

11-11-79
Mustell
Dear Mark,

9/19/79

Jim has sent me the CIA's Motion to Remand in your case and his affidavit.

I would add that if there is a remand you might want to consider a direct, frontal and I do mean vigorous attack on the integrity of what they say, and you may want to go over some of what I've gathered after our use for it in ~~some~~ court was past. They have made the most incredible claims to withhold what they never withheld prior to the 1974 amending of the Act.

In your 9/14 you ask me why I say that they did have the tape from Mexico. I now do not recall the record. When I wrote I thought it was in one of those you went over when you were here. Either I am wrong in my recollection or it is a subsequent record, meaning one I read later.

I've made a separate file on Oswald and Mexico from the FBI records as I got over them. By now it is large and Ed has a stack of copying to do, including of pages to go into that file.

What I'll do when I can after this copying is done is put the file in order and read it and see if I can find the reference I had in mind. Of course it could have been the Hoover to Rowley letter of 11/23 but I'm inclined to believe it was something having to do with Rudd's trip.

I've read the passages you cited in your memo from the HSCA report and am not surprised at their deliberate, intended dishonesty.

I'm not wasting time to read the entire report. However, what you cited was worth the time. So if you note or recall any other parts within the time please let me know. I'd rather read FBI records in the same time, and I am. However, when I got for my weekly blood-test or take Ed's grocery shopping I do not carry FBI records and have to wait. It is safer and easier to carry the report and other printed matter.

After reading the Motion I am no less persuaded that the real reason is to stall past Robinson's decision in 1948. Meanwhile, if this move succeeds it can give them and Smith a chance to make a better record.

Best wishes,