Dear Howard,

As I'x think about your comingw visit and what you can best do, one thing that could also serve a very useful purpose for me and all of us occurs to me. It is about this I write, so you can consider it and plan the best use of your time as you see it.

We have agreed that you should reread the PMs, and I have suggested that you may want to go over what I have leid aside, in a separate file, for the remaining part of this aspect of my work.

As you know, I plan to sue for some of the suppressed material. This will require that I go over my entire and rather large file of correspondence with the Archives. It occurs to me that it would also be illuminating to you in many weys if you were to do this. Among other things, you will have that much of an index to what I have obtained of which you may have no knowledge, it will give you a smattering of other aspects, and it may show you have I have been able to obtain certain things that have been denied.

If you were to do this, one further step would be of great value to me/us. That would be to itemize each request have made in one column and the date of the letter responding in another. Thus we will have a list of what I have sogght that has been denied.

This has a number of swlues. I suggest you will draw your own conclusions about why what is denied and can learn much from it. I think this will broaden your understanding of the entire subject. It is a necessity for the trial and for the preludes. I should say "suit". It will illustrate their evasion techniques for you (and the rest of us, for I cannot keep it all in mind).

There is this added advantage to me. I have to slow down further, at least for a while, and I do not have time for it. I fear, also, that were I to lay eside other work to do it, the emotional stress would not be helpful. I now have a letter from Rhoads asking this of me as a prelude to their review of their refusals, and I think it best that we take this literally, as though he has good intentions, and take him up on this.

Other things in this letter will interest you. It discloses that I have again forced into the Archives what had been withheld from the Commission. In this case, unless Rhoads is deceptive, it is the original copy of the original Oswald-wew Orleans footage, of which only edited versions were given the Commission. If this turns out to be what is represented, the importance can be great.

in case you agree and I forget, I suggest we broaden this to include all federal agencies, esp. SS, FBI (DV) and Navy, here for your information, not for the purposes of the suit.

Rhoads has written me that the picture was taken for Nichols. I have asked for a print, a copy of the order, and renewed my request for duplicating what was taken for me, thist time adding a negative. If you bring camera, bring copying equip.

My Mamiya-Secor sets to within 18".