Dr. James P. Ahoods
Archivist of the United States
The National Archives
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Dr. Ahoods,

In my initial response to your letter of 1/22, I told you I would be making further response when I could. I here address several other matters.

First, however, I want to thank you for what I regard as a less equivocal, more meaningful expression, as when you speak things as "not in our possession" and "we do not know where it is." While I would hope your interest in the integrity of your archives would impel you to use the Attorney General's directive to locate and have this material, I take such words as those quoted at face value and suggest that had they been employed earlier much unnecessary correspondence between us might have been avoided.

At the top of page two you say you have no "lists of individual documents that have been made available for research." Insofar as this relates to what was classified and is not, I suggest you may want to have further in spirit made for you. Whether or not complete, others have been supplied such lists by the Archives, and it is my learning of this after I was led to believe otherwise that caused me to write you about it. But before developing this, I believe I have also asked for any list similar to the "List of Basic Source" materials for those files not numbered 1-99.

As to the quotation of my list, this was offered by Mr. Johnson when I asked if there were any lists of what had been released others classified on my list. "No," he said, and this was not disclosed to me, but I was also informed that the list of these files did not exist, and I was happy to have my list on staked. I was also told that others had not been supplied what I had asked for and had not been given. I assure you the existence of such records was not disclosed to me, as it should have been, and an explanation of what has been charged to my account will disclose the same to you for me. I realize your knowledge of this is necessarily second-hand. Partly for this reason I direct your attention to the self-serving character of such words as these: "The offer to correct your copy of the list was made in response to your specific statement that our copy of that list was not up to date." That occasion was not the only one on which I said declassifying most researchers had been told the classified was utterly meaningless unless researchers were informed of the existence of documents that had been declassified. This is, I believe, that such documents were declassified lists equating with should be made. It is in this context, I venture, that you have been somewhat desired of disclosure of the existence of such lists, and to offer the made and accepted. To this day you have not informed me of the existence of such lists, not even in the letter in question.
With regard to the specter memo, I am willing to accept your version and extend any apology you feel deserved. There remain, however, questions in my mind that I cannot with you. The original note on which I had been promised these two memoranda existed for a file all of which was allegedly available for so long was not kept. Further through faulty records I believe a second date also was not met. If the possible ulterior purposes of this withholding of these two memos only is not known to you, I suggest that as a responsible government official you might want to acquaint yourself with the possibility. The only reason I was ever given was because this was necessary to make a classification "orderly". The opposite, to one not privy to your agency's knowledge, would seem a more obvious interpretation. If you can now give me any amplification of it, I would appreciate it and I think a written record of it might be helpful to history. I would also like to know the date on which the rest of the file was released to research.

When I long ago made the first request for a copy of a page of the Oswald marine's guidebook I specified the page. Locating this now would be a great burden that should be unnecessary, for I did provide it. Quite obviously, I could not request a copy of a single page of a book without identifying that page. As I reminded you, the FBI was the official repository of all Commission exhibits and must have photographed each. I know there were notations on pp. 1, 91, 145 and 109, but do not know whether these include the page for which I asked. If possible, I'd like a copy of each of these, and I believe the FBI or Secret Service should be able to supply it. And this book must certainly was "considered by the Commission".

In Mr. Brinkley's testimony, he refers (1042) to a report he gave the Secret Service about a man seen in the Dealey Hotel with Oswald. If, as it should have been, this report or any record of it has been delivered into your care by the Secret Service, I would like a copy of it, please. The information should include at least a partial identification on an automobile.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Herald Weisberg