

7/22/71

Mike Simmons was waiting for me in the offices where the researcher's cards are issued. I had phoned in advance, told him that would be my first stop because card needed renewing, and, with good light and table there, that is where I examined them. Marion Johnson is on vacation until Monday. He also showed me xerox of carbon of letter written me yesterday and not mailed because of typo in address, saying that somehow the knot in the tie had been untied, and it is all a jystery!

Simmons had typed legends on film envelopes. Girl took them and all are of excellent quality. I bumped into Gri later, thanked him, and when we chatted briefly he told me the unclear ones I had been sent were by the FBI, not him, which I do not doubt. All envelopes (there are three) are marked "Not to be copied for anyone). Because there was absolutely no identification on any print, I asked Simmons to put marks on them for identification, so I could check back. These numbers have no significance, are the haphazard order in which he took them from file folder in an envelope.

PICTURE OF FRONT AND BACK OF TIE. The tie, having been untied, is flat. It is clear that the nick didn't damage the lining in the slightest. It is into the outer cloth only. The back of the tie is entirely unmarked. Thus, no bullet or anything else went through it. 1 is front, 2 is back. It is CE395.

The next envelope labelled CE 394--PORTIONS OF BACK AND CUFF AND SLEEVES. 3 is back. But id doesn't say which side is up or whether it is the inside or the outside of the back of the shirt. I asked that I be informed which side and which way, if possible by tracing or xerox of hole only. The hole surely seems to be different in several ways, including by enlargement I think upward since those I have were taken. This is 3. 4 is labelled cuffs, but seems to be short for cuffs. However, if it is collar, the edge is an arc whereas the shirt collar has straight edges. Mike marked it this way, but Girl later said he had taken the inside as I'd asked, collar. What is hard to determine without side-by-side comparison is whether what follows is correct: the characteristics of the frayed edges seems identical with the DJ pix I have, yet this is inside. Now if the cuffs have such damage, it was hardly from that same supermagical 399! It is the inside, for the bottom is missing. Slits run same direction, toward button and button-hole. There is heavy blood marking, which may not be true sleeves. The slits go to the seam in both cases, perhaps a bit further on hole side.

5 is labelled CE394 & 395 PORTIONS OF FRONT OF COLLAR, SHIRT AND TIE. But the flattened tie obliterated any view of damage to shirt. I had asked for the knotted tie in place and collar buttoned. Collar is buttoned. I asked that since tie is ~~unmarked~~ untied, it can't show what I want to see, so I ask for picture that shows as much as can still be seen, but -toned collar only.

Pictures taken earlier--and note not of knot, as I'd asked. Unlabelled except on envelopes. Numbers added by Simmons at my request. 6 is CE393, back of coat with rulers, flap of collar apparently folder under to permit measurement to seam. Rulers right angles. From top collar, 4 5/8-5 1/8, or approx 3/8 long. To right seam, 1 3/4-2, or approx 1/2" wide. 7 CE394, shirt, back and front. Rulers rt angles. Top collar down, 5 1/2-6, or 1/2"; rt seam toward ctr, 8 1/2-8 3/8 and from vertical, triple-stripe pattern to right to rt, about 3/8". Hole appears to be about 1/4". #8 front, with white cardboard lid inside. Doesn't show through slits. Not buttoned. In each case, 5/8-3/4 from edge. All these measurements are actual, for they are made with ruler in picture, thus eliminating reduction or enlargement in photographing.

I was, of course, curious, about how this could have happened. Simmons said that Rhoads and Johnson had also wondered, each, apparently, not knowing. BUT, he also said that all this stuff is in a special safe to which only two people, Rhoads and Johnson, know the combination.

And thus is the evidence secured! The obvious explanation if both Rhoads and Johnson are innocent, given security guards on building, is that someone from a federal agency, like the FBI, got access and undid the knot. No purpose but the destruction of exculpatory evidence was served.