

1/25/72

Dr. James B. Rhoads, Archivist
The National Archives,
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

although limited in the use of one hand by an accident, i make immediate response to your letter of 1/21, which did not reach me until today. i cannot conveniently use my files, so i will be forced to depend upon recollection in saying that i believe i referred to more than "the examination by dr. john k. lattimer of the materials transferred..." to which you make no response.

with my standing request for all regulations, etc., a subject of some and to me unsatisfactory correspondence, and with you pre-existing regulations, i believe you were required to send me the new regulations on "warren commission items of evidence" as soon as promulgated, not three weeks later, and you did not. this, too, seems to be a discriminatory and consistent practise.

there seems to me to be a conflict between #5 of this 1/2/72 revision and the alleged contract in that as this revision reads it broadens access to the film and other materials covered in the contract to include "researchers" and is not limited to pathologists and those in related fields of science and technology. parenthetically, i think not for the first time, i ask how this can include urology.

as i recall the correspondence, of which i provided you copies if mr. marshall did not, i had what amounts to his approval prior to my suit for pictures of the clothing. you then swore that this contract prohibited the showing of this clothing to anyone. this would seem to include dr. lattimer. now you have again revised the regulation you would not and did not provide me prior to this suit and withheld from the court and say that the clothing can be and under certain conditions will be shown to researchers, the word you use. it includes me. i have raised the unanswered question of false swearing, again not for the first time and again without response.

it is becoming clear that the regulations are revised with one improvisation after another and in each case to cover an official violation or in preparation for more official propaganda, not for reasons of genuine scholarship. if i do not forecast to you my belief about the reason for this newest revision, i do ask the official explanation, the need for it other than enabling impropriety, and why at this rather remarkable time, more than six years after you received this material and more than five years after the signing of the alleged contract.

in any event, i believe the letters from mr. marshall to me do authorize access to the clothing, the official exhibits rather than all of it, and that if you do not now provide it promptly it will be your refusal, not his. i would like this to be as soon as possible, and i would appreciate prompt responses to those things to which you have not responded. i would also like to know if this change in the regulations regarding the clothing have anything to do with dr. lattimer's known interest in the ace bandage and the brace. the coincidence of this change and his exclusive and improper access is remarkable.

sincerely,
harold weisberg