

Dear Roger,

2/1/81

Reur 1/27, I came on the single reference to camoflage on 288 so I suppose there is no more. Thanks.

In your thinking about such evidence as the JFK clothing I suggest that you bear in mind that there ~~is~~ may have been some awareness in some quarters that the evidence need not be exactly as officially represented.

With the clothing, there was no need to condemn it because it was gifted. This also is true of the pix and X-rays. However, while the clothing was Kennedy property, the film was not, strictly speaking. It was, under the so-called Pittsburgh Code, federal property, even if turned over to the Kennedys.

The month April 1965 has been progocative to me for some years but the only correlation I can make with the date is my leaving WW with ~~Prager~~ <sup>Prager</sup> at about that time of a little earlier. This could have given someone an insight into what could be done with the medical and related evidence.

Some time ago, long ago, I heard that Weinreb had questions about the WC's conclusions so if a purpose is to be served by speaking to one of the former staff he may be a good one. What do you expect of him? If he says we were wrong, today that would mean little. If you mean what he knows about the DJ end, that is different and he might know something. With regard to the gifted stuff, I think some were genuinely interested in what they thought the Kennedy family wanted but others may just have wanted that evidence not to be available. I doubt anyone will say or be able to prove the latter.

In your 1/26 you refer to getting pages from the Criminal files. You do not indicate the last number they added, lower left, to identify, and I'd be interested because I've not heard anything from them for months, not since appealing the task force stuff which they now claim referred to the panel only. I've appealed that, too.

You seem to add your own numbers, by section. In my set they added their numbers to the records and the inventories, lower left corner of pages of records. No, I see you begin with them. #902<sup>903-</sup>, this is because McNaughton found problems with CD1 and they didn't want that out.

1350 - I've known about this for years. Got first copy in discovery in C.A. 75-226. We questioned Gallagher about it on deposition and he claimed that they (all) didn't trust Asbersold because he was too inclined to rush to the papers, as they saw it. He committed suicide several years ago. I'm satisfied there must be more correspondence but I've not come across it. And what A. said was most important Gallagher never did.

Referrals: I don't believe I've received any

Yesterday I got more than 6,000 boring pages I have to go over. Discovery material in the spectro case having to do with (non)destruction of records. Like the curbstone plate, so I'd best get back to that.

We are having the most beautiful sunrise after a cold night. Much of the year I have a magnificent view of it out of my office window, the sill of which is about the height of my chair and the top above my head. We have a virtually glasshouse-thermopane. Last year and the year before I got my exercise clearing up the woods, and there is a nice patch to the east. One of my neighbors, of my age and also with physical problems, has been referring to that patch as "the state park." I've ~~must~~ cleared away all the underbrush and pulled all the honeysuckle and other vines out off the trees, so the lower branches are about all gone, up to head high on some trees, higher on others, depending on what was choked by the vines. There also is the brink of a hill toward the horizon, so the effect, all in all, is really unusual and glorious to look at. What a wonderful day for the day, if not to begin, to be seen as it gets light! (Most of the year I'M up before the sun.)

Best,

1/27/86

Dear Harold,

Jefferson refers to his camouflage theory on p. 288

Some of the documents I received from DOT have me confused. Their legal memos regarding eminent domain legislation for the WC exhibits mention JFK's coat, shirt and tie. Yet, these were not condemned, but became part of the Marshall-ESA letter agreement. Why is this? And why is it that the x-rays and photos — even though not WC exhibits — were not condemned. Note that their memos on drafting legislation date back to April '65, the same month Buckley & Bank transferred the autopsy materials to the Archives.

One of the DOT lawyers, Lloyd Weirich, is now a law professor at Harvard. Jerry is willing to go question Weirich on these points as soon as I send him copies of Weirich's and other related DOT documents, but I'd like your thoughts before I prime Jerry with questions. (I'm considering going up to Boston myself, if Jerry finds Weirich willing to cooperate.)

Best,

Foggy

1/26/81

Dear Hull,

On 1/21 I received a box of 478 pages from the Command Director's 124-page inventory list. This, according to them, represents a "partial release" of the documents listed on pp. 1-79 of the inventory. They have released numerous (about 200) documents from this portion of the list to other DOT components, or other executive agencies. Bear in mind that I did not request every single document listed on their inventory. I do expect some good stuff to come out of the last 1/3 of the inventory grouping. Hopefully, it won't take too much longer.

Of possible interest to you, in case you don't already have this stuff (please advise if you want copies):

Command Director's 124-11 file - -

See inventory p. 416  
File 124-11 →  
Sec. 207 #1

Document # 902 - - letter from Woyencraft to Niederlehner (DOD) 9/21/67. (Letter of 12/16/63 from John McNaughton to Nicholas Katzenbach should be kept with the recovered W.C. papers

" " "  
#2

Document # 903 (undated) - Woyencraft to files. He advised Marion Johnson to remove McNaughton letter from WC's open files because it has "statements that would be taken as disagreements of fact w/ Commission's ultimate findings, out of context."

See inventory p. 64 #1172 ←

Document # 1350 - - letter from Miller (AAG, Crim Div) to Rankin 12/26/63 enclosing letters from Abersold of the AEC and McNaughton of DOD.

Also,  
See inventory  
#4  
#12  
P. 46  
P. 69

(Herald, these two enclosed letters are still withheld, having been referred to DOD for advice on release).

Do the above have any bearing on your specific suit? Also, have you made a request for whatever secrets the OIC has locked up in its safe?

I just received the carbon copies of the letters you sent to me. Congratulations.

Best,

Rogers