Mr. Harold Weisberg 7627 Old Receiver Road Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 16, 1996, regarding the Review Board's release of records, which included some documents relating to Mark Lane. Although it has become increasingly clear that nothing the Review Board does will please or satisfy you, I would like to take this opportunity to make several points in response to your letter.

First, contrary to your assertion, the quote from Chairman Tunheim in our news release did not relate specifically to the Mark Lane documents. The statement was general in nature and referred to the group of several hundred documents being released. Furthermore, although none of the documents in this particular group of records directly addresses the issue of who killed President Kennedy, they still contribute to our understanding of the history surrounding the assassination.

Second, the Review Board did not, as you allege, "define all such records out." I am not quite sure what has led you to continue to make this erroneous assertion. In releasing previously closed information in documents such as the ones dealing with Mark Lane, the Review Board demonstrates its determination that these documents are assassination records and are an important part of the historical record.

Third, we are fully aware that these documents were publicly available with redactions in the past. It is the Board's job to review all redactions and to open them up if, in its judgment, the continued redaction of the information could not be justified under the President John F. Kennedy Records Collection Act. In these documents, and thousands of others, that is precisely what the Board has done. These documents cannot simply be ignored, even if they are not important in your view—a view, I might note, that is not shared by all interested parties.

Mr. Harold Weisberg July 25, 1996 Page 2

Fourth, I suspect that you would have been quick to criticize the Board if it had failed to open up these types of redactions. In my view, based on your previous letters, it is precisely this information that you have argued so passionately should be made publicly available. Thus, I fail to understand your criticism.

Finally, the Review Board and staff will continue to release information that has previously been kept from the American public. It is a long process, and there are many more documents to be reviewed. Perhaps at some future date, documents that interest you will be released by the Board. We look forward to any specific and substantive contribution you can make to our effort.

Sincerely,

David G. Marwell Executive Director