

11/3 refer to my 7/25/67 and release
on "return" pix, Xrays. This was first
possibl time could see Bah.
Par 3, ref to discrepancies, /poss
explanations (adrenals, brain, etc.,
but no accounting of them in Report.
Note that O'Neill rpt suppressed from
printed record (ref to)

-CONFIDENTIAL

November 3, 1966

Dr. Robert Bahmer
The Archivist of the United States
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Dr. Bahmer,

Pursuant to our conversation this morning, I am writing to make formal request to study the photographs and X-rays of President John F. Kennedy. I understand this decision is not yours to make and that you will forward my request through appropriate channels.

I am also taking this opportunity to record my belief that the entire manner in which this evidence was returned to government custody has the effect, if not the intent, of denying access to it to those who can and make use of it, to restrict it to those who failed to make use of it when it was their responsibility to do so, and in effect constitutes continued suppression.

Because of the highly unusual nature of the entire arrangement, I would appreciate it if you can send me copies of any or all laws involved, with the appropriate provisions marked. If you or anyone else in the government can do so, I would like an account of the chain of possession of each and all of these photographs and X-rays backward from your present custody to the cameras. This request does not seem to fall within what appears in the press as the restrictions and limitations imposed upon the evidence itself. It also now seems to me to be essential that those of us researching and writing in this field have what the government has denied us and everyone else, proof that there has been no possibility of substitution, elimination or any kind of tampering. This I regard as additionally important because other evidence was destroyed and tampered with, because some of it is missing, and because the published accounts of the numbers and kinds of the pictures and X-rays are inconsistent with the evidence about them.

As I have in the past, I assure you that my interest in this matter has to do exclusively with my research and writing in the field and has nothing to do with idle curiosity. At the same time, I want to impress upon everyone involved the nature of the double standard involved when identical evidence relating to the murder of Oswald while he was in custody and which came to pass only because government made it possible it at the same time made accessible to researchers. I also want to record my belief that access to pathologists is a deception, even after five years, because it will have no meaning a) because they will not have the kind of intimate knowledge of the applicable evidence and b) because of the time lag.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg