

I made what I presume is the first request for the Kennedy family CIA agreement and what is relevant, You refused, giving very specific reasons. Now if this reason was a genuine one, it eliminates the possibility of the explanation I was given when you gave this, in violation of your own regulations, in another, one known not to have the background required to understand it. Dr. Baker did not respond to my request for a full explanation. I have repeated it countless times to you, I believe it is more than proper, especially because it entails a clear violation of your own regulations. In not one case did you in any way acknowledge any of these inquiries, now extending over a period of about two years. I therefore cancel this inquiry, ask for a meaningful explanation and wonder you caused any investigation to be made to determine how your regulations which my rights could be so grossly violated.

It has been months since I asked for access to some of the late President's garments. Ultimately, I was refused. I then asked that pictures be taken for me, by you, and you again refused. This is passing strange for a number of reasons, not the least of which is your own confirmation of the total absence of the essential one with regard to the right side view of the neck which to be on the side, I then asked that you take the photographs you already have and do a very ordinary, simple thing, enlarge this part of the view of the tie and the tabs on the collar of the shirt. Your silence on this after so long a lapse of time is not less than unacceptable. I cannot regard it as accidental. This is not the first time I have reminded the Archives about this. I again ask that you do this, which is entirely in accord with your own practices, and recently, and I remind you how inconsistent this is with your claims, especially that it is your intent to prevent "misuse" use of this most basic research materials. The only way to show the pictures you have can be used properly is to show they are meaningless, and constituted an unimpaired and unobstructed display of the late President's blood. It is sorry, that is not what I want, however, you insist I use this, pretending it is other than it is. You have every right to dispute my statement to you that the pictures you supplied are utterly without value or meaning.

In your memoirs I cannot begin to understand, you claim you do not have certain pictures you did take. You may claim one of these was taken for Dr. John Nichols. I want to unravel this. I asked that you do certain things, including sending me a copy of his order and duplicate any photographs you did take for me, with negatives in such case. I was handed a set of duplicate prints, apparently unacknowledged, and nothing else. As to my demands, you say let it rest here. There is nothing in this that need go to another authority. I hope you will order it done as soon as possible. For historical respect your claim that certain things were not

3BW

pages 302-304 from CD 75 that are withheld from research". Are you saying there is nothing else on Mertens? 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 in CD 301:592 plus anything else you had aside 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: 1035-6.

With respect to CD 1140, I asked for the pages referring to Dr. Fernando Penabaz other than 8 and 9. 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 not by him.

I am at a loss to understand why you sent me two pages only relating to Ferris, CD 301:88-6. Unless they are the only references to Coffey and Beaubouef, 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

3F

request to appeal and it is obvious the almost undeviating long delays in my kind of response are in no wise necessary. As soon as I can complete this and decide which I might want to abandon simply because this will in any event be rather complicated, I will submit it.

However, I have call some things to your attention, with the util-now subtle hope you will deal with them promptly. I also call a few things from the past to your attention and again ask the responses you have never made.

I made what I presume is the first request for the Kennedy Smith-GMA agreement and what is relevant. You refused me, giving very specific reasons. Now if this reason was a genuine one, it eliminates the possibility of the explanation I was given when you gave this, i.e. violation of your own regulations, to another, one known not to have the background required to understand it. Dr. DeWitt did not respond to my request for a full explanation. I have repeated it countless times to you. I believe it is more than proper, especially because it entails a clear violation of your own regulations. In not one case did you in any way acknowledge any of these inquiries, now extending over a period of about two years. I therefore renew this inquiry, ask for a meaningful explanation and whether you caused any investigation to be made to determine how your regulations under my rights could be so grossly violated.

It has been months since I asked for access to some of the late President's garments. Ultimately, I was refused. I was asked that pictures be taken for me, by you, and you again refused. This is proving strange for a number of reasons, not the least of which is your own confirmation of the total absence of the essential one with regard to the tie, a side view of the neck said to be on the side. I then asked that you take the negatives you already have and do a very ordinary, simple thing, enlarge this part of the view of the tie and the tabs on the collar of the shirt. Your silence on this after so long a lapse of time is not less than unconscionable. I cannot regard it as accidental. This is not the first time I have reminded the Archives about this. I again ask that you do this, which is entirely in accord with your own practice, and promptly. And I remind you how inconsistent this is with your claims, especially that it is your intent to prevent "misuse" of this most basic research material. The only use to which the pictures you have can be used regarding authenticity, for they are meaningless, and constituting an unseemly and unnecessary display on the late President's behalf. It is wrong. That is not what I want. However, you insist I use this, pretending it is other than it is. You hesitate to dispute my statement to you that the pictures you supplied are utterly without value or meaning.