sense of it; deciding on "the most advantageous course to follow" which means how to ignore it all in plain English; and that you still need "clarification."

This no doubt explains your failure to use the phone a single time to ask me a single question of for a single clarification or a single explanation.

And you limit this to my "correspondence." That is not by any means all the board got from me as you well know.

I think your letter can be regarded and I do regard it as high-class Harvard-style mysticism. It is the letter of a lawyer covering his ass with a lawyer's letter.

So I will be a bit more blunt about what you did get from me and what uses you could have made of it before you defined out of the Act and your responsibilities under it what was unwelcome to you or that you feared addressing, perhaps over what it might mean to your future. From me you got, among other things:

A prima facie case that the government conspired, on the highest ^{level} ~~levels~~, not to investigate the assassination itself and proof that it did not, both documented with official records and official evidence.

Official proof that Oswald did not commit the crime and more, the official proof that he could not have.

That this is official evidence means that officialdom knew about it, knew the truth, and lied about it to us, to the country and to the world.

Proof that the autopsy chief prosecutor testified in official proceedings in contradiction to himself and, because of the materiality of his false swearing, was a perjurer. This with regard to more than one matter. Also the official proof that this was officially covered up.

Official proof that the autopsy notes, which are in evidence before the Warren Commission and was in its possession when it questioned the chief autopsy prosecutor, did then

exist , thereafter did not exist where it was required to be, and after that, the same chief prosector swore to having destroyed those note by burning them in the fireplace of his recreation room on November 24, 1965, which was months before he testified with them in his hands.

This is only part of what you say you cannot understand; ~~what~~ ^{what} needs "clarification" or, ~~then~~ ambiguity is yours, you do not know what to do with. Despite what you refer to as "significant effort."

If you would like the record you will leave to include more like this I'll take the time for it.

You have the power of subpoena, which means to compel appearance with the production of records, and testimony ~~Under~~ ^{Under} oath and this is not clear to you, or you cannot understand it or you can't figure out what to do ^{after} all these months.

But you can ~~define~~ ^{define} "assassination records" so that to the degree possible by your definition you can try ~~to~~ ignore all of this, while "filfilling our obligations under the law."

I am not ~~so~~ yet to old, too ill or too ~~infirm~~ ^{infirm} to tell you I resent very much your effort ~~to~~ misuse me as part of your covering up for the failure you intend and supervise and impliment to protect earlier official covering up and worse.

Resentment is not the only emotion I feel strongly but I do not believe it is necessary to ~~articulate~~ ^{articulate} the others.

Hu