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When I got to ${ }^{4}$ oni Kelley's office, we chstted for ia mile and were doined by informetion-minn farner ond counsel Goff, who atsyed for tae entire meating, which lastad noll into (posaibly through) the lunch geriod of moct government employeos. "Stoyed" is not the rigtt kosd: participoted.

I believe this was quite a valuable meeting. It was friendly. I se an more than not uneriendly. $I$, meening we, are gatting more of whet has been denied us as a result. Its ultimste $v$ lue may be a quastion, but I think it mill be of interest. I'll keen you informed.

Agsin, I went to emphasize the neceselty for not attracting any attention to this, for if anything is used out context or for purposea of sensation, I think this will turn off. Some of you knon the folue of what I have been able to get. So, I am aritinz you glone, snd I eat each of you to keep what I'll be sending to you to youresif.

As I can, I'll be writing memos on sarects of what we covered. By ond lerge, but not eatirely, I bolieve Kelloy was honeat with ms. he Fos untruthful on one occasion and a little loter, whout latting its senm cs though $I$ tha aware, in $v y$ polite wey, I ves able to indicate it. Thesher he was untruthful on others i may bnve no rey of knomint. It was never unplesaant, not even then it wes a little pnintad.

Teran-s I cen charecterize it beat, briefly, titin a reatgtement of
 Where wo 017 ant grount a larige table. In the ancrway to his secretary's ofice

 told us". I quid, "I also know hor the President wes kilied. The Secret Service told ze. I 11 kg their initial secount better". There wis laghing and i made it explicit: I knes they accounting, prior to the offlcial line wes established, Was contradictory to $1 t$ and + understood the requisements of accomodation in a bureaucrecy. in objections, mo proteats, no ended smilaz.

So, I taink we underatend each other. I think we have a rea onsble relationship and I also think I $x_{111}$ be abla to go back for snything ond evorything they have given the Comission or the Archives that we cannot get. In fect, tils wes pretty explieft。

I hat aent some of you a fex eryptic notes on whet ${ }^{2}$ glenned to take up. I gave them to Kelley, for his aearches and responses. I remabered enother thing and we vent into thet verbelly. It is not ontirely aatisiactory to mo, but i nust acknolwedge it fa neither gurprising ror unexpected. This bad to do inith the reports of a Secet Service men ot the TSBD. He aays they investigeted that and it boild down to a reporter ghowing credentials lise Secret Service credente
 been the men. I esked "Allmen?" ond he seld he didn't recall. This and other tiaings I decided not to pust one so that, there I folt I had to be forceful an demonstrete a willineness to be, I cculs have credibility, On these areas I ild not back down snd 1 Io expect constructuve results.
 There was one enlergerient of gieele snd three like the pizzo, not ilentical but similar. I quoted two things to him for further search: Johenn Fuah saying be me de 17 prints and the PBI agents showing as many es six stills at one time fe aill slso see to it that each of tuese is in the irchives, ifi is not. I tola him

0
one he showed me nid one at the A was from Thi fontage (Gernerl). A showed me but two from fide . During the wurae of this conversation, it becane clegr they were aware of tio secoud man with LilO. tried to identify him but without suecess. The reports do not reflect this. Here $I$ not they did much not reilected in the reporta $9 t$ the $A$. I told them fully Bod frenkly about the film tha $\mathbb{E} E I$ got that कes never given the comission, is not now in the $A$, end told them if tiley ranted my copy of Hartin they could usve it and I'd tell them hon to get the other. There was no rejoinder, which 1 s the better situstion. I also told them both filme ind bon edited, edited coples being returned, and that in the Wartin film there is a unique tixaxbi view of tho is which be lonks different tian in any other pix.

Soon we got into the raceipts, and scon I asd them? Three we have been told do not exist. Secsuse I am getting them through chanrels, I didn't try to momorize them. They sucw the numbera of film as coctrasted with tise numbers of conteiners. They gico 14 X-reys, 8 of the 14 " size, six of the other. The six represente a correction from enother number. I wes quite pointed here in explaining yht total sbeence of some of the X -reys, snd the damege and tine no-image, which, opparently, wes new to them. They understand they got the exposed and undevaloped film . I asked then to investigete to learn whet happened. We nent around on this for a while, the result being we got to cover it pretty clearly, fith the essentisl implications not lost upon them. And I went into deteil on the aworn teatimony thet establithes the existence of X-reys not now listed. I think I cen explain it but I made no effort to. That is cometiang they should do. I dited humes tic and Finck NO to them, ofrerine them my inck if they do not want to ask DJ.

I think this may be signifieant, and, intentinf emphosia, not offinse, impress on you the need for eilence. There was reaton to believe, frem a relikese faul pot in 1960 , that some of the Il lur hed been snoved tae Commission. I pot a story I belleve on that. I invited sugreatod interpretationo or analysia. Bepore the autopay dectors tastified, he does not know the exect dete, the 38 tonk all the X -raye and nono of the fotures up to the WO whera a number of membere of the stofi vent over them. They also tonk a viewer. The purpose was to prepare for the quecticning of tae doctors. I think a more conspi atorial interpratation is not extreme, given some of the sinheraerving liss by staif members. For some resson Kelley eerme to heve the idea thet Specter wes not in on this. I suggest one poesible interpretation, essuming his recollection is accurate, that the viewing of the $X$-riys is all Adems needed. in any evant. I belleve Kelley at least intends to be honest, for he dic conifm to me thet he shomed Specter one picture. It is as $i$ knen, in Dallas, the purpose being to locste the non-latal. ile Was a bit slippery in 1 :entifying it, asve that it was to show the rear wound. At first he asid head, and I askad him if he was certain. He apperentily wasn't and this onded $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ th his saying, ofter wo wont over it, thet ell he knows is that it wss e pieture shotinfs the neck. Which could be elther, hum? In this con ection, he conflrmed shat I have in tae Specter momo (PA) on obby'e at-itude. He wes never consulted until after the outopay teatimony and then dic not refuse the Com. I slan not he couldn't iasve, as I noted to them besenee he didn't have them. I not kow he nuver did, as I will explein. Thus fas, I thin' at least for the most part this is raseonable ond in essence I belleve it. de may or may not heve shown Specter only a single pieture snt he mey or may not anve recolisction of whet it showed. But we do snow certalin volunble things we didn't knoweanlier.

Kow, ha wes indafintte in responso to s specific question obout the reason for the trongfer of the pix, K-rays end other geterials. I wuntac to know whose ifee it me. A long tine luter, when me cama bacic to this is a difierent entext, there vess a broad hint it was in Dobly's name. Du, the paraon to won they ware delivarei is Ars. Lincoln, then roridiz in the Arcites for twe Xen. Lib. It is she who signed thia roceipt. I do not now isp the promise of it, but I think I'll get at'her the receipt itself of the contents. The unierstond completely
why I rant is, for i apelled it out. The snow I'li sue if I in rot get it, and that ny langer heg slready told me we cen ot safely flle tgataat the archives alone for fesc of getting toesec ont on a tecanicality. They do mot mant to to sue them, an they tade no efiort to hide it. They rent flur hes and seid they'd prefere a relaticnshipis which i do not anve to oven invoce the law, for they heve nothing to ilde, etc. How it ia by no masns certaia thet there ia no SS copy (aigned by bircoin) ot the frebs ves. Thoning tast the originol is there, they $m^{n} y$ not have aent another copy. Fowever, taey have also bsen in touch aitu the Archives about this, in some deteil. There is no noint in goine over all of it. They will corsult Rhosds again end be in toneh with me. I meited until the ond and then, lonkn at the lanyor, sutw, "You fonow, if there ever mas sing ground on which pou could have withheld this, had you mante to, you lost all of that when the clark Zanel ueed it". He noteod ascent. Unly sli ntiy, but $t$ coulw see it. I here though it might be a ghod dies to ofier ratat ghouly not be nocesary. I geid if, in thair opinion, there wes eonetaine that could be put to soandalous use, I'l accept a nazked copy as long ea it raflected wat wss tranaierech in a mesming ful wey or, if they'd let me examine it, a retyped copy with such meterial, if any, a<iningted. I slso told tham thet having put up with abusa for more then a year on this to avoid en action thit, in hiatory, might unfairly raflect on ame of those in ocently involved or their fomilias, I was prapared to ba atiant as long an I remannad uncomvinced I was being dealt mith honorsbly, that I mas not just beince put off, as I regsrded whet the Arcaivea had done. I told them if they had not been provided copios of my letteas, or didn't aent to ask for them, they were welcome to monsult my files, thet hey mould find I made the first request 1/69, the roply recuiring 82 dsys (nith verbpl promises of action in between), thet on gettin: the ifne about private pere I bat soid okay, not tiest one. Give mo to geve nment copy, and that to this day ${ }^{+}$buve, when I go buything, goten only a restatemant of the original position. I think they uniexstood this is no way ond I get the 1 dee it is nnt the moy they nint it. howner, Goff aleo msde it clesr that he bell vas there is e lala requiring all govermant reconrds on this to be et thw Archives, so they ragard the Areaives as the asency of paromount, interest. I cited the Clark memo. Kelley then acknolneigeit he had given that P Ee, wien I cent $1 t$, to Godi.

I went over all th medicul tuings in Biakop. They will check them. I went into datain on the wotee, whet 14 missinis, whet I can prove is misaing, an finat I cea prove they had in their dukea. I distinguiaked between this end what I resaonobly bellevad thay should bo abl s to secount for. They will chock. They reat thes the way I do butpresume they just turned it oll over. I conla belleve tiant in some cosea they may not have mado coples. There mas a gort of beli-hearted effort to sugrast thet all the not -8 mere the boly chart. Inis mas *ondoned im edintely Fion $T$ sain two tanges: It did nots antain all tha data in the proctocol and it contsing none of tures' handतriting. I then added Pinck N. O. and thet didit. Mo'II sec. But they lemon.
it ore point, here thar nisuniesatood mo, kolley saif they aave none of the tiasie alldes. I told him 1 nas intarested $1: 3$ the mocords of a 11 of tais, all zunples rade, तit taer or not uzed, all memos, coverin lotrers, atce, non of whica ere is the Archives. Thay'll back, on they'Il chack 'o seo if the re are any lotters, temos, etc, on 1221 sil: the tro others noted on 2049s. I tola them nothine in A Spectar fila. Koligy sist he had an copy of 1321 alta him, ont later - bliuded to having geon a pepar fith a vary large, blue l2z1 st the botom in that shaff....I Ifent into thy fact thesta sampla act to inape han ramaved froa the ent lor reet in any cind of decent gutorsy ons ther was go recors of tt. ie pe'ced why nul I tol him. (I dallbaretely stayed anoy fron eny jetaile of any wauns, e. cept for explicitness os the fregnentation in the torso, eiting scurces). Theynail: lo ols for eny notes their boys made. Kellemen has retired and is in Elorids. They are not in touch. I think K retired young.

Nobsdy wate ony ariortbtomrush me. No reforence to 2 unch time, etc.
 Anok them both up, nolitoly and, it aeams, electively. Tho wee about the character

 turned averything over to the archives paralagt to twe ex owdor, and one rron ithe Accilves seying nothing bsa been turned over, the lwoly gele omledgod writine the letter for Fozlay. I think hat $h$ pened iv that the told peopie to do it ma there was taen a change in personnel, the nep ye ple asoumine it hed oll ber gisen to begin witn. I do not belifve there tus a duliberste suppression by tha 59 but I also bumit if you were to ergue I could offer no proofo it is opinion. The other renark pes obout selling bonke. I told hin his pr expert ora thero, smid he sould teli hin if this whs what domintited me, go knew poriectly mell that Soing what I wae going to so ruch trouble to avoli, filing so suit, voule be then mey to gell bo ka. forner agreed. So, no more of this on we understond eaca other better.

I do believe it is new to Kelley that two betches of the eutopsy pictures show no inmee, as receinted by korshail. Ho cidn't understend and I had to go over it several times before he did. In the courge oit it he got the idee thet et ame point tae SS might $b$ hola reoponsible for a) the homenine ona b) the totel sup resaion of it. I thince he mill look into it and, if he cen et tris lete date, find out end presibly tell me.

The negative film wat printed. They made no copies of the K-reys and they krow of nons being rasdo.

At ons point towerd tae erid he suid, in nore or lase these moxds, "I'm told" or "I hear" thest if I wunt to trow wast is in the Archivse I ask you". I elughed and tolz him be buet wave been telking to $s$ insend who exaraerated ind asked who. Went on to sorothing elss. of courec, this is not ot ril the case
 in $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{C}$.

I'th sure there mae more on the mesical-entopsy but I wes not eble to make notes, it rent tor fast, ze I dian't try. Yes, they will check to see if Zellermen bede on inventcry of who wes thare. They 1111 check the 6.5 morament, they will gee if tuey csn learn about the "enidentified struature". Tuey get the point that the missle receit wes not likely for tws piecos of metel dust when it selc one misele

The cer mes Treghea in Dalles. $\ddot{B}_{3}$ erys under thal supervision. I askad if snythine turned up 3 n be seid no. On the closeness of their supervision, I asked inin if be wented to gea pictures with no egente congpicuously near it and he ect that point very clenriy. Then tiney asked why I seld becenoe this provided en opportunity to remove and an op-ortunity to edd, supervised or not. So, my
 weter neas the car.

I saw the orighnal of the guthorization ond the copy is feitheul, if porr. The origingl ia cleor. The identifyine orrors ars on it. They motr of no relsted porers.

As ? think of other thinge I'l? try zne moke notes en let yoin know. There undoubtediy vas are on this efpoct alone.

## Best,

