Mr. Mark Lynch
122 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

1/22/85

Dear Mark,

Hopefully by tomorrow the cold will have moderated enough for us to spare heat for my office and a copying machine I hope is not frozen. I'll make copies of the letter I began yesterday to DJ's Huff on the chance that several thing in it may be of use to you in other litigation. Jim Lesar, to whom I'll also send a copy, can provide copies of this and any other Huff letters to me that may be of use to you.

First, they seem to be extending the decision in the field offices case to include any and all records, those <u>not</u> within the litigation in particular.

In my postscript I refer to it as ambulance chasing, but he rather openly aolicits additional litigation, and with regard to really ancient matters. My first request for records on or about me was about 10 years sgo and of the Nosenko requests they do not ignore, in 1978 they wrote me that it was being handled, then again more than a year ago. In fact the FBI only last week made a referral to INS.(Another Nosenko request was for merely what the FBI had already disclosed. If remains ignored.)

It is only by accident that some time ago I used my Ronnie Caire request as an illustration: I just stumbled on a copy of the appeal. Attached to it are the FBI's records reflecting not only that they'd lied to me but that Caire was a registered foreign agent. Oswald had applied to him for a job in New Orleans and that appears to be the only job application the FBI did not investigate. Caire represented <u>anti</u>-Castro Cuban and Oswald's symapthies were in the opposite direction.

The lie on which they seek to defraud Jim of his fee in my King case (on remand, en banc petition not acted upon) is that they process my requests in order of receipt, along with others'.

FYI, the personal record I sent Huff has the FBI reporting that Russian embassy staff visited me. Never happened. Must be a corruption of a tap when I was doing something asked of my by USIA and State. Earlier I sent Shea, who also did nothing, an FBI record, also false, that I had a personal relationship with a citizen of the USSR in that embassy. Obviously there are underlying records and as I recall in one instance were cited by number.

Sincerely,

Harold

1/23, FYI: I presume you are both first-amendment types, so of the intercepted mail some never reached me and I learned about it only later. A dear friend hand carried a copy of my first book to a dear friend of his in Germany, with the major German publisher, Fischer. Fischer went for the book, kept writing me, with no letter returned to it or ever reaching me. In the end they returned that copy of the ms., and it also never reached me. My mail to my London agent also was intercepted, and I have records on this and the consequences somewhere. I'm sorry these things do not come to mind when I'm writing Huff, but I've been feeling, even for my present condition, weak and lousy except during my walking therapy, and that is when my mind returns to such matters. Please, what follows is to go no farthur, but the single dictabelt Hubbell admitted finding when she finally got to what should have been her starting point cannot possibly be the original dictabelt of that police-broadcast recording, the FBI has to know this and nonetheless conned the NAS panel comvoked by the AG (because it is outside FOIA) and thus corrupted its report. This found dictabelt will almost certainly have cross-talk on it from the second police channel, which is the basis of the panel's conclusion.

The significance of this may not be clear to Mark but I'm sure it will be to Jim. It can have enormous consequences and it involves the induced defsmation of a firm of scientists of pre-eminent reputation and expertise. This is why I offered to pay for the second dub, so I can provide it. It can (but not necessarily) be very important to the House of Representatives, where the request of the AG originated. I can think of no other explanation for the delay in providing what is outside any exemption and could not be more in the public domain.

The office in which the recording and related records was found is the liaison office in Criminal, with the House and the scientific panel.

The recording has to have been obtained by the Dallas FBI during the litigation in which Phillips swore repeatedly to the contrary and was in his own division.

It thus is both Dallas and FBIHQ and not res judicata, if they were to claim that, as Huff's letter can be taken to indicate.

Separately, if it presents no problems for you, does this, if not also other matters of which you are both aware, provided a basis for going the new-evidence route?

This is not the same as asking you to do something if it is.

If you feel that you cannot or ought not tell me, can you refer to someone who can?

While I think of it, reminded as I am by some of the above - and in this connection I remind Mark of what I once wrote him, of a prima facie case of E Howard Hunt/CIA interference with my publishing - there were two interferences in England that I recall, and I think Jim is not aware of either because they were before we met. I have a file of relevant records in a box for university deposit, on the non-publishing history of my first book, which became a sensation and a best-seller. I planned a book on that tentatively titled, with an obscure composing room phrase, "Dick Daring in the Hellbox, or How I Got Rich in Six Months." (A private editor and Pocket Books both made the prediction.) I was informed that when a fabulous woman, the Baroness Maura Budberg, introduced the book to the major British publisher, Collins, they went for it until Sir John Sparrow, reputedly a don doubling as spook, put the kibosh on it. (Don of All Saints, as I recall.) Then, while Andre Frewin was drafting a contract on it, he was, mysteriously, fed misinformation. He wrote me frankly about that and I'm sure I have the correspondence in that box. In this connection I'd appreciate it if Mark asked his associate Adler to show him the CIA record Adler wanted and I sent him. Not as definitive, but as of potential relevance and significance.

And ought not these records still be available to me from the CIA? In response to my (repeatedly appealed) 1971 requests?

Harold