Dear Roger, 4/13/89

We appreciate you letter of the ninth. I'd planned to respond shortly but do it now to answer your 4/11 questions.

Appropos of your appreciation of this area, which despite the freezes at night now has more blooms that you saw, Jerry McKnight and I were talking about this last night. We celebated Bill's liberation, the four of us, with dinner at a new Mexican (family operation) restaurant. With four ample meals that wereq quite good and three bottles of Carta Blanca, a fine Mexican beer if you are not familiar with it, the bill was about $30. Another of our area assets! Jerry, who comes from what then was a fine sections of Philadelphia, was an undergraduate at Penn State, took his doctor's at Maryland and lived at Greenbelt before moving here, and has travelled much, does not want to live anywhere else, he likes it that much. So does his wife. You'll meet them when you return because you'll have more time. Jerry is probably the most popular prof at Hood. He has earned that rep.

When mistakingly the Hopkins surgeon told me not to drive, I missed only a day or two of some walking therapy. Young men who work at the mall came for me before going to work and I was taken home by others there for the same purpose as I am. For a couple of months. And nobody would take any pay. (I gave the two young mall maintainance workers gifts, though.)

On a different matter I've been annotating Melanson's The Murkin Conspiracy.

I cannot explain why Hoch and Ranftel withheld from Sylvia. I'm not surprised at Ranftel. I think I told you my experience, which he has denied to Hoch but not to me, and I can tell you that he sent me nothing and asked me nothing when he was going over those records. He knew I had them but he also knew it was impossible to read all of them rapidly. Hoch, as you may know, remains hung up on Lifton. Has been for years. And, I understand, has adopted some strange beliefs he has not shared with me, like Specter's single-bullet theory.

I have no clear recollection of CE 1126 and am not rereading it because I do not believe it will illuminate the dark area you mention. I think a clue may be his knowledge that the WC had no interest in him and his recognition of how unusual that was.

If you do not know the titles of the various FBI files I think you might want to make a card file on them. If you don't have a list of their file classifications, I can provide one for the period of interest and Lesar can provide the newest, which is of no particular interest to me. 62 is administratige inquiry. 109060 is the main JFK assassination file. 109090 is, and I emphasize the actual title, Liaison with the Warren Commission. I've identified at least one other HQ Commission file (these are both HQ) and my appeals were ignored. The "original" is known as the "record" copy and it is almost indexed. The duplicates are not and are, inconsistently. They are not as "Not Recorded" to distinguish them from the record or indexed copy. The abbreviation is NR with a number and ff, indicating its presence in the serial arrangement, so many past or following the serial that is numbered.

I have a small and entirely incomplete 3x5 file on FBI personnel. It says that Bartlett was liaison with the Secret Service. I am not aware of any low-level liaison with the White House so I presume Burkley used Bartlett to tell the FBI what he wanted to tell it. And that it was, as he saw it, self-serving. We can guess his motives but have nothing more of which I know to go on. Cover-the-ass.

You found there was no enclosure with the copy I made for subject file. I suggest that when you return you have the serial identification and we check the copies I got. I may have overlooked making a copy, omitted it by accident, or intended what you found only as a reference to the complete file.

If I were to guess why Burkley is not listed by the FBI as at the autopsy it is

possibly because he was not ther all the time, wa in and out. I think there are others the FBI agents did not list but I'm not now clear on who or why.

It does appear to be odd that Rankin asked Rossn to obtain Burkley's memo but he may have had his own reasons and it may be that the FBI did perform such chores for the Commission.

Whether or not on its initiative the Navy started sending things to Burkley/SS. I have a letter from it saying they did not retain anything, a violation of regulations. It may have been Burkley's idea that the SS have those records if he had no secure place in which to keep them The documents he endorsed that I recall are those within his responsibility as physician to the president.

I don't think that what the Commission used that did not have his endorsements were redcated. I think they are copies made from the originals before he got them and thus could have have held his endorsements. I am sure Rankin et al preferred to avoid those endorsements I found.

I also believe he would have signed a copy of his statement.

I think the questions you ask about this are answered as well as we can now by the fact that Rankin went out of his way not to call Burkley when he knew he should have and his use of the unsigned copies when he had the signed originals. Rankin's own purposes.

I agree also that this is wrong that the SS should have a record. I'll return to this. It may be difficult to follow under FOIA, it may be worthwhile, but I'm not in a position to do it.

I did not know that Epsteinker, my name that Sylvia liked, has this new book out. Might be interesting to sse what he has to say and how he angles it.

Now, what I know about this SS end, as best I can now recall it:

Kelley got perhaps embarrassed by my letters and there came a time he invited me in to see him. When I got there Goff, if I recall the name correctly, SS general counsel, and I think another or other agents were with him. The others were more or less unfriendly or unwilling participants but I can't say this about Kelley. We made a deal that if they would make certain thinks available to me, including the autopsy records, I would not sue SS.I gave my word and I kept it and I learned that of all things the Archives blocked his efforts, I think with DJ involved. He made an effort to keep his word and I felt bound. I also regarded it as quite exceptional for the Archives to intrude. I have some records that may bear on this in the Archives records on me that it let me have, perhaps not all they had. He later told me that he had transferred everything the SS had to the Archives. Later, and I don't now recall why, I decided that they had held some back. Mayve it was records in certain areas only. I don't know.

I gave my word and I would have kept it, but in retrospect, and I'm not at all sure this then entered my thinking or decision, I wonder if my knowledge that the FBI saw to it that SS was frozen out of the investigation made me somewhat sympathetic to the position in which it found itself. If you are not aware of this, it was in an area of considerable interest to me. I think we should discuss this further when you are gere. As soon as the N.O. FBI learned that the SS was checking Oswald's literature out it asked or told the N.O. SS to hold off. It did get in touch with HQ and ask that SS be called off. SS HQ heard from FBIHQ and it called its local agents off. How the FBI got triggered by this I don t know but I can tell you the results of my own investigation of that matter. Provocative indeed.

On still another matter about which I have no personal feeling or resentment, now that you have seen what I have and that I can supervise or even observe what others are interested in, can you find a reason that satisfies you that Richter refused to even ask to see what I have on the area of his professed interest to Jim Lesar, the scientific

testing? I don,t recall that we ever had any disagreement, but should any have stopped him?

142-10 Hoover Avenue
Apartment 404
Jamaica, New York 11435

April 11, 1989

Dear Harold,

I began to write this in haste by hand last night because I arrived home later than usual and still felt a little bit fatigued from the weekend. There was something bothering me, and I wanted to get it out in the open immediately. This morning, I looked at the handwritten letter and realized that my single-spaced penmanship on this one would probably be a little too dense for you to read comfortably, so I am typing it.

Without having made even a significant dent in your alpha-subject files, it is nevertheless already clear to me that Ranftel and Hoch were less than forthcoming in sending documents from the FBI's 1977-1978 releases to Sylvia during the days of the HSCA. I have learned this also from my recent FOIA request, which yielded the pages I left with you (most of which you probably already have). I know that on behalf of both of us, Sylvia had requested, inter alia, stuff relating to the autopsy. Within the past two weeks I have seen numerous items which never made their way into Sylvia's possession or mine, although she did receive a lot of junk from them.

Ever since I began to analyze Burkley's activities and their possible significance 15 years ago, I have puzzled over CE 1126, his purported typewritten personal account of his role that day. This unsigned document had no apparent context and was woefully lacking in perti-

nent detail, although dripping with sentiment. It gave no clue as to why it was prepared or what purpose it was intended to serve. Its genesis was a complete mystery.

In your files (either the "Autopsy" or "Burkley" file -- I'll have to begin keeping track of where these things come from), are two LHMs. The first is dated June 4, 1964 from Brennan to Sullivan. The second, dated June 8, 1964 is from Rosen to Belmont. The original of each was filed in 62-109060, and a copy of each in 62-109090.

In the Brennan memo, a liason agent named Bartlett is mentioned. Was he a liason with the White House, the Navy or something else? Note that Burkley asked to speak with him, not vice versa (if this can be taken at face value). Although Burkley by this time must have compared notes with Roy Kellerman (or perhaps even reviewed Kellerman's reports), he persists in taking credit for giving the Parkland doctors JFK's blood grouping and information as to his medication (presumably the Solu-Cortef). (Burkley has stuck to this story consistently, judging from an Oral History transcript from the JFK library.) He then tells Bartlett he prepared a memorandum. It is not explained why. Neither is it explained why or through whom he submitted it to Mrs. Kennedy or the Secret Service, or whether they were the only recipients. Note, however, that they were given <u>copies</u>; no word on the destination of the original ribbon copy.

Burkley further notes that he has not been called by the Warren Commission. We might presume that, since the Commission was not yet finished, Burkley may have had some inkling that he would never be

called. Finally, he requests Bartlett to intercede on his behalf with the Commission to get his statement into the record.

Brennan adds gratuitously that Burkley is not mentioned in the Secret Service report. The memo is stamped "enclosure", but I found none attached (perhaps a report by Bartlett himself? A copy of Burkley's statement? The June 8th LHM by Rosen clearly indicates that it could not have been a copy of Burkley's statement that was enclosed.)

Didn't the White House have its own liason with the Warren Commission? Why did Burkley go through the FBI? Why not through Tom Kelley, to whom he states he had given a copy of his statement?

Why is it that neither FBI document mentions Burkley's presence at the autopsy, although his name is on Sibert & O'Neill's attendance list?

According to Rosen, Rankin asks him to obtain Burkley's memorandum (why doesn't Rankin go straight to Tom Kelley?)

Your work in Post Mortem established that,

1) Willingly or unwillingly, the Secret Service became the repository for original documents relating to the medical aspects of the case which, due to your efforts were ultimately turned over to the National Archives.

2) Burkley had a penchant for personally endorsing such documents.

Also, the copies of autopsy-related materials which found their way into the Commission's record all have in common the redaction of Burkley's handwritten acknowledgements of receipt and verification. These redacted copies presumably came to the Commission from the Secret Service.

I am compelled to the conclusion that he must have signed the original copy of his own statement, even though that is not the version which appears in CE 1126. This inference, combined with the total absence of CE 1126 of any detail concerning the wounds or the conduct of the autopsy, lead me to the further conclusion that what is printed as CE 1126 is not Burkley's complete original statement, but one that was re-typed in its place, and probably edited in the retyping. If Rankin did have Burkley's statement prior to June 8, then this may have been a shadow game he was playing with the FBI. After all, Burkley had been mentioned in the testimony. Rankin knew who he was. If Rankin truly never previously received a statement from Burkley, why would he settle for an unsigned copy when a copy of the original could have been obtained?

Something is terribly wrong here. The Secret Service ought to have a record of what it received from Burkley and what it transmitted to the Commission, including a record of the Commission's own request for the statement, and a letter by the Secret Service of transmittal. And, somewhere, someone must have either the original or a true copy of same.

Can you shed any further light on this? Doesn't it sound to you as though your friend, Tom Kelley, may have been holding out on you?

Would this be an appropriate avenue to pursue under FOIA and, if so, would you care to follow-up or should I?

Best

Roger Feinman

Late P.S.: I see Epstein has a new book out "Deception: The Invisible War Between the KGB and CIA" (Simon & Schuster)

ROGER BRUCE FEINMAN
142-10 HOOVER AVENUE • JAMAICA, NEW YORK 11435

April 9, 1989

Dear Harold (and Lil),

Because my tendency to procrastinate may well outshine even David Lifton's (a dubious distinction), I am writing this immediately after having arrived at my apartment. I want to properly thank you and Lil for your gracious hospitality. Although our time together was so terribly brief, it magically seemed to melt away the years since we last saw each other in New York, and the distance which has confused us since then to letters and the telephone. The magical quality of the trip was brought all too near to home when I arrived at Penn Station earlier this evening. I immediately headed for a public phone to make my customary Sunday phone call to my mother, during which a disheveled bum accosted me demanding a handout and a cigarette. A harsh reminder of the new reality in New York City.

Your place is simply beautiful, and the dinner and lunch which Lil prepared for us were a welcome change from my usual fare.

Harold, I always knew of your extensive collection of books and files, but it wasn't until yesterday and today that I began to fully appreciate the enormity of what you have accomplished and the effort that it represents. As I write this, it occurs to me that your homestead should be designated a national historic landmark. No one can ever hope to duplicate your feat in securing the official record of JFK's assassination from extinction. Thank you, Harold. (Even though I should not thank you for opening my eyes to how much more ground I need to cover, I'm thanking you anyway. This has always been a labor of love in any event; working on this case is the most interesting thing I have ever done or will ever do. Let others ponder whether it is worthwhile.)

I am now about to review the staff I brought home. I will write again presently. For now, however, I can only express my great eagerness to return to the rolling hills and [redacted] verdant meadows of Frederick, and to the files -- a table of delights which you have kindly set before me.

Best,

Roger