March 13, 1970

Dear Mr. [Name],

You have written to me that you have been denied requests to view records, resubmit them for a hearing, and then appeals of the denial if that is denied. Since then I have received a number of similar requests from you. You have, in essence, interpreted your request to me as a license to make a response at all. I think this is simply improper, and I think your refusal to respond after two months is another manifestation of what by now is clearly a conscious, deliberate misuse of the raw power vested in government functionaries.

This has, indeed, been clear as a consequence of reviewing an entire correspondence between us. I have completed it. It is in your position; and I too, no matter how much you may disapprove, I would keep your thing, regardless of the time it takes. I do not accept your offer, but I feel one to you to our position for, if you are unable, I have every intention of appealing this matter in court should that become necessary.

Among the things I find are countless requests for being informed about your agency's requirements as well as the invocation of the Freedom of Information Act. No longer time, despite constant repetition, have we to respond in all. This is my agency's requirement for the use of this form, to this date you have not responded. I do not regret the intense of Congress in inquiring to this, it reflects the nature of the spirit of the law, as is, I believe, both change of the regulation of your agency.

I find that I regard as perfectly proper requests to which there has been no response after an insubstantial period, as well as about two years, I have encountered explanations of the same thing, at least stating the fact of your need for the records. I find cases in which, response was not made until after half a year and elapsed, I find instances in the employment of deft five language filled by silence when you were questioned, addressed directly.

In one thing: I do not find is a complaint that you, or I have asked a single improper question, asked for a single thing above. I have written what not assumed, in your capacity,

I now, on the contrary, every time, did not have to say: I have written all my on 13 time, I can now tell you that it was only after several years not. Nonetheless, encourage you to the description of the operation of, as I can, for I think it possible but outside of things this is true. The question is: you forget that for the first time in court. If you had to make a moment, perhaps you may come to understand that the explanation of your being a rash interest, unless you may have been given by counsel your own explanation to me. If you feel as I say, it is better to understand this. This method is a good one, and if it is adopted personally or in your instructions, we all can see that it will save over your things. And you not in a single and I sent you my request, if I at filling suit, in my purpose.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]
I will submit a list, with due care, of all this and the
you can read in writing for, a. I am by no means say that this is not at least part of the selection for a number of reasons. I asked that you consider specified requests regarding this and it is obvious that direct unaided writing of your kind of response to any one necessary. In case I am to find this side line, I might want to state clearly because I will fill in my own to be rather constricted, I will submit it.

Now, you have all seen things to your advantage, and in all of.

And, I wrote all and same things to your advantage, with the. I think now futile hope you will deal with them promptly. I also put a few things from just in your question to go in not the responses you were very much.

I made what I presume is the first request for the Innesley Daily 26th agreement and that is relevant. You refused me, giving very specific reason. So if this reason be a genuine one, it eliminates the possibility of an examination I was given that you gave this, in violation a your own regulation, to which, one known not to have the background required to understand it. But, when I did not respond to my request for a full examination I was reported is contrary to you, I believe; it is more than proper, especially because it entails a clear violation of your own regulations. I ask to each do you very many acknowledge any of those inquiries, and extending even a period of about the year. I have now renewed this inquiry, ask for a meaningful examination, the one you cannot or investigation to be made to determine how your regulations and my rights fail to be grossly violated.

It has been, since this case for some time in the Innesley Daily garments. Ultimately, I was refused. I then asked that pictures be taken mine, by you, and you again refused. This is passing strange for a matter of reason, at the least of which is your own confirmation of the total absence of the essential one with regard to the view, a side view of the neck which we did not see on the side. I then asked that you take the negatives you already have and do a very ordinary, most thing, enlarge this picture or the view of the neck to the extent it will show your silence. I ask in the hope of time is not lost upon unnecessary. I cannot regard it as a verbal. This is not the first time I have reminded the Archives about this. I say in ask that you do this, which is entirely in accord with your own practice, or recently. And I remind you how much time is in your offices, especially that it is your intent to have me "submit" use of this now. Basic measure. Etcetera. The only uses to which the pictures you have been used primarily scholarship, for they are priceless, and come with an unseemly and unnecessary display of the Innesley Daily's blood, it is given. This is not what I want, and yet you insist I use this, just nothing is in the time it is. You have yet to dispute my statement, to that do not the pictures you can lied are utterly without value or meaning.

In some manner I am to begin to understand you all in you do not have certain pictures you did for me. You no. claim, of course, do not for me. John Nichols. I want you unread this. I asked that you be certain that I am the one who is sending me a copy of his order and duplicate the photographs you take for me, with negatives in each case. I take issued a set of duplicate prints, entirely unidentified, even in thing else. Despite my reminders, you have not yet acted. There is nothing in this that need go to another authority. I hope you will order as soon as possible. May I remind you of your claim that I am doing, it has been done because they endanger the evidence and ask you to remove it with considerably.
to take care of your books either to keep competent records of it would, when you write, you and obtain a record of it would be something against my account and should at the very least two of your employees made about this, Mr. Johnson, has no to the arrangements are supervised, upon second or photographer. Your silence and the deliberate ignoring of this proper request is consistent with a lesser honesty of purpose or any concept of scholarship. It is consistent only with frustrating my work, to the degree you can, and I am sure your government's consent to the negative of the picture taken for me. I also think that this one is dated on a negative so that the prints and my duplicate negative will be properly identified.

For more than a year we have been in communication on the case of transfer of certain items, including the pictures on X-rays of the gateway, which were on government property. It took you 62 days to determine this was a "private paper." It is close to a year since I asked you for a copy of the government's copy. You have not at any point indicated that there is a government copy, as I know beyond doubt there is; or b) whether or not you have it. For my immediate purposes in this letter, I ask you simply to tell me whether or not you have, or have had a) a government copy of this paper and b) of the other documents relevant to it. If it seems necessary, I will then write you again further.

It is now more than 8 months since I asked the total number of pictures and X-rays on the gateway in your possession, together with an identification by type and size of film, the identifications on each, the records of change or destruction. Your response to this proper inquiry is one I will not further embarrass you with repetition. I know this request. You must certainly recognize that any, it relates in any way to the content of any of the film.

When you declined to give me a list of the documents relating to the late David Ferrie, either as incompletely released by your agency in letters in the news or as they actually exist, I wrote earlier for both of them. I also wrote and the reasons for withholding each can be given. You write that the files have been sent to me. I sent to the Archives, asked for and examined them. I wrote you that they are gutted, but they do not contain the documents not withheld. I also contain no record of what is withheld. I do not regard it as a favor to entrust me into such a futility, for this wasted both money and time. You have not before this time been a long time since I wrote you. "You have increased my letter by my request," which I herewith renew. At the same time, particularly because you have to be reminded to do certain things for the security of ... is in as you, I ask an explanation of just how these files did get gutted out by whom, especially a special file set up, may find where you still have, and I remind you that your handled property as yours, the distinction in you as an individual. I am not very astute to me.

It was long time since I asked for this. This is to Queen the four documents by which Warner Specter was sent in the November's letter. I am well aware of this matter. I will still write to do it.

I beg you to now request with regard to Ferrie, and I will return here. If you have certain or two to which you have access, I would like your attention on them to him and the records associated with him in the correspondence. In our.

You have not responded to my request. It is your duty to bring all of the final reports on the gateway or the. This is in your hands, if not.

In connection, did you newly understand, that this is your decision for the matter additionally. I think to unfold the matter.
I have asked, without any response, for and on occasion submitted to use the auto-copy pictures and x-rays and related withheld material.

My request for the Hanney-family- CIA contract was placed to include all attachments and related papers. You have never mentioned any related papers. Nor have you provided them. I still want them.

You have never responded to those requests about the executive sessions; for a list of what was discussed 1/30/64, which still, I am convinced, establish that withholding is for reasons other than alleged, and for access to that of 6/24/64, which was made available to another writer.

With regard to Frederick O'Sullivan, I have asked the date and location of the interview, and how the alteration in his testimony was made. It does not appear in the typescript sent to the printing office. There has been no response of any kind, after a rather long interval, also, the C's identification.

I believe there has been no response to my inquiry about an additional Berkley file, its existence and contents, if it exists.

As soon as I can, I will decide what to request again of the specific items already identified by you and refused by you and will incorporate them in a separate letter. Meanwhile, I hope that you will depart from the red record of the past, respond to this promptly and constructively, and forward or make available through proper channels whatever you may refuse me. I believe there is nothing extraordinary about any of the foregoing requests, except the treatment we have received by your agency. I would hope you do not refuse me or it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

H. Goldblatt

7/31/70

Assigned to Johnson

Y. 70