of under Pelihar Cal W

Fuch

March 80, 1969

Fr. Will Wilson, Aset Atty
General, Criminal "ivision
Department of Justice
Weshington, D.G. (Astm Mr. Corl W. Beleber)

Deer Sir,

It is not from my letters to the Department of Justice, to which, to date, there has never been meeningful response, that you can any "it is minimized that further exchange of carrespondence... will serve me useful purpose". This is your policy determination. It is consistent with the refusal of your agency is mene meeningful response. If you will read the last two letters to which yours of March 26 is suppossedly addressed, you will find this is true. I deeply regret this, for it is this official blindness, this continuing martgaging to the arrow for the pest, that will bound you people personally and to an unending and unboosessary problem and emorpose to the administration of which you are part,

I begin with the assumption of hemsety on your part. I therefore my you gravet possibly have reed my books of that rether extending ( end I believe arong and immorel) federal explanage on my public opposarances and coy, so you do in your second paragraph, that nothing will make me "sericin that the classest of politics played he role in the investigation of the assessination of President Kannedy or the formulation for of the quidalines for the release" of the files. You may have reed FM paraphrases. From my own by mer large study of thousands of those, I can escaptive they could lead you to this misepprehension. I is the preferedent incompetence of those reports that is a major cause of the existing problem and situation. I am propered to prove this st your convenience. If there is enything I say that you do not believe, I invite your challenge and with each instence note the same offer of preof at your convenience. I hope this is an offer you accepte.

It is not with the formulation of the guidelines that I quarrel but with their interpretation and explication. For exemple, may time you want I will make a case for you that much too much that should not have been released has been, with the result that people were meedlessly damaged. All of this of which I have inswhedge is consistent, falls into a single pottern. I know of no case where the demograt person was not either "liberal" or not ettreetive to the FBI agests. On the other head, what commet pre orly be suppressed has been. I can and on your request will put in your hand complet, for in some cases, on enternit restinguations the posts where the interpolation of the production of th for the spectrographic analysis of the bulket and freguents of bullet said to have been used in the assassination, not have you told me why this has been demied me. I have saled for this with some regularity for close to three years. The only response had been an FME falsehood, You knew and I recently alluded to it, that Mr. Vincon told me a review was underway and I would soon heer about one request. Yet about this, ten, when I made inquiry, you wer silent. Many more exemples are available if you must them, but I think you should by now understand that in eddressing yourself to the "formslation of the guidlines" you at best seek to eveds my complaint.

In the sense in which you use the word, there is no westent for saying I believe "phhitics" played a "wels in the investigation of the assassination". I do not now and never did believe this was a Republican or a Democrat matter, nor can I recall ever having said enything that could be tortured into sugresting this. However, in the selection and appointment of the members of the Commission, there was a political genius. I have worked for several branches of the government and lived class to it for 35 years. I recell no single instance in which any edministration ever appointed a majority of five of seven members of any body from the minority party. One of the things this achieved is obvious: the present Republican administration is that of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Perren Commission. You thereby ere saddled with the responsibility of the precepting edministration, of the other phlitical party. Anyone is authority today who might consider looking into possible error by the Terren Commission is immediately confronted with the consideration that acknowledging such error will be to assume political responsibility for it. While I do not expect you to pay attention to me or to give serious, arture thought to what I tell you, I nonetheless tell you that for a short while you do have a period of grace in thich this will not be true, through the unintended kindness of former Attorney General Clark. Thereefter you, by your silence, by your refused to do what impurtial reading of what you now have requires of you, you assume responsibility for what he has done. His transgressions will become your, To the degree I can, I will see to this, for it is my obligation as a citison.

Each one of you in authority is the captive of him upon when you depend for 'mowledge and advice. Each of you, as you undoubtedly balieve you may properly, takes on faith what is given him, what he is told. If I sell-holfwedge there is too much I do not know, I also insist know of no case in which enyone in sutherity ever sought empotent, entside knowledge and advice. I cannot conceive of this having happened without my knowledge, for there are very fews indeed, from whom such counsel could be cought. Whether you believe me or not, it cannot be done without my knowledge. Not hencetly. But what happens if you are, for whatever surpass, with whatever metive or lack of motive, misinformed? Do you expect those who may have been responsible for the error of the past to leadly proclaim that today? And on such a subject?

You see, I have never believed there was the measter conspirety my opposition alleges inside the government. I have always thought and still think much if not most of this can be emplained by the normal workings of bureaucracy, and I have often said this, whether or not it is in the material available to you. However, the more time passes, the less credible this will become. In the future, these errors will not be susceptible of such explanation. (And if you perchance think I am personid in soying there has been federal esphonage on me, I will put copies of it in your hand.)

I directly challenge your totally erroness statement, "the substantial co rectness of the Commission's Report remains unimpeached by any recent developments". This challenge is so direct I do not even suggest you will have to make "further investigation" that "would serve to eliminate the doubts" I have. and I care you to accept my challenge. I will restrict myself to all arrow point, all the evidence on which is in your possession. Now, if the government would like to prove or to satisfy itself that I am some kind of

wierd nut or that my research is incomplete or undependeble or merely that I am wrong, here is your chance. In advance I warn you that in selecting this single point I have selected one on which I will confront you with what I regard as a case of perjusy and its subpraction.

government. Yet I do, very much, went a dialogue on this subject. I do realize that everyone is not dishonest, that most of you who sit in judgement on the fact think you know, think you have been beneatly informed. I also realize that not a single one of you has or could have taken the time have devoted to this. And I happen to believe that to consider the government and have made so encourage an error requires an inordinate ensure of courage of supone in authority, purhape the risk of his career and future. It is for this measure that I say I have selected a single point I regard as pivotal. There are many, all central. If you accept my challenge and are not persuaded, but if I am convinced you see wincore, I will thereafter take others, one by one, until you are satisfied or I am that you have no intention of being setiafied.

I agree with your statement that for FM sgents to slender as would be a violation of Decartment policy. I can only tell you that it has been reported to me. I do not expect you could ever be satisfied on this point, for you would have to accept the deniels of the agents that they did. I was aware of this when I wrete. Even though I knew there sculd never be a certain determination ( and I have pursued it me further), I felt obliged to inform you, procisely because it is the kind of thing no responsible government would can't to happen. If agents did this, I would also presume it we not on the instructions of the Director and I would not expect them to confess it to him.

With much of what you may of the confession of perjury by Coon Andrews I agree. 'ou do not say enough, however. I am in hearty agreement that there should be no federal intrusion into State proceedings. I wish I could say this had been the policy of your Department in the recent past. Ween Afthrews is a friend of mine. I em genuinely serry for the plight in which he finds himself. "e have had a number of long conversations over the past several years. It is my belief that the greatest harm of his confessed perjury was to the federal proceeding. I do not by ony means suggest that what he confessed in New Orleans is the total inedequacy of his federal testimony. It was quite important in the deliberations and conclusions of the Commission. Mor do I suggest that it was sponteneous. I am in pessession of proof that it was not. This may or may not have occurred to you, may or may not figure in your own deliberations. For what it may be worth, I report it to you. It may well complicate things for you. I do suggest that if the Department of Justice does nothing shout it the matter may not drop there. And I also suggest that in the total picture, this and other indequacies of the New Orleans investigetions may ultimately be more of an embarresement to the government that new mey preser likely or than the numerous lawyers you had observing the trial may have been able to detect or report to you. They, regardless of competence, are limited by what was presented in court and by the state of their own knowl dge. Newspaper account; og my presence at the trial ere in error. I left Mew Orleans during the jury selection and have not returned. My own knowledge of the proceedings is limited to what appeared in the papers and what was reported to me by friends in the press. But my knowledge of fact is not by any means limited to what was presented in court.

Your could not be more right then you are in saying that I intend to pursue this. What I have already done has been finencially rainous and that has not deterred me. If y u have followed my published work carefully, you have but little indication of what I have now learned, believe I have established. And you are correct in saying that the "release of additional meterials in the files" will be helpful to my work. That you do not appear to understand is that this does not have the significance you imply, for there can be no material in the files that can in any my destroy what have already established. Until this is understood by the government, it will not understand the stake each and every employee of whatever rank has in this, nor can these amployees understand what this can mean to the present administration and the resident, in the immediate future or in the historical record.

I take you at face value when you say "we will welcome receipt of" my views and " we seek, as you do to serve the best interests of the nation on this grave subject." I have given you indication of my good faith and I give you the opportunity of showing me yours, I sak for direct ensuer to the questions I have reised and for those documents I have sought thee, I believe, connot properly be denied me. In addition that reflected in my letters to your Department, one in particular of those many denied me by the government I call to your ettention. In the panel report alleged to be on the autopay there is reference to an April 1965 memorandum of transfer. I requested this in Jenuary, with the additional request that if it were not given me an ex-- planation be given in writing. I was then and burs on a number of a becquent occasions assured this would be forthcoming. It has not hyppened. I believe this is entirely indefendable. While there may be foctors of which know mothing that might properly deay me this document, I can conceive of ne good reason for the delay in response, for heve written many times, or for what now encunts to the refusel to tell me why it is denied me. And I tell you in candor that I have every reason to believe I know that this memorandum is and says. Also, I would like to have xerox copies of or be able to berrow severel transcripts of testimony, that of the afternoon proceeding in Judge Helleck's court in Tashington, the day testimony was presented by the plaintiff (with copies of the affidevite effered by the government and of its subsequent motions), and that of FMI Agents Shoneyfelt end Fresier and Colonel Finck in New Orleans.

If we can establish a besis of mutual trust, there is great potential for much good. For my part I ask but two things: complete respect for any confidences ( for I have when for me is an enormous investment in my work) and that, whether or not I am believed, i be listened to with an open mind. I do hope we can achieve this.

Sincerely.