

February 28, 1969

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

It is now three weeks since you assured me that I would hear soon in response to my request for a copy of the "memorandum of ~~agreement~~ transfer, located in the National Archives, and dated April 26, 1965". My original request was three weeks before that. On several subsequent occasions I have been assured response was imminent.

I recall to you that when we spoke in Judge Helleek's court I suggested that the integrity and independence of scholarship was at ~~stake~~ stake, your own and that of your agency with it.

I now call upon you to tell me what requires this assembly delay in answering a simple request for a simple record that seems to be beyond any proper restriction. Certainly it is outside the guidelines. It seems to be but another of the dismal efforts to frustrate inquiry into this most awful tragedy superimposed upon the great one of the assassination, and one of the endless efforts to make research into the assassination more difficult and less rapid.

Let me be open with you. I believe I have known the essence since about October 1966, from someone who had access, outside the Archives.

In this particular case, the now-customary delays in answering proper and specific questions is your own responsibility, for it is three weeks since you indicated your awareness and made the unfulfilled promise. You have seriously impaired my work by this delay, and I tell you with equal open frankness, I believe this was the intent. I have every reason to believe, and I here record my belief, that the government owes very well that what is in this memorandum is entirely inconsistent with false official statements and that, for not other reason, it seeks to suppress it. This is improper, if not illegal. It is anything but scholarship, is opposed to "freedom of information"- a self-condemnation.

If I am wrong, I call upon you to prove it. Nay, I dare you to. So, and I will apologize, in writing. Fail to and I will publish it.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. I also recall to you a similar case in the past, where your predecessor denied me access to the GSA-Kennedy-family "contract" and then made it available under what, for all practical purposes, was an exclusive basis, to the New York "Times" whose reporter, the government had every reason to believe, would be (and, in fact, was) entirely unaware of the significance. I still await explanations I have sought for almost a year.