xmxmxmxmxmxmxmx 473-8186

New address: Route 7
Frederick, Md. 21701

November 25, 1967

Dr. Robert Bahmer
Archivist of the United States
National Archives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Dr. Bahmer:

There is heat in your letter of November 15 but no denial of what can not from the record be denied, that once I request declassified documents they are re-examined and reclassified. I regret this has become the case.

Until now I have been following standard procedure of attaching a slip with my name to the document I desire. I have, for the most part, learned by accident that what I requested was denied. Until recently I kept no list of what I requested, trusting your staff to perform their function. I had no reason not to trust them.

Only when it became apparent that I was not getting all that I requested did I begin to keep a list. With the tremendous accumulation of trivia in the great volume of the Commission's files, what little time I can now spare for this could be used more productively in research rather than in needless record-keeping.

That in my haste I may have made errors in these notations cannot be doubted. The need for keeping them in the first place, however, should not exist.

There is no doubt that Wesley J. Liebeler wrote a glowing letter to J. Lee Rankin when he left the Commission. I believe it was, as I indicated, co-signed. I have not gotten this. I know of no proper possibility of classifying it to begin with or reclassifying it after I requested it. This can serve only to prevent embarrassment, for Mr. Liebeler subsequently changed his mind, quite publicly.

Whether or not a document is "consistent" with the government's position is something for the researcher to decide for himself, not for the government to decide for him. In the case of the Griffin-Hubert memos of March 20 and April 1, whether or not they are, they are not consistent with each other. And there most assuredly is a memo relating to General Walker and Cubans which is not consistent with the Walker testimony and which I believe is withheld for that reason. No effort was made to learn whether the former general was in association with anti-Castro groups. The Commission's interest was in whether Lee Harvey Oswald attended one such meeting the general also attended. In the interrogation, Mr. Liebeler disclosed knowledge that I have not found in any of the pertinent files not still secret, including the size of the contribution the general made.

I believe your description of the July 22 memo as "a reference to Walthers and Cuban sympathizers" is not warranted by that document, which says that Walthers took a file box of Oswald's records with a

list of names. There is nothing new in this and it would not have attracted my attention.

Because I did not anticipate that the Liebeler-Griffin document would be withheld, I did not keep a record of it. However, I note in my letter of September 26, in which I seem to have renewed the request, the date of September 25, 1964, and presume that is the date.

The net effect of the failure of the archives to make the copies I have requested and of the reclassification of requested documents - and I have no way of now knowing the magnitude of this - and of the new regulations you apply, is to limit the productiveness of the limited time I can spend at the Archives and what I may learn therefrom. Because of the nature of my work in this field, I presume this causes no official unhappiness.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg