Mr. James E. O'Neill Deputy Archivist Mational Archives Wash., D.C. 20408

Dear Mr. O'Neill.

The first of the two sentences of your letter dated by stamp of 1/26/77 says that an your 1/24 letter through an eversight no copy of CD 651 was enclosed. The second sentence is "The copy of CD 651 is transmitted with this letter."

I had already written you about the non-enclosure of CD 651 before I received this letter from you.

Your second sentence is consentary on the current state of official scholarship.

You do not enclose a "copy of GD 651."

You did enclose nine pages, the last of which is numbered "19." There is no indication on this page that it is the last page of CD 651.

By pagination alone you did NOT enclose a "copy of CD 652."

In addition there is not one of these nine pages of which there is not obliteration by blacking out. And on not one of these pages is any exemption cited, producated or by any of the most indirect means suggested.

Your earlier letter referred to the withhelding of centent from the full CD parts of which have since been released. I have read all the pages you provided. I find nothing that at any time ever qualified for any withhelding.

However, you have withheld from me and I am sure from others.

I therefore ask you what has been released, as the what you have sent does not show, and the basis for the withholdings. I would like the records, and I ask for them under FOIA, that relate to these withholdings from the beginning.

What you have not sent does not appear to be Warren Consission records. They do appear to be other records on which what I would guess to be is the handwriting of an employee of the Archives has written the CD identification. Other indications are those of a non-Warren Consission record. In addition, there are obliterations that are entirely foreign to the parts of Warren Consission manner records where any information appears. If this is not enough them I add that what you have sent is an extremely remote generation copy. So I am asking for a clear copy of a Warren Consission record. Not, asy, of an FBI record. And I would in each case like a statement of the relevant exemption claimed to be applicable. By this I mean both now and at the time of original withhelding.

The Archives is under an archivist whe is also the government's top experts on these matters. So I cite the first of the pages you sunt me, a page on which if there had not been so such reversing of xe exces the word "symopsis" would be completely legible. The last item on this page under what I am confident is "symopsis" deals with information that had been witheld, information attributed to Turi Hesenbis. I am with many regard to this as an illustration and in particular asking what exemption every applied and hew it is or could be applicable, the KGB knowing well that it has lost a man and what he know. But were this not brue chat information there is in this language that meets the requirements of any exemption.

To this I add that the other pages do not contian a single reference to this which is supposedly a symmetrie of what supposedly follows. May a please have those pages?

Sincerely,