

John, Bud, Paul, Gary, Sylvia  
Attached "hoads letter of 8/27.

8/29/69

Sometime over the weekend I will retape the response to "hoads, a poor carbon of the draft of which is enclosed. If you do not get another copy thereafter, it is because I have not decided to moderate it. This is so blatant a thing in which I have him nailed so firmly I see no reason to disguise my indignation, soften the complaint. If he is not party by advance knowledge, he is by complicity, for my earlier letters were specific enough for him to cause an inquiry to be made. If he had ~~had~~ such an inquiry ~~to~~ made, this may force a confrontation with whoever provided his information, as if we do not all know.

The copy he ultimately provided is a copy of the very, very poor copy in ODS62a. + have had it for some time, since before they told John they had no copy. Paul reported to me long, long ago that he had also seen it elsewhere.

Their records will be absolute proof in a way that may not have ~~damned~~ upon him, in the bookkeeping. I will not bore you with details, but it is and will always be irrefutable.

However, at the risk of seeming paranoid (the reason for sending this poor carbon being speed), I want you to be aware of the fact that there is no reason to believe this authorization was added to the JFK file until very recently. It would be too raw to try and add it to the other autopsy files, some of which have been so carefully examined, at least by me, some, certainly, by Paul as early as the summer of 1966. The one file seen by few is the JFK 4-1. They will have more trouble with this in due time because of the composition of the JFK-4 series. My hunch is that it was not until John and I were in correspondence about this and the feebees knew John was about to do something in court that one of them contrived this minor correction. I am inclined to believe "hoads knew nothing about it (which is irrelevant and immaterial, but it may make a difference to him since he can anticipate being in court himself, with John, with me, or with both). Some of you are aware of the knowledge of someone not party to it and not informed by me of some of my unpublished material and of his persistent prying to learn of it. It would be grossly unfair to say this casts him in the role of informant, but it would be grossly stupid to overlook the evidence this incident can lead to such a belief, unpleasant and unlikely as it may seem to those who know him better than I. To those of you who will find this a mystery, it must remain that way. There are other possible leaks, other possible explanations, like interception of mail.

I expect that, with Bud, I will be using this in a special way.

I now also have different agencies, in writing and confirmed by each, of opposite versions of whether what cannot be withheld is in the Archives and has been refused me on the ground it isn't there. The agency of origin says it is, the Archives says no. While I want you to know this, I also want you not to be talking about it. I believe nothing is to be gained by talk and the possibility of hurt exists.