

my 9/28/77 to HR

"appeal" when they do the deciding for Vawter. 3/4. is incomplete and thus misleading, with Vawter being misled and the Act being frustrated. 5. is opposite Rhoads' sworn testimony to the Congress. And what I'd forgotten, there was an ex. sess. review by GSA general counsel in 1972. Does this interest Jim re 1448? I question the unexplained marking at the bottom of p. 2 But the handwritten note makes the GSA lawyers part to the game of appeal as they play it.

Their 1/30/68 does not say they obtained Marshall's permission for the exclusive release to Graham or why it took so long for them to send me a copy.

If I do not come to it one of the paperclips I moved by accident referred to one of their letters saying they would give me everything I had been denied if and when it was released.

My 8/30/72, MWJ's note "Not so" opposite Secret Service being agency of paramount interest, is interesting because there is just no basis within the law for him to be claiming this. It was their property, the M of T swas, as were their other relevant records, including those improperly given to them. In the other interpretation, did the SS release to me, you have that covering letter. So why does one in his position say such things, do they influence others and do he do them on his own when so many know the truth?

You added a "dirty works" note to refer to this and what follows, other use of the phrase. In both cases it was Rhoads personally, on the agreement and on the access to L. It is interesting that MWJ asterisked NNPL and added "Dirty Works Section." True, he understood, whether or not others took this as some kind of joke! But this was the last of the routing.

Their 9/12/72 with the Yock crack to Steve, or Garfinkle, "W. Strikes Again." In this conspicuous by its absence is the NYTimes request for the agreement or any reference to Rhoads telling Graham, exclusively and before Lattimer knew, that he was granting L. access to the autopsy material. While on their own the lawyers can't be excused, these pseudo-scholars were manipulating them.

Their 10/3/72, suggest you ask if their legal eagles find this to be the meaning of the Act today and if so what decisions so hold; for a copy of the Marshall desire in par 2; what records show the Kennedy family, their designation, had control over S.S. records and any legal opinion on this and relating to the other matters in the memo.

Their 1/17/75 to me, which I'd forgotten and I think JL had, seems to be to be important in their representations in 1448. I'm making a separate copy for him for that and will give all to him in the a.m. This is a false statement re what they have.

What appears to be Rhoads' question, "What is he talking about?" has no answer here. His note is of the day after my 2/3/75 letter. If he cannot understand what for me is pretty plain and simple, that they have not provided records asked for for presentation to a court of law, what can he know of what goes on or the contents of the affidavits he executes? (They even then did not provide all the records for 226.) MWJ is absent in snide cracks or pontifications and there is no comment re my top p. 2 on improper withholding being the undeviating rule.

\* \* \* Your N.O. on banc sitting was reported in radio news but nothing I've seen in print. Hope the experience lived up to the expectation.

I have an Archives letter I'll have to let await my return. I'll send it then with my response. They claim the internal communication exemption on some of my requests and ignore others.

Best,

Mojawko

June 17, 1975

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Route 8  
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This is in reply to your letters of May 14 and 29, 1975.

We regret the delay in responding to your requests, which has been caused both by the scope of those requests and the increase in work on the Warren Commission records. The copies of records you requested are being sent to you separately. Mr. Lesar's request in your behalf was answered by our letter to him of May 28, 1975.

Commission Documents 451 and 651 were withheld from research at the request of the FBI, and the Coleman/Slawson memorandum of June 24, 1964, concerning Nosenko was withheld at the request of the CIA. As we do not have the other information you request, you may wish to consult those agencies.

Included in the copies of records we are sending you are copies of Commission Document 434 and a page from the Oswald-Ruby chronology relating to Nosenko. The executive session transcript of June 23, 1964; a letter of March 6, 1964, from J. Lee Rankin to Richard Helms; the transmittal letter for CD 434; and Commission memoranda dated March 9 and 12, July 15 and 23, and the deleted first paragraph of the memorandum of W. David Slawson to J. Lee Rankin dated August 22, 1964, are withheld from research under 5 U.S.C. 552 (b) (5). We are not aware of any CIA documents, tapes or transcripts of interviews with Nosenko or other defectors, or additional Commission internal papers relating to Nosenko or other defectors among the Commission's records.

Sincerely,

(MISS) JANE F. SMITH  
Director  
Civil Archives Division

cc: Official file NNFL  
MJohnson:ram  
75-276 & 289

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
ROUTING SLIP

TO	CO	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10
NAME/TITLE						CORRESPONDENCE SYMBOL					
1.											
2.											
3.											
4.											
5.											

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ALLOTMENT SYMBOL                         | <input type="checkbox"/> HANDLE DIRECT               | <input type="checkbox"/> READ AND DESTROY |
| <input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> IMMEDIATE ACTION            | <input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMENDATION   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> AS REQUESTED                             | <input type="checkbox"/> INITIALS                    | <input type="checkbox"/> SEE ME           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NECESSARY ACTION | <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CORRECTION                               | <input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND RETURN             | <input type="checkbox"/> YOUR COMMENT     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FILING                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> PER O'R CONVERSATION        | <input type="checkbox"/> YOUR INFORMATION |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FULL REPORT                              | <input type="checkbox"/> PER TELEPHONE CONVERSATION  | <input type="checkbox"/>                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ANSWER OR ACKNOWLEDGE ON OR BEFORE _____ |  |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PREPARE REPLY FOR THE SIGNATURE OF _____ |  |   |

REMARKS

*What is he talking about?*

*YRP*

---

DATE RECEIVED IN NN *6/3*

DATE REPLY DUE *6/10*

REGISTER NUMBER *75-257*

FROM	SIGNED	RTO	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10
NAME/TITLE		CORR. SYMBOL		BUILDING, ROOM, ETC.							
		<i>N</i>									
TELEPHONE		DATE									
		<i>5/30/75</i>									