

August 14, 1971

Mr. David W. Belin
Herrick, Langdon, Belin and Harris
300 Home Federal Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Dear Mr. Belin:

I have been considering the conditions set forth in your letter of August 3 under which our correspondence may be used "directly or indirectly or disclose(d) to any third party...for any purpose whatsoever." You state you would not anticipate giving any consent for use unless "the quotation was not an extract but rather there was a complete verbatim inclusion of all of (your) correspondence with (me)." Please be assured that I would not consider making any of this correspondence available to third parties unless I disclosed it in total, with every word of our exchange included so that there could be no question of misrepresentation or out of context quotation.

Furthermore, I wish to advise you of the interpretation of your conditions by which I will abide. You say that I "do not have (your) permission without (your) express written consent to use...any portion of (your) correspondence..." Since you have waited until August 3 to impose this condition, it obviously cannot be retroactive. Thus, I could not have been bound to these conditions during the time period for which I was unaware you would impose them. Likewise, I cannot give my consent to have you impose any conditions on letters which I write. Any letter which I write to you I will feel free to disclose to third parties although I assure you that should I decide to disclose such letters, I would disclose the entire letter verbatim so that I do not misrepresent what I have stated in those letters. Also, as of now I will assume that I do not have your permission to make any distribution of letters which you write me. If you were to consent to such distribution, again, I assure you I would, if the occasion arose, distribute only complete, verbatim copies of whatever you have written.

Since I have stipulated that I cannot permit my own letters to be regulated (and indeed you have my permission to disclose my letters to any third party so long and only so long as you disclose the complete, verbatim letter), you are in the position of having only my impression or interpretation of your letters revealed. Thus I urge you to permit disclosure of your letters on the condition to which I heartily agree, that they be disclosed completely and verbatim. This would be entirely fair and proper to both of us and, frankly, I cannot understand your reluctance to permit any disclosure in this absolutely unbiased and innocuous manner, assuming, of course, that you would not have said to others what you have said to me (and I don't accept this excuse). I hope you will reconsider the harsh restriction you have placed on distribution of your letters for I feel this may be unfair to you and against your own interests.

You seem to want to be certain that if and when your correspondence is disclosed, it plus "the overall evidence involved with regard to the murders of President Kennedy and Officer Tippit" be "fairly and accurately" presented. To this I give you my assurance that I will not become guilty of the despicable actions of others in this regard, those who indeed have presented the evidence neither "fairly" nor "accurately." This includes those who proclaim that no one saw Lee Harvey Oswald in the Book Depository between 11:55 and 12:30 and deliberately conceal the fact that at least two witnesses did in fact see Oswald during this period, those who claim Oswald constructed a paper sack, fail to present any evidence proving this, and then conceal the testimony of the

one man who might connect Oswald with the source of the bag but in fact cannot and does not; those who reject the credible testimony of a man who saw two people on the sixth floor and immediately reported this fact to the authorities, basing the rejection on this man's "tendency to exaggerate" about personal matters unrelated to the assassination, while at the same time accepting and emphasizing the testimony of three confessed liars (a man who first declined to identify Oswald as the gunman but subsequently admitted lying to the police about his inability to make such identification, a woman who denied ever having a phone conversation with a lawyer while a tape recording of her phone conversation with that lawyer was being played, and another woman, the wife of the accused, who, when she gave her first testimony, stated outright that everything she had told the federal authorities prior to that date was conscious lies); those who quote the wife as having seen her husband take his rifle to practice and having been told by her husband that he engaged in practice when on several occasions the wife strongly and emphatically denied any knowledge of rifle practice; those who, as was recently revealed in an excellent article, quote a witness's statement that he saw Oswald on the sixth floor at 11:55 but conceal the fact that this witness originally told the authorities he saw Oswald on the first floor at this time; those who report the time of the Tippit murder as 1:15 to 1:16 and credit one witness with having made the first police radio announcement, while they conceal evidence that the murder may have occurred at 1:10 (too early for Oswald to have been the assailant) and also proving that it was in fact a totally different (and suppressed) witness who made the announcement (see vol. 24, p. 202).

Currently, I am aghast at such actions and can find no adequate explanations. As you know, I seek explanations.

Sincerely,

Howard Roffman
8829 Blue Grass Rd.
Phila., Pa. 19152