3/16/70

Dr. James B. Rhoads
Archivist of the United States
The National Archives
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

Your letter of the 12th and mine of the 15 crossed in the mail. Considering that the most recent of the requests responded to in your letter is two months and 12 days old, I hope you will understand the reflected impetience.

However, because I did write you, I write now to acknowledge receipt of this letter and the enclosures.

Thank you for notifying me my account needs replenishing. A check for $25.00 is enclosed.

I will go over the enclosures as soon as possible and will write further if it seems necessary. There is some confusion, some uncertainty I will mention now.

With regard to Ferrie, the newspapers of February 24, 1967, contained the report attributed to your agency that there were a total of 40 pages relating to Ferrie in your custody, of which 19 were declassified. My own check, when Mr. Johnson made these 19 pages available to me and then copied them for me disclosed three duplications. While it i possible he did not give me the identifications of those still classified, he most certainly did of those declassified and, as noted above, the press is consistent in giving a total of 40 pages. This we not a universal fabrication, nor did all reporters make an indetical guess. My recollection of that conversation with Mr. Johnson is quite clear, including where we then were. Furthermore, I credited him with this in OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS (p. 175), where I wrote, "Marion Johnson, effecient custodian of this archive, gathered for the press the 19 pages referred to."

Your second paragraph says, "The name file for Ferrie, however, contains the following pages in Warren Commission Document 75 that are withheld from research:", thereafter listed. Now at your suggestion, I asked to see this file and, as I reported to you, it was gutted. There was no reference to any of these pages in it and quite a number of pages I have on Ferrie were not there. There was a separate folder identified as those pages from CD75. There were, as I recall, two pages in it and no reference to any withheld pages. There are more than two pages not withheld from CD 75 alone.

What I should like to know with regard to this paragraph is: are all withheld Ferrie documents in CD 75, the pages you enumerate?

The most recent of my requests for this information was December 24. In that letter I also asked for documents relating to Layton Martens, Melvin Coffey and Alvin Beaubouef. Here you say only, "the name file for Layton Martens contains

pages 302-304 from CD 75 that are withheld from research". Are you saying there is nothing else on Martens? You make no reference to the other two. You also do not give the date of the O'Sullivan interview.

With respect to CEs 394-5, I look forward to getting the enlargements and I thank you for them. After examining them I will write further. When I can be in Washington I will phone to arrange to see the two photographs of CE 394 that you have prepared but do not furnish copies of. Without seeing them I do not know if I would want copies, but if you do have the pictures already made, would you mind telling me why you do not furnish copies?

Your paragraph on the picture of CE399 is, as I have already written you, in the most serious error. Long ago you asked me to send you an electrostatic copy of that picture and I did. You now say it is the one you took for Dr. Nichols. I will not make an issue of your refusing to make a copy of his order available, although I think for a number of reasons, some of which should be obvious, you ought to. However, my writing on that picture, taken for me, under Mr. Johnson's supervision, was in the summer of 1967. It is dated. Obviously, this cannot be the picture you didn't take for Dr. Nichols until about May 28, 1968.

Your penultimate paragraph does not give the date you first made the first two Specter memoranda available to researchers.

My request of January 4 was for the entire Burkley file. You make no reference to this. May I assume that what you sent is the entire Burkley file?

The same day, with regard to Shand, I asked for the attachments relating to him inCD87:592 plus anything else you had <u>aside</u> from the documents I listed. You make no reference to these attachments and duplicate the documents I told you I had, CD 301: 315,320; CD1107: 1055-6.

With respect to CD 1140, I asked for the pages referring to Dr. Fernando Penabaz other than 2 and 3. You sent me pages 1,4 and 5, which you had already provided, and also supplied what I did not ask for, pp. 6-22, which are clearly marked as a speech <u>not</u> by him.

I am at a loss to understand why you sent me two pages only relating to Ferrie, CD 301:85-6. Unless they are the only references to Coffey and Beauboeuf, which I very much doubt.

For those things I did request that you sent or are sending, I do thank you. Perhaps if there were less deliberate delay in responding to my requests, some of this wasteful duplication and error might be avoided. While your letter says it is response to a number of mine going back to last December, the fact is that in these letters I repeat requests made earlier, without response.

If you would like what help I may be able to provide in straightening out the mislabelling of your pictures, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg