

3 My 9/20/77 to Hoffman filed under in FARA

"appeal" when they do the deciding for Vawter. S/ 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, MMJ'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 swag, 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 MMJ asterisked MNFL 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 routings.

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 5/30/75 letter. If he can't 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.) MMJ is absent in aside cracks or pontifications and there is no comment re my top p. 2 on improper withholding being the undeviating rule.

*** Your N.O. en 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,