

1
Apr 43/70

are 3 listings to that name in the [redacted]

I think you are reading too much into the Burkley file. As you may recall, I pointed out CE 1126 to you in connection with the reference to Kenney, and the possibility that Burkley may have been in part responsible for the orders to keep quiet, and for the deleting of information on the adrenals from the final report. If he was directly responsible for some of what happens, then the omission of medical information from CE 1126 may be significant. However, if he was not, there would have been no reason for him to record such material, or to observe closely - after all, the place was crawling with presumably competent doctors. He may have had no experience with forensic medicine at all. Certainly the WC should have called him - and many other people - once there were evident problems and it had been decided not to use the photos. Also, I see nothing at all inappropriate in his attention to Mrs. Kennedy or the fact or manner of his reporting it.

More or less the same goes for the Secret Service reports. Presumably there is a little distinction between the bodyguards on the Presidential detail and those who concentrate on investigative work. It is interesting that nobody goes into the hassel over the removal of the body (although how many would we expect to, i.e., how many were there at the time), but are we sure that there was such a big fuss as Manchester makes out?

The incompleteness of the file, although deplorable and all that, is hardly surprising or unique to Burkley.

The "FBI laboratory letter" referred to at CD 5.151 appears to me to be from the Lab in D.C. to the Dallas Field office; hence it would not be in the Archives. I would expect it to contain only what is reported in CD 5.151.

I think all the SS statements from CD 3 are in CE 1024, with others which are not in the Burkley file.