NOTE: The first reason he gave me is that it was given to the Archives for safekeeping only. It took about 100 days for this answer, and that with repeated needling. Obviously, the Kennedys have secure storage for two typewritten pages. Especially when all of this was in a chest they allegedly took almost immediately. He also gave others, later, as I kept after him, and the Secret Service did give me their copy, but he intercepted it and the GSA decided to withhold it. I did make a deal with the SS:if they'd give it to me I'd not sue them. When I went back to them and asked for a direct copy, the took it up with the Mitchellisti and decided the way out was to give their copy to the Archives, too. The beginning means that he said this was the property of the Kennedy family. I then asked for a copy of the government's copy and he refused to comply with the law, that he refer the request to the "agency of paramount interest", i.e., the Secret Service. I have asked the SS again and they have again referred me to the Archives. I'll be addressing that separately and differently, when and as I

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

Through the courtesy of Fred Graham, who never intends it, I now have still another reason, rather alleged reason, for withholding the so-called Memo of Transfer.

The rest of his Orwellian contribution to the doublegoodspeak over which you preside leaves without possibility of serious question the complete and intended falsehood of the first reason you gave me.

When I have accused you in court of perjury without even pro forma denial, I suppose the question that follows is a confession of naivete.

However, I would like to know and possibly to quote which if any is the one (or more) you may really believe.

As we both know, the "agency of paramount interest" gave me a copy through you and so told me. You then invented another fiction that served only to suppress that which the federal government itself wants suppressed and blames on others. These others do not have the right to interpret the law, have not interpreted the law, and there are, to the government's knowledge, controlling court decisions in which the government was overruled in such suppressions.

I remind you of these things to remind you that I alone of those involved seek to avoid sensational publicity and undignified usage in such matters, and that my intentions are serious, not scandal-mongering.

Tragically, the way things are going, nothing but scandal may be possible. But it remains to be seen who the ultimate victims will be.

I do hope you will have the self-respect to respond, for that fiction it took you about three months to concoct is now a transparent lie.

Next time the Department of Disinformation (or is it the Department of Dirty Works?) collaborates with Mr. Graham (who once indicated it might not now be far into the future), please give him my thanks.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

can and in ways not in their interest and under circumstances not of their chosing. I think it is not impossible. Meanwhile, the accounting given the Times and Graham lacks fidelity in all essential particulars, beginning with who did the delivering and going to the recipient and the ultimate destination. I have a first-person account of this and no reason not to credit it. It is also an official source. It furthermore is not new, hence not contrived as the current one is, there then being no need for the contriving.