Director of Information  
Office of the Administrator  
General Services Administration  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

Over the months, I have made requests for documents in National Archives files relating to the assassination of President John Kennedy, anticipating that requests would be rejected. I asked that if rejected, to save time, which your agency wastes for us as a routine matter, the request be forwarded to you as my appeal under your regulations, as a necessary pre-requisite to invocation of 5 USC 502. In addition, I addressed a letter drawing together some of these requests, with the understanding that if the decision was not changed following review, it would be forwarded to you as my appeal.

I shall interpret failure to respond as waiver of the requirement, unless there is explicit response, now that there is no doubt you have been informed. I believe the long delays are in themselves waiver of this requirement, when considered with the language of the law, its legislative history and clear Congressional intent.

Herewith I appeal a subsequent decision, to refuse me photographic copies of photographs in these files. I have been provided with utterly meaningless copies of photographs of some of the President's garments, though showing no detail, nothing but gore, or those the magnification of which, for proper study, is automatically prevented by their having been made from photographs only, the screen of which appears as dots upon magnification.

The National Archives has made its own photographs of these garments, for the alleged purpose of making them available for study rather than simply study of the garments. When I sought permission to examine the garments, under a precedent whereby I was permitted to examine Lee Harvey Oswald's shirt, I was refused. I was sent photographs of which I was denied copies.

One of these was of the front of the President's shirt. It is the only such photograph in the Archives of which I have knowledge that can serve research purposes and can be used for other than unignified or sensational purposes. I ask you for it, or an enlargement of the one showing the plaque to the shirt.

There is no existing photograph of the side of the knot of the tie. I have asked that it be made for me and have been refused. I ask you for it. For purposes of my research and, I believe, any genuine research, and for the purpose of the damage or the knot is essential.

I have obtained from the Department of Justice a piece of the part of the President's shirt shown in JFK Exhibit 60. I believe this effectively refutes any allegation or claim such photographs not showing the knot of the tie cannot
be evident with properity. The most obviously essential portion of the 30
not to exclude such pictures in the spirit designed to make clear to the
this I am the last to wish to localize but made it to no other ground for with-
holding under the provisions of the alleged agreement.

I also want a photograph is from the original negative, not a
photographing negative, of the top of the collar, preferably the largest
clear enlargement of the area of damage and including the top of the collar,
the archives pictures rather than those included in WH Exhibit 60 or
CH204. If there is more than one such picture, I would like to have one
from whichever picture the archives photographer considers best shows the
damage. I would like to be informed of the existence of any others.

With regard to CH204, I would like the largest clear enlargement of
the area of damage the photographer can make, if necessary, from the existing
negative. Here is it not necessary to include the collar area.

It is my understanding that the Columbia Broadcasting System was
permitted to take photographs of this clothing, and I know for a fact
that they were permitted to make their own photographs of CH203. Regulations
require these to be non-exclusive and to be available to everyone. I would like
be informed when I may examine these pictures so that I may determine whether
or not I desire prints of them. My interest in the Bulletin is not in the battle
only. If CBS was permitted to photograph the clothing, then there is adequate
precedent for your photographer making for me those pictures I want.

In the past, it has been the official practice to delay replying to
those of my requests that were not completely ignored. Both, I believe, are
contrary to the spirit as well as the letter of the law and the clear Congres-
sional intent. I have reason to believe your legal office has been kept fully
informed of my requests and that responses have been made. There thus seems no
reason for inordinate response to this letter. Therefore, if I have not heard from
you by July 9, 1970, I will assume you do not intend to reply and will be guided
by this belief in any future actions I may take.

Sincerely,

Harold Neisberg