6/20/70

Director of Information Office of the Administrator General Services Administration Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

Over the months, I have made requests for fourments in National Archives filesr relating to the assassination of President John Mennedy, enticipating these requests would be rejected. I asked that if rejected, to save time, which your agency westes for me as a routine matter, the request be forwarded to you as my appeal under your regulations, as a necessary prerequisite to invocation of 5 USC 552. In addition, I addressed a letter drawing together some of these requests, with the understand that if the decision was not changed following reviews it would be forwarded to you as my appeal.

I shall interpret failure to respond as waiver of the requirement, unless there is immediate response, now that there is no doubt you have been informed. I believe the long delays are in themselves weiver of this requirement, when considered with the language of the law, its legislative history and clear Congressional intent.

Herewith I appeal a subsequent decision, to refuse me photographic copies of photographs in these files. I have been provided with utterly meaningless copies of photographs of some of the President's garments, these showing no detail, nothing but gore, or those the magnification of which, for proper study, is automatically prevented by their having been made from photoengraved copies, the screen of which appears as dots upon megnification.

The National Archives has made its own photographs of these & ments, for the alleged purpose of making them available for study rather than permit ting study of the garments. When I sought permission to examine the garments, under e precedent whereby IS was permitted to examine Lee Harvey Oswald's shirt, I was refused. I was show photographs of which I was denied copies.

One of these was of the front of the President's shirt. It is the only such photograph in the Archives of which I have knowledge that can serve research purposes and can be used for other than undignified or sensetional purposes. I ask you for it or an enlargement of the area showing the damage to the shirt.

There is no existing photograph of the side of the knot of the tie. I have asked that it be made for me and have been refused. I ask you for this. For purposes of my research and, I believe, any genuine research, such a side view of the damage to the knot is essential.

I have obtained from the Department of Justice a print of that part of the front of the shirt shown in FHI Exhibit 60. I believe this effectively refutes any ellegation or claim such photographs not showing the photoengraving screen can

3A

be withheld with propriety. The now obviously spurious pretense has been that not to withhold such pictures would permit undignified or sensational use. To this I add that Mr. Burks Marshall has informed me of no other ground for withholding under the provisions of the alleged agreement.

I also want a photograph made from the original negative, not a photoengraving negative, of the back of the shirt, preferably the largest clear enlargement of the area of damage and including the top of the collar, from the Archives pictures rather than these included in FBI Exhibit 60 or CE394. If there is more than one such picture, I would like this one made from whichever picture the Archives photographer considers best shows the damage. I would like to be informed of the existence of any others.

With regard to CE394, I would like the largest clear enlargement of the area of damage the photographer can make, if necessary, from the existing negative. Here is it not necessary to include the collar area.

It is my understanding that the Cohumbia Broadcasting System was permitted to make its own photographs of this clothings and I know for a fact that they were permitted to make their own photographs of CE399. Regulations require these to be non-exclusive and to be available to everyone. I would like to be informed when I may examine these pictures so that I may determine in ether or not I desire prints of them. My interest in the bullet is now in the base only. If CES was permitted to photograph the clothing, then there is adequate precedent for your photographer making for me those pictures I want.

In the past, it is s been the official practice to delay responding to those of my requests that were not completely ignored. Both, I believe, are contrary to the spirit was well as the letter of the law and the clear Congressional intent. I have reason to believe your legal office has been kept fully informed of my requests and what responses have been made. There thus seems no reason for inordinate/NetPonse to this letter. Therefore, if I have not heard from you by July 6, 1970, I will assume you do not intend to reply and will be guided by this belief in eny future actions I may take.

Sincerely,

Carton Conference - Contraction

Harola Weizberg

AB B 13 Cin Lillian & Harold Weisberg OG d'Or Press Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701 Code 301 / 473-8186 6/20/70

Director of Information Office of the Administrator General Services Administration Mashington, D.C.

Deer Sir,

Over the months, 4 have made requests for documents in National Archives filesr relating to the essessination of President John Kennedy, anticipating thes requests would be rejected. I asked that if rejected, to save time, which your agency wastes for me as a routine motter, the request be forwarded to you as my apreal under your regulations, as a necessary prerequisite to invocation of 5 USO 552. In addition, I addressed a latter drawing together some of these requests, with the understand that if the decision was not changed following review; it would be forwarded to you as my appeal.

I shell interpret failure to respond is usiver of the requirement, unless there is immediate response, now that there is no doubt you have been informed. I believe the long delays are in themselves weiver of this requirement, when considered with the language of the law, its legislative history and clear Congressional intent.

Herewith I expeal a subsequent decision, to refuse me photographic copies of photographs in these files. I have been provided with uttarly meaningless copies of photographs of some of the President's germents, those showing that no detail, nothing but gore, or those the argnification of which, for proper study, is sutomatically prevented by their having been made from photoengraved copies, the screen of thich appears as dots upon magnification.

The Notional Archives has made its oun photographs of these germants, for the alleged purpose of making them everlable for study rather than permit ting study of the garments. Then I cought purmission to examine the gurments, under a precedent whereby Iz was permitted to examine her your Usuald's shirt, I was refused. I was show photographs of which I was denied copies.

One of these was of the front of the Fresheart's shirt. It is the only such photograph in the Archives of which I have knowledge that can serve research purposes and can be used for other than undignified or senectional purposes. I ask you for it or an calorgement of the cree shoring the denses to the shirt.

There is no existing photograph of the side of the knot of the tic. I have asked that it be node for me and have been refused. I ask you for this. For purposes of my research and, I delieve, any ginuing r search, such a side view of the demoge to the knot is essential.

I mays obtained from the Dipertment of Justice a print of that part of the front of the shirt shown in FM thatbit 30. I believe this effectively relates be withheld with grow Lety. The now obviously spurio pretense its buin that not te attinola such pieturos a ula pertit undignified or sincational use. To this I add that her. Lurks Horsault has informed no of no other ground for withhelding under the previsions of the alleged agreedant.

I cheo wont a pactogroph are of from the original adjustice, not a partodengraving hegetive, of the blan of var shirt, preferably the largest (clear callergement of the pres of damage and including the top of the coller, froi the archives plotures rether then those included in THE Exhibit 60 or CESC4. If there is norm than one such licture, I hould like this one uses from whichever picture the Archives photographer whethers best chois the . denege, I would like to be informed of the existence of any others.

With regard to 38594, I would like the largest clear enlargement of the cres of Gymege the photographer can make, if necessary, from the existing negetive, mere is it not necessary to include the coller ores.

It is my understanding that the Columbia Broadcasting System was permitted to mele its own photographs of this Cothings and I know for a fact that they were permitted to make their own photographs of CE599. Regulations require these to be non-exclusive and to be evailable to everyone. I would like to be informed when I may examine these pictures so that I may determine wether Vin or not I desire prints of them. My interest in the bullet is not in the base only. If OPS was permitted to photograph the clothing, then there is adequate precedent for your photographer making for me those pictures I went.

In the pest, it is a bean the official practise to delay responding to these of my requests that were not completely ignored. Loth, I believe, are centrery to the spirit zes well as the latter of the law and the clear Congres-sional intent. I have resson to believe your legal office has been kept fully inferued of my requests and what responses have been made. Thore thus seems no reason for inordinfelf settons to this latter. Therefore, if I have not neard from you by July 6, 1970, I will assume you do not intend to reply one will be guided by this belief in any future actions I may take.

.

Sincerely, Charola Leisberg

3 new

nLgiu

(4)

(5)