

7/6/95

Dr. Gary Aguilar
909 Hyde St., #530
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dear Gary,

What interested me most of all in the partial transcript of your conversation with Boswell is what you did not mention, most of all his stating that ~~they~~ they all made and consulted notes of the autopsy, page four, and after it, page five. With regard to page five, all he acknowledged in the past that I can recall are the few notes on the autopsy face sheet and that does not appear to me to be what he is talking about in what he wrote then. Perhaps it is, however.

Without success I've tried to interest the ARRB in this based in what I had in Post Mortem. That was before NA! was published. From the record in Post Mortem those notes existed when Humes testified before the WC.

In your thinking about this I believe it is important to keep in mind that as of the time those notes were made the prosecutors had to expect to be witnesses at a trial. When that changed Humes rewrote the protocol. But I believe that the notes do not support the second protocol and that is why they've been memory-holed.

What he says on page eight, that they felt it was not necessary to open the tract of the nonfatal admitted shot because they "found the entire tract" is still a different version and ~~an~~ obviously false one.

It would have been much to their interest to have said that to Lundberg but they did not. Why they did not is what can only be conjectured but the most obvious of the possible explanations is that they knew it would have kicked back on them if they had. And Finck's testimonies were under oath on what he said. He did testify they were ordered not to establish that tract.

If you can pressure the ARRB it might do some good, on the notes, on getting them and if necessary on issuing subpoenas on them and to take sworn testimony.

Your letter to Bristow was good. Is that the address at which he should be written or is he now at AMA headquarters?

Thanks and best,

[Handwritten signature]

*filed
copy*