

Harold Weisberg  
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701  
6/21/74

Dear Congressman Edwards,

As I told Mrs. Stickney yesterday, it was not until I was driving to Washington yesterday that I heard on the radio that the Judiciary committee is now considering the question of Nixon's "gift" to the Archives as fraud.

In anticipation of your coming I had, in haste, made electrostatic copies of two excerpts from a Department of Justice Motion to Dismiss in one of my 5 U.S.C. 552 suits, that one for pictures of President Kennedy's clothing, the areas of damage.

I enclose this.

As you will see, it is the Department's own interpretation of sections 2107 and 2108 of 44 U.S.C. that the agreement of the GSA Administrator is required as a pre-condition or any "gift."

~~KENNEDY~~ His signature on a contract, not the Nixonian representation of a unilateral "deed," is the first and in this case never-met condition. Without it there is no "gift" and without it in my view what GSA and IRS later did amounts to a conspiracy.

Dr. James Rhoads, Archivist of the United States, can provide you with a large amount of relevant information, including copies of laws and regulations. Retrieving those I have would be time-consuming, less authoritative and there might be omissions.

One precedent of which I know is the so-called "letter agreement" between GSA and Burke Marshall, acting as representative of the executors of the estate of the late President. I believe it was drafted by the Department of Justice. I am certain it was not drafted by Marshall. In that case the Government already had physical possession and in that case, unlike Mr. Morgan's representation, the signature of the lawyer was proper and was accepted by the government.

The Archives and the legal staff of GSA has much experience under the law. There is no possibility either did not know that the minimum conditions of the law were not being met. I believe the same is true of IRS. I believe that without this first condition being met there was no gift and all that followed is on this basis illegal, with the official actions thereafter amounting to a conspiracy.

As I told Mrs. Stickney I have to be in Washington Wednesday and Thursday, the 26th and 27th. I should be free by 10:30 Wednesday, after a WTOP broadcast on the King assassination. If my dentist is on time, I should be free in the same general area not much after 9:30. If you would like to see me either day, I can bring work with me and sit in your office and await your convenience. I am willing to stay down and not go to your office and meet with you after you leave your office. While this will make a long day for me, I believe it would be better because whether or not you are being watched, I have been robbed recently and unpublished Watergate documents were stolen. Considering the extent of my files, I cannot regard this as accidental.

I am aware of how busy you must be. But I also cannot carry with me what you might want to see. I am willing to trust you and do not doubt that where I might want confidence to be preserved until after I complete this book you would do this. However, there are other Members in whom I could not place this trust. Because of the nature of the work I

I am doing on Watergate and other matters, including criminal and civil litigation, and because of the improper interests in it and in me that have already been manifested on a number of occasions, I am reluctant to invite an unknown (to me) member of the committee's staff here or to discuss my unpublished work as I would with you.

So you can better understand that this is not paranoid, some of what was stolen is enough to justify serious criminal charges against important personages, people and charges never publicly indicated as criminal in any investigation.

Not unrelated is a series<sup>es</sup> of operations and acts by a federal agency that I believe to be illegal and am certain are publicly unknown and have been either deliberately overlooked or suppressed in all official investigations. To a large degree I have documentation of this. Where I cannot put in your hands that documentation I do not have, innocent people can be hurt. However, I can describe a finely-focused subpoena to you. This would give you proofs and avoid needless hurt. I think I can act as intermediary and perhaps arrange this without subpoena, which would be better, I think, considering that subpoenas would make this whole thing known.

I would prefer not to tempt "sinister forces."

The need of protecting the innocent could not be met by a staffer.

I have other indications of still other "sinister forces" at work. Until we are face-to-face or I can put it in your hands here this also will have to remain elliptical. If what I regard as one possible interpretation is correct - and you as a lawyer will understand this better than I can explain it anyway - you may well have something else of considerable significance.

In all of this I hope you will bear in mind that my willingness to help is at some risk to myself. I do not mean personal risk because I am not afraid of that or I would not have spent the past 10 years as I have. I have been without regular income for these ten years. Right now we exist on a regular income from work that nets my wife not much over \$100 a month plus a small sum she picks up in private bookkeeping. The income from my books is both small and is not really income because I still owe the printer money. So, my work means more to me than that of most writers. And I would like to be able to publish it if at all possible before use. There is and has been a publisher reluctance to have anything to do with political assassinations. I do not have the funding for publishing this book but I am seeking it and I am trying to interest a large publisher, where I have a friend who will be visiting me in about two weeks and will read what I then have completed. I am willing to run risks if the public interest requires it but I want to avoid any risks for which there is no real need.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

cc Tom Susman, EML