Martin Ludlow

January 1, 1969

Honorable Ramsey Clark
The Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clark:

While previous correspondence with you has been less than regarding and, when answered at all, has been answered non-responsively, there is this difference between my writing you and my writing J. Edgar Hoover: He never answers anything, responsively or otherwise, having refused to send me even a press release he himself issued falsely attacking me.

Because you are the Attorney General and because the matters of which I write are the responsibilities of the Democratic administration now about to leave office, I again address you about the improper withholding that amounts to suppression of the evidence in the murder of President Kennedy. One of the things I would like you to bear in mind is your own executive ordef of October 31, 1966. In it, you directed that "the entire body of evidence considered by" the Warren Commission "be preserved intact". This means that everything considered by the Commission must be in the National Archives.

Among those things not in the National Archives are records under your personal control. This includes such items of evidence considered by the Commission - in fact, basic to its conclusions - as the spectrographic analysis of the bullet and various fragments of bullet(s) said to have been used in the assassination. When, after promulgation of your order, I asked for this evidence at the National Archives, I was told it was not there. In my presence the Federal Bureau of Investigation was phoned and told the Archives it was, citing a file. I soon proved this file was not of and did not include the spectrographic analysis. The FBI has since failed to supply it. Mr. Hoover just refused to answer my letter on it. This most basic evidence is not covered by any of the guidelines, cannot properly be considered to be covered by the subsequently enacted "Freedom of Information Act", I believe I am entitled to it, and I ask you for it.

I ask you to recall that the FBI was the Commission's major investigative arm and the supplier of its technical and certain analytical services. What it "considered" in this work it "considered" fpr the Commission. Yet, in supplying what was identified as Commission Document 1485, it failed to supply certain of the essential evidence. On the page numbered 11 of this file, the concluding sentence reads, "The Identification Division further advised that the two latent fingerprints developed are not identical with the fingerprints of LEE HARVEY OSWALD". The National Archives informs me they have no record of whose fingerprints these were. Astounding as it is to a non-expert that a piece of paper preserved fingerprints for so long a period of time, it is no less astounding to me that when the FBI allegedly was looking so diligently for any Oswald accomplice, and it did have evidence of such an accomplice, it did not give the Commission the name or names of those whose fingerprints were found on the literature Oswald distributed in New Orleans. This information, which

should have been available to the Commission, should have been an important part of its deliberations, also should now be in the National Archives. It seems to be immune to proper withholding. I ask you for a copy.

On a number of occasions, FBI agents, acting as the Commission's investigators and for it, showed numerous witnesses various photographs. Some of these are not in the National Archives, and usually it is impossible to relate the pictures with the investigative reports, so it is not possible to know which pictures were shown which witnesses. I ask that you have this defect remedied, that a complete file of pictures, each identified with the proper investigative reports, be sent to the National Archives and there made available in the usual manner.

I also ask that this include each and every one of the photographs obtained by the FBI and not given the Commission, not put in the Commission's files, not reported to the Commission and in the full, unedited form similarly be added to the "intact" evidence in the National Archives. In this connection, I want to single out but three of the very large number of still and motion-picture photographs fitting this description and of which I desire copies. One is the first of two Polaroid pictures taken by Mrs. Mary Moorman, of Dallas, Texas. A second is the motion-picture taken by the minor son of J. Pat Doyle, of Portland, Oregon. Another motion picture is that taken by John Martin, of Minneapolis, Minnesota. The latter two are 8mm. movies. My own evidence convinces me each was edited. Neither was given the Warren Commission, whose files do not even reveal the existence of that taken by Mr. Martin. Both show, or in the form given to the FBI showed, Oswald's literature distribution in New Olleans leading to his arrest on August 9, 1963. This was the subject of an extensive FBI investigation. I ask that what is deposited in the National Archives include everything removed by the FBI before the film was returned to the owners, in the form of copies, if that does not exist in the originals, which were retained by the FBI.

I further ask that you cause to be deposited in the National Archives those pertinent reports of interviews with witnesses that were withheld from the Commission and/or are not in its files. I have the statements of witnesses so interviewed, where there is no report in the National Archives and where there is no record in the files of the Commission of the existence of the reports.

I am aware that the Attorney General, like any busy executive, can become the creature of those upon whom he depends for complete and dependable information. I believe I know what has not been communicated to you. Should you, while you are still Attorney General, want to rectify what I am confident history will record as a record with which you may not be content, I am willing to offer you any help I can. Should this information be made available by your successor or the coming administration, it will be a considerable reflection upon you personally, the administration of which you are part, and the Democratic Party.

There remains unanswered correspondence between us. I would appreciate responsive reply as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

cc: Fred Vinson, Jr.