

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

National Archives and Records Service
Washington, D.C. 20540

July 1, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Coq d'Or Press
Route 8
Frederick, Maryland 21701


Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This is in reply to your letter of May 30, 1970.

Enclosed as Attachment A to this letter is a copy of the electrostatic copy of a photograph of the base of the bullet in Commission Exhibit 399 which you sent us with your letter of December 12, 1969, and which is referred to in Mr. Eckhoff's letter of December 30, 1969, to Mr. Bernabei. You requested a copy of this photograph in your letter of January 27, 1970, and we furnished two prints to you as you acknowledged in your letter of February 4, 1970.

You also requested another photograph of the base of the bullet in CE 399, in your letter of January 27, described in your letter of February 4 as "the special picture I asked you to take for me in duplication of the one earlier made for me and now allegedly lost". In our letter of March 12 we requested you to send us an electrostatic copy or rough sketch of the photograph you wanted, and it was this copy or sketch which we did not receive, as we stated in our letter of May 13. Enclosed as Attachment B to this letter is an electrostatic copy of the photograph we took for you on April 7, while you were present, which you stated in your letter of April 13 was the one you had wanted. If you will compare the photographs in Attachments A and B, you will note that they are not identical. If we had duplicated the photograph in Attachment A for you, we would have been furnishing you a duplicate of a photograph of which we had already furnished you two prints, rather than the photograph you wanted.

Sincerely,



HERBERT E. ANGEL
Acting Archivist
of the United States

Enclosure

7/5/70

Dr. James E. Rhoads, Archivist
The National Archives
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

Mr. Angel's letter of 7/1 says it "is in reply to" mine of May 30, but it really isn't, is not responsive, and has purposes I am left to surmise, the most obvious of several being to misinform if not actually deceive others inside the government to whom copies might be sent.

On more than one occasion, letters to me from your agency have, in one way or another, stated or suggested that what I wrote was not in accord with fact. The contrary, as I have on more than one occasion, told you, is the case. My letter of reference addressed one such case. You had said I had not had a special picture of the base of Bullet 339 made for me, and you claimed to have written in a record of making it or a copy of it. You then claimed the unreasonably delay in making a copy was because I hadn't given you an electrostatic copy, which also was not in accord with the truth, as the letter of 7/1/70 acknowledges while seeming not to do so.

The most casual comparison of my letter and Mr. Angel's should disclose to you that his is a non sequitur, going into all sorts of irrelevancies and in no way answering to what I charged in the third paragraph of the letter, the stated purpose of the letter, "...the spurious reasons given me for not having provided the picture I had repeatedly asked for over a long period of time: 'He did not prepare the photograph earlier because we did not receive the electrostatic copy or rough sketch of the photograph which we requested you to send'."

Moreover, Mr. Angel's letter grossly misrepresents your letter of March 12, 1970, saying of it, "You also requested another photograph of the base of the bullet in GN 339 (sic)..." It is true that I did, later, ask for another photograph, and that it is not identical, the reason for wanting a second photograph, but this is not what you said March 12. Rather than paraphrasing, as Mr. Angel does, I'll quote you directly: "To the best of our knowledge, we have never taken a special photograph of GN 339 for you. If you will send us an electrostatic copy of the photograph to which you refer, we may be able to identify the negative just as we identified the negative we took for Dr. Nichols." The attachment I with Mr. Angel's letter is exactly that photocopy his letter acknowledges I had sent 12/12/69, months earlier.

I am prepared, should it interest you and serve any useful purpose, as a consequence of the time-consuming facility you asked of us, a review of our correspondence, to show you other cases where the errors allegedly mine are not. In this case, I note the response is not over your signature.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg