

Hope you can read the Sylors,
Down. I didn't buy a typewriter.

2834 Divisadero St
San Francisco, Calif.
30 July 1968

Dear Tom,

Your letter just reached me Monday
after being forwarded from Honolulu. And
just this morning the copy of Sylor's letter
arrived. Characteristically Sylor's letter seems to
me to offer a very laud answer to the question
you raise.

But let me take up the evidence (in some of
the evidence) which suggests that the copy we
have may have been tampered with. (1) Anne's
Certificate of 24 November 1968: I served 2 years
as an officer in the Navy and I must say that
the typical certificate was a common document. The
standard form for Navy documents is TC Form.

July: is a brown paper, etc. I never saw
an official document of this form during the 2 years
I served. The whole idea of a document being submitted
simply to indicate the time when a copy was taken
was absurd. (2) The letter of the head count is
was issued over to U. S. Naval Medical School
is curious - standard Navy practice would require
that such a document would be in a messenger and
was that.

(2) The letter of the head count is
given on the fore sheet: Note that the
of the two measures (the nipples) this is the only wound
in the body in respect to which location measurements
are given. If the head and neck wounds are located
on the diagram but no measurements are given. Why give
measurements for just this one wound only? Secondly
inspection of the Xerox copy of the fore sheet in Archives
in the absence indicated to me that a different,
and much blunter, pencil or pen was used to write

in the measurement 141 mm from process than was ⁽²⁾
used elsewhere on the face sheet. If the original sheet
was dug up, perhaps a handwriting expert could give
a word authentic opinion on this.

But this evidence of tampering is really quite
scant and the overwhelming evidence I know suggests
to me the following scenario: A careless and
slighted or tippy person under great pressure by
unqualified people yielded a provisional report including
that both bullet did not transit. Hence all the
Penny on Nov. 23rd raised a central problem which
was solved by the transit hypothesis, or hypothesis
which later would give a crucial element in the
single-bullet theory. For the reasons you mentioned
in your letter the location of the back wound is not
decided a central consideration by Hames & company
-- actually by the wound in both 5.5 in below the
top of the collar and 5.5 in below top of arm.
On Nov. 24 or 25 the autopsy reached Admiral
Bunkley and within 24 hours several copies reach the
Secret Service. Meanwhile the Schlot-O'Wall report
forms the basis for the FBI studies and also
(as you suggest) for the press leaks through Nat
Hackett of the Wash. Post. That is before
Dec. 7th a copy of the official autopsy report
reaches the Texas Medical Examiner, Dr.
Rose who fills out the JFK Death Certificate
and dates it about that day, or on
Dec. 23rd the official report reaches the FBI
and about the same time reaches the Commission.
The on piece of evidence which primarily suggests

this scenario in the press let a half of ⁽³⁾
desch. Unambiguously this certificate indicates agreement
with the published official autopsy report. It's dated
Dec. 5th or thereabouts gives us a cut-off date
for the existence of the published report. It
must have existed prior to Dec 7, 1963. When I
get back to Howard I'll send you a Xerox of it
if you will.

Now let me take up the two ~~other~~ observations
mentioned by Sylvia which support the suspicion
that the ~~published~~ undated autopsy report is not the
one Harris handed in on Nov 24. (1) The FBI

Supplemental Report of 13 Jan. 1964. I was caught the
idea that the single sentence (I believe) which refers
to the bullet hitting in JFK's head was simply
an oversight, a mistake, or the result of the person
who wrote the Report not "getting the word" about
the official report which reached the FBI on Dec 23.

(2) The SS conducted on-site tests on 12/5/63 to
determine how the President could have been struck in
the throat by a bullet from the 6th floor window.
We know that on-site tests were conducted on this day
but how do we know they were conducted for this
purpose? Is there anything in the test themselves
or in official SS documents which indicates that
this was the purpose of the tests? I don't know
of anything but Sylvia may. If my memory
does not fail me, she footnotes this statement with
a reference to a NY Times dispatch. But hardly
we know that the NY Times reporter did not in
his own book infer a purpose for the on-site
tests which was not what was known then their real

purpose?

(4)

I conclude that the most probable hypothesis is that there was no substitution of outpours but only bungling. But for different reasons than those adduced by Sylvius, reasons I mentioned at the beginning of my letter, I don't think the suspicion of some fiddling or substitution should be completely put out of our minds.

I certainly would like to meet you sometime, Tom, either in NY or at Sylvius or in Philadelphia. The whole Garrison thing certainly is distressing at the present time and I'm very much concerned that something very interesting involving at least Fernie and Oswald was going on in New Orleans in the summer of 1963 and I saw it would be to know what it was.

Best regards and if you get a minute let me know how the poor Sylvius studies

you.

Barl.

Sylvius:

Your suggestion that the book would might have been ~~cut~~ 5 1/2 in. below the collar and 5 1/2 in. below the top of the waistband is a great idea. It removes something which had been puzzling me for some time. Let's get the pathologist (probably someone or other) let me know if this is anything I can do.

Tom's Harris is infinitely amusing. What a circus!! So the pomologues are beginning to abandon ship even before the "test". Looking forward to a visit in early September when we can cover these recent developments with some gusto.