Dear Ned.

Although the return receipt on your registered peckage of 1/3 will indicate I received it, I add that the enclosed list seems to accord with the contents. I've not yet refiled the various items. I presume it is complete for an you know, I kept no list of what you had.

The package and contents were damaged. his not a claim against you and I can't make one to the post office for that would require surrendering that which was damaged, about 150 electrostatic pages. Rather it is a suggestion for the future, based on our considerable experience with the new postal science, the destructive capabilities of which exceed the imagination of the uninitiated. For a package with this kind of contents newspaper is an imadequate protection. Vardboard is preferable, and it is generally a wise precaution to have an inner wraping under the cardboard when there are so many loose sheets. Also, the wraping paper on the outside is too thin for such weight and contents.

What is missing and what I did eak for is your assurance that you had said as copies of any of what I loaned you for very limited purposes and that you would not sake or paralt any use to be made of any of this material. This was specifically understood and the one exception to the showing of any of this stuff was for something you planned that never came to fruition.

Sincerely.

Harold Wolchern

Returned to H. Waisberg on 1-3-71 A. Documents initialed by Berkley face sheet

Humes certif of burning material Nov 24

Humes certif to Stover Nov 24 typed autopsy B. Connally File 1 C. Inlarged photo of shirt collar D. Kerox and of CE 397 E. Sibert & O'heill Report F. Certif of Reath (2 pages) G. Dallroy how 25 certif to Bushly H. Two copies of Post Morten II