

October 17, 1969

Mr. James Rowley, Director
United States Secret Service
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Rowley,

Enclosed are a copy of my today's letter to Dr. Rhoads and the enclosure, marked as is the copy to him.

You will recognize, I am certain, that I have also asked for these public records and not been given them by your agency. I herewith renew my request for these and any others you may have turned over to the Archives, made from whatever copies remain in your custody or accessible to you.

It is difficult for me to consider it merely an oversight, carelessness or anything other than willful official suppression that I have been denied access to what cannot properly be denied me. In addition to other applicable law and regulation, it is my belief this is an open violation of the Freedom of Information Act, in this context, "so-called".

This belief is fortified by the unquestionable official suppression relating to just this evidence that is already a matter of public record, if no attention has been given it. In the event it has escaped your attention, let me refer you to the statements of Commission counsel when he introduced exhibit 397 into evidence (3H374):

"...the identical document which has previously been identified as Commission No. 371 for our internal purposes."

If you will examine the printed version of Commission No. 371, published as Exhibit 397 (17H29-48), you will not find the enclosed page from it, the receipt by your agency to Admiral Burkley. But this page at the top is clearly identified as "Commission No. 371". By expunging from the evidence this receipt for these documents, their existence was effectively suppressed. In four years of trying, I have not been able to get to study them.

Recently I have restudied the existing evidence about the original autopsy notes. They permit no doubt that your agency received from the Navy certain notes in Dr. Ames' hand-writing that are not in any file and whose existence has been denied me. Specifically, the argumentative receipt your agency gave the Archives to sign when you delivered some originals is in error.

In order that I may know which of you is telling me the truth, for you both cannot be, I ask for a copy of all files you have turned over to the Archives and a record sufficiently specific to permit individual identification of all files on this subject you have maintained and still exist.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

October 17, 1969

Mr. James H. ...
Archivist of the United States
The National Archives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. ...

In the past I have explained that the large number of my proper requests that have been either ignored or not properly responded to is in itself the receipt of my kind of occasional check list of these requests. I have said this to you in writing and in person, during the recess in the trial last winter in Judge Hellock's court. At that time you rather surprised me by telling me you had just caused a check to be made and I assumed all my requests had been answered. At that time I told you this was not the case. Since then, despite the fact of a year that has elapsed, some of these requests are still without answer or response.

Here I renew one of these long-standing requests, for the receipts and other documents enumerated in the November 20, 1964 receipt the Secret Service gave Admiral Barkley for use in the autopsy evidence. This is from SN 371. I enclose a copy for your convenience. In order to insure there can be no misunderstanding, I am marking each document I want. In each case I desire a copy made from the original. If in any case you do not have the original, I would appreciate a statement of this fact plus the identification of the file from which the copy is made. If there are any attachments to any of these, I would also like a copy of each such attachment.

In the past I have requested copies of the receipts executed and signed the night of the assassination at the Navy Hospital. I have not been given any, have been told there are no copies in the archive. Since then I have been informed by both the Secret Service and the Navy Department that they have conveyed their files. These receipts also must exist and I believe I am also entitled to copies of each.

With regard to the item marked twice, "One receipt from FBI for a missile recovered during examination of the body" I would like to see the exhibit number or other identification of this missile and would, at your convenience, like to examine it.

If any of the other records of the autopsy I have requested and not been given are available, I renew my request for them. I have been assured repeatedly that I have been given all autopsy material when this I did not and have not had the case. And so now you will not see to it that my other unanswered requests are filled. On my last visit to the archives, I renewed one of them, in person.

Sincerely,

Harold ...

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Protective Research Section
November 26, 1963

Receipt is acknowledged this date, Nov. 26, 1963, of the following items from Dr. George G. Burkley:

1. A piece of bronze colored material inadvertently broken in transit from casket in which body was brought to Washington.

2. Letter - Certificate of Death of John F. Kennedy - Dallas - dated Nov. 22, 1963.

3. Carbon copy of letter dated November 26 from Commander, U. S. Medical School, concerning law and regulations regarding confidential nature of the events.

4. Receipt dated Nov. 22, 1963, for bed sheet, surgical gapes, and shroud used to cover the body in transit.

5. Receipt dated Nov. 22, 1963, regarding a carton of radiographic film, undeveloped except for X-rays, delivered to FBI for safekeeping.

6. Original and six pink copies of Certificate of Death (Dallas, N)

7. Receipt from FBI for a missile recovered during the transportation of the body.

8. Letter from University of Texas South West Medical Center including report from Dr. Clark and summary of course of treatment and examination of the President in Dallas County Hospital. Said letter of transmittal and three carbon copies have been retained in that area.

9. Copy of autopsy report and notes of the examination as described in letter of transmittal Nov. 22, 1963.

10. Letter and 7 copies of the above items.

11. Receipt for post mortem examination signed by the Dallas County Hospital dated Nov. 22, 1963.

George G. Burkley

10/15/69

Dear Dick, Gary and Paul,

It is unfortunately only too true that the Archives has made it impossible for me to keep any meaningful check list of what I ask for and do not get, as the enclosed letter to Rhoads protests. Dick and Paul, each in a different way, have recently called some of the material for which I renew my request to my attention. I had asked both the Archives and the Secret Service for it. The Secret Service told me it did not have it, which I do not believe. I believe there was some special kind of fingers-crossed formulation.

I will not be mailing these letters until Bud reads and approves them. I anticipate this will be Friday, when, unless the day changes by phone, we planned last week. He was then here, for the purpose of going over my entire file of Archives requests to decide which he will file suit on. He got through 1968 only. He took 1969 with him to study. If he approves, I will ask for all of these things again, in his presence, at the Archives. I will also ask for a list of what the Secret Service turned over. And in his presence I will ask for and examine the entire box of originals one part (which may be the entire thing) of which I saw last week.

I believe it is important that we make no mention of this at all until we get into court. It will then be more effective. I am telling no one but the three of you of it. It doesn't make too much difference what response they make, once we get into court, for no judge will ever believe that such records as these do not exist. Nor are they subject to any withholding, under guidelines, regulations of their kind, law or anything else.

As there are developments, I will keep you posted. If any of you has any suggestions, I would appreciate them in duplicate, so I can give Bud a copy as my lawyer. I have copied for him what Dick and Paul have suggested, but that takes time and costs the little bit that I cannot now afford.

When we finally agree on what we will sue for (and whether we include the Navy, which I have caught in either deliberate lies or violation of its own regulations), I will let you know that, too.

There is one document withheld on Ferris that I have, unofficially. It cannot be properly withheld, not even as an investigatory file; the reason given me in writing. I anticipate Bud will agree to sue for this, too.

Bud will want to keep this as simple as possible and to restrict it to what he regards as legally unobtainable. We will not duplicate what John is doing. I have told him generally what I am about but not specifically because he is expanding a dubious suit to include everything I have. And Washington is a much better forum.

Also enclosed is my letter to Rowley. You will not tell him what I did not tell Rhoads, of the suppression of the list in Exhibit 397. It should worry the man who was in charge of keeping the President alive,

Sincerely,

October 17, 1968

Mr. James Buckley, Director
United States Secret Service
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Buckley,

Enclosed are a copy of my today's letter to Mr. Boardman and the enclosure, marked as is the copy to him.

You will recognize, I am certain, that I have also asked for these public records and not been given them by your agency. I herewith renew my request for these and any others you may have turned over to the Archives, made from whatever copies remain in your custody or accessible to you.

It is difficult for me to consider it merely an oversight, carelessness or mistake which has resulted in official suppression that I have been denied access to that cannot properly be denied me. In addition to other applicable laws and regulations, it is my belief this is an open violation of the Freedom of Information Act, in this context, "neo-fascist".

This letter is fortified by the unquestionable official suppression existing in just this evidence that is already a matter of public record, if no attention has been given it. As the fact it has escaped your attention, let me refer you to the attached copy of Commission counsel which he introduced exhibit 327 into evidence (38372):

"...the identical document which has previously been identified as Commission No. 371 for our internal purposes."

If you will examine the printed version of Commission No. 371, published as Exhibit 327 (17229-48), you will not find the enclosed page from it, the receipt by your agency to Admiral Markley. But this page of the book is clearly identified as "Commission No. 371". By examining from the evidence into receipt of these documents, their existence was effectively expressed. In four years of trying, I have not been able to get to study them.

Recently I have restudied the existing evidence about the original autopsy notes. They reveal no doubt that your agency received from the Navy certain notes in Dr. James' handwriting that are not in any file and whose existence has been denied me. Specifically, the argumentative receipt your agency gave the Archives to sign when you delivered some originals is in error.

In order that I may know which of you is telling me the truth, for you both seem to be, I ask for a copy of all files you have turned over to the Archives and a record sufficiently specific to permit individual identification of all files on this subject you have a list that are still active.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg