



Lillian & Harold Weisberg

Coq d'Or Press ROUTE 8, FREDERICK, MD. 21701

Code 301/473-8186

7/17/71

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

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

As perhaps has suggested itself to you, to the degree I can - like to leave a tiny record. Therefore, I note that your letter of July 15, which reached me today, while saying it is in (belated, as usual) response to mine of a month ago is, in reality, because of my letter to Judge Gesell, of which I sent you a copy.

So this letter, the picture should have been made by today. Therefore, not to press you, I will not appear to see them before Tuesday.

Although your letter does not say so, there are two things about enclosure (2) that are new. In response to my previous requests, you never provided it, knowing + intended litigation and had asked for everything. Can you now tell me why? Also, it was revised after my letter of June 16, 1971, or less than three weeks ago. Would you please tell me the need for revising regulations titled "Regulations for Reference Service on Warren Commission Items of Evidence" when you inherited the Warren Commission files more than six years ago? I note the inclusion of language, "in order to avoid any possible violation of the provisions of the letter agreement between the General Services Administration and the legal representative of the Kennedy family..." If there is any uncertainty, and especially in view of my correspondence with this representative, of which I have supplied you with copies, have you ever sought his opinion on this? His correspondence with me does not suggest any opposition to providing me with copies, especially with consideration of the controlling phrase, "to prevent undignified or sensational reproduction of the clothing". As you know, you do provide undignified and bloody pictures of this clothing for reproduction, and the government itself has reproduced such undignified photographs. It must be apparent to you that this is not a frivolous inquiry.

Your concluding sentence, while perhaps not so intended, may be interpreted as evasive. It limits what you have now provided to "the relevant information regarding regulations concerning the Warren Commission materials." This may later limit me to your interpretation. My request, if you did not understand it, was for any and all rules, regulations, interpretations or any other things, such as definitions of records, required by me to properly and fully pursue my interests in obtaining what I regard as public information. Thus, special regulations "concerning the Warren Commission materials" may, conceivably, not be all applicable regulations. As you know, I am merely repeating a request years old and to now never fully responded to. I hope I am wrong, but I believe that as of today all of this has not been provided me. Therefore, I ask for anything else there may be or the assurance that I will not in the future be confronted with such regulations or other rules you will hold to be controlling and have not provided. And, is it a safe assumption that the printed regulations do not contract, abbreviate or in any way omit language not therein included?

DATE RECEIVED IN MND	7-22
DATE REPLY DUE	we
REGISTER NUMBER	12-8
ASSIGNED TO	John

Sincerely,  
Harold Weisberg