

3/3/75

Mr. Marc Raskin and  
Mr. Richard Barnet  
Institute for Policy Studies  
1520 New Hampshire Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear both,

In this morning's mail I received a copy of a Zodiac release on your formation of what is called in the release the "Commission on Domestic Intelligence and the Electoral Process." It troubled me for hours. It does not mention your names but in a later telephone call from Jon Newhall he attributed them to Mark, whose characteristic self-promotion permeates the release, they were used.

Although my day started at 3:30, with the intent of being able to get to work I've had to lay aside, because this matter does trouble me in many ways, knowing it will be unwelcome I've decided to write you. It is not easy and I will not take time for all I'd like to say, but I think I owe it all around.

Many aspects of this are troubling. Your failure to speak to me is one. I trusted both of you, in confidence, with materials it had taken enormous effort for me to obtain, in an effort to let you know the kind of evidence I had developed and its potential. You both knew. And I now remind you of this trust and its confidentiality. I remember your expressed shock that there exists such documentation. (The same documentation you now appear to be saying you will sue for.

According to this release you are about to sue for work I have already completed. I am aware that releases are not always accurate and I know that reporters, even the most sincere, do not always understand. But on the other side there is the fact that you both know that I alone have concentrated on this work for 11 years, you both know me pretty well, you both have had long-standing and often-repeated invitations to come here and see more, yet neither ever came and you launch this project without speaking to me?

Am I that much of a terror? Did I ever not go in when people wanted to speak to me. even though going in meant I increased my indebtedness?

I suppose that what really decided for me is that when Jon Newhall asked Mark why you would be suing for what I'd already filed for is the factual and legal horse-shit that Mark gave him, I was not hep on the law and might be thrown out. This is an outrage. Jim Lesar, young as he is, probably knows more about this particular law than all of you combined. He filed the suit his way. I didn't even see the complaint until after it was filed. And can any of you know the legislative history of the amendments and say or tolerate this? (Congressional record 5/30/74.)

Taking all of you together, how much do you really know about this subject? I'm distinguishing between propaganda and fact, knowledge, evidence, proofs. Yet you go off on something like this without even speaking to those who have knowledge? If this is responsibility I guess I'm much older than 62 and that far out of it. Your colleagues Billings and O'Toole are experts? Their associations refute it, as does their records. (Great thing the IPS in association with the exponent of a police-state device.)

Taking some of you only, for I have no question about the seriousness of purpose of others, have you the remotest notion of the liabilities you have taken unto yourselves, the automatic destruction of credibility that is built in except for propaganda purposes?

Has it occurred to any of you legal geniuses that in filing a duplicating suit at some time in the future while attracting attention to your alleged intent rather than your performance you are doing a job for those you say you want to clean up?

If this is not clear to you then the realities are even worse.

And I do have reason to question the seriousness of intent.

You talk about what is still suppressed. Does any one of you either know or have a basis for knowing.

And about what is "classified." Again, does any one of you have even a legitimate suspicion or a basis for it? Is "classification" in fact the major problem? And if you don't know, what in the world are all of you going off half-cocked for when in sooth not one of you is really expert?

Is this really any better if any one of you speaks in this way for all the others?

I'm quoting, not paraphrasing.

I look at the description Mark gave Newhall of your composition with a turned stomach. Is "former FBI special agents" Bill Turner, the fink who introduced the biggest single diversion- a product of SDECE if not of SDECE and CIA - into Garrison's office with the greatest single waste of his limited funding (assuming he would not have wasyed it anyway)? The man who had the man now called "Sturgis" by if not your "photo analyst" then his patron and associate pegged as "Edgar Eugene Bradley" on the basis of Bradley's enemies in that faction of the extreme right and with him had Garrison persuaded to indict a man dead several years for the JFK assassination? (I broke that one up in time.) "Former CIA technicians." Is this O'Toole who has this police-state device and by means of it has now proven that what on the basis of simple fact had already been established as lies are for the first time lies?

What "intelligence community experts" - what single one - knows a damned thing about this subject? What single "scholar" on this subject is associated with you? Fairies-and-needles boys you may have, but is that relevant or responsible?

So you've got "attorneys!" Big deal. Ask another attorney, Jim Lesar, for his estimate of the time I've had to waste cleaning up after fuck-up attorneys. A license to practise law means no more than that and in too many cases is an atrocity. It means neither knowlegge nor understanding nor even plain common sense.

If it was my purpose merely to be disagreeable I'd remind you both that it has been years since I assured you -with evidence- that I had completed the work that would tear this whole wretched business asunder. Aside from asking yourselves what might not have happened in that time that did come to pass I ask you why, with this knowledge you had you went off so half-cocked. Is it not enough that the well-intended Gregory and Groden have done so remarkable a job for the Ford/Rockefeller cover-up without all you bumlbers at this late date either intruding yourselves unilaterally without knowing what in the world you are intruding into? Or might be messing up? Did you in fact make the most rudimentary inquiry? Have you either any notion or a basis for any notion? Anything other than personal ~~xxx~~ publicity for some of you?

When none of you secure ones who do not really have to worry about paying any day's bills would lend a hand in any way, Jim Lesar and I set about really trying to accomplish what you are incapable of. Neither of us, by the way, has any income. So much for your noble purposes. You did not speak to me, not one of you all of whom know me. If you spoke to Jim he did not tell me this.

But he did tell me that five days ago when Mark made his pitch to Bud's authenticated abortion he asked Mark if he would see to it that the work I had already done that could accomplish your alleged end would be printed. In five days I have not heard from Mark, who for the sake of appearances before those to whom he was appealing said he would if I would talk to him. Not that I ever haven't. Not that I didn't abandon my second book to get Wesley Liebeler off Mark's vulnerable ass in late 1966 (and did while Mark was running away).

I knew Mark was a plagiarist when Marc asked me for help with his Yale Law Review

2

piece that was by order Marc accepted to ignore my prior work that AT HIS BEST Mark partly duplicated. Despite the insensitivity of the request, if not the intecency, and despite what had been attempted against me by Mark's publisher I spent small sums I did not have and time I could have used for other purposes and made a real effort. (Marc never sent me the promised copy.) Of course I would today cooperate with Mark for a common objective if he would be honest about it, as I am sure Lesar then assured the silent Mark, who made his pitch with the unkept promise. After five days I believe this is not an unfair representation.

While I am being what you may regard as this indelicate I'll pour a little more on, as I think you will take it if it is not what I have in mind.

So your associate Halperin was tapped. Well, long before he was I went to at least Marc if not both and said I had copies of surveillance on me and sought help in doing something about it. It was a little rougher in those pre-Watergate days and everybody was so busy! I then had two friendly witnesses and one not friendly but on tape, in addition to these copies and more evidence.

I guess Wordsworth was right about being the first.

Being tapped is that big a deal? Before any of you were old enough to jerk off I was being tapped. Even had laws passed against me.

Big deal indeed!

I do not write this in anger. Rather is it a combination of disgust and apprehension. But I do not mince words in the hope I can capture your attention and make you think.

Marc should remember that the day he announced his "New Party" I was there with a proposal he did nothing about. And now all of a sudden he and others are about to misuse if not merely exploit the work of others. Unconsulted others.

You call this principle if you must. I don't. I do warn you that this is an extremely complicated matter on which there is nobody who knows enough to be sure and none who can come close to knowing enough is or would be associated with you and those in the Zodiac story without my knowing about it.

This story concludes with the report that the ACLU is going to help you. Well, I started there before the FOI law became effective. I took Isbell to the Archives in 1966, long before Mark's book was out, and turned his stomach. The ACLU has yet to respond to the request Isbell told me to put in writing. If those brave spirits had had the balls in those days do you think for a minute the law would have had to have been amended? That was the time to establish precedent. They ran. Not quite. They gave me the name of a lawyer who would represent me if the feds latched onto me.

Can you really be this hungry with Viet Nam not the issue it was?

Can you really bring yourselves to risk being this irresponsible?

When you rush into print before you have been able to do anything, can I but wonder? When not one of you can have the remotest idea of what the real scoop is?

Call my bluff if you think I'm outting you one.

In fact, does any one of you know what to file for? What is "classified" that is needed?

If you have a copy of Halperin's last week's "request," which I take to be the most primitive beginning, a letter, I'd like a copy.

Sincerely,