

Declassification of 11/1/00 Doctors Report in February 1947

As in most cases, where it is possible to check the original reasons for withholding information by the Archives, this report, clearly, was not subject to withholding under the laws and regulations and was withheld from improper reasons. All, and there are several, add up to official embarrassment.

This report is not WCX material.

Insofar as the allegation it was withheld as medical records goes, if it ever was valid, that validity ended on the release of the panel report, which has such a listing. This is a more meaningful listing, which raises questions about the forensic-medical experts who concoct a less meaningful one and use without explanation initialling added after exposure of the film when they had this report explaining the initialling. I have not compared both lists yet.

Why it was declassified, and more, why at this time, remains a question. This is not a tone of review, so it is not a course-of-business declassification.

In the short note I added to my letter to Jane Smith on receipt of the list, I indicated some of the possible reason, including intended use by another. However, since then it has occurred to me that this may be a reaction to what I have done, including filing appeals with Vawter last month. There have been occasions on which I have been allowed to have what has been withheld when I made an issue, I presume on the basis that it is better to let me have it quietly than run the risk of my drawing more attention to it by going to court.

Another possibility is a delayed reaction to my pointed and almost offensive letter to Kelley on the Secret-Service destruction of some of the film, although I think that not likely, or not as likely. An interaction between that and the letter to Vawter is also possible.

Perhaps the lies in which I caught them prompted someone to want to release some of what they'd lied about, for Lattimer has used, is misused, these things, and they'd lied about that, pretty blatantly.

If we may not be able to decide on the reason or reasons, it is sometimes useful to ponder them for the values this can hold for future efforts to bring declassification of what was improperly classified about.

There is no consistent pattern to the declassification, so each case has to be approached and understood separately. There has been extensive declassification of what should not have been, and in no case that I can recall is there any possible relevance. A conspicuous example is the Valle medical-sexual history, which is nobody's business and could be used to hurt him. Another is that of Marguerite Oswald having lived with Eckdahl before they were married, relevant to nothing, not even the shrinkery, yet not withheld when that session was declassified, and it was one of the earlier ones released.

I suppose it is possible that this was given to me to divert my efforts to get other things I'd asked for at the same time, perhaps to make me think that I had been given all I had asked for. A possible example of this is a Secret Service memo on the film destruction. I am not sure I recall clearly, but I think there is one. (Does HR remember without my checking-Lattimer?) Kelley could have written me and said there is no such thing as there was not one. This refers to the incident, but need not be the same thing, and if there is a separate memo, at the least it should identify the person who took the pictures and state how it is known that five films were exposed, if that is the same film. Remember, only military personnel were permitted in the autopsy room, and of those, only those necessary.

Again without checking, I believe there is no reference to a neck wound in the back. Description is shoulder, and that is a vital enough difference. There also seems to be closeup film. There was duplication. I am inclined to think it is not as easy to get tight shots with a 4x5 camera as with a 35mm., but I think that with the elimination of 120 film, which could have been a reflex, some of which permit very close shots, hand-held, really close shots would not be easy with 4x5.

As I noted, this does not say it is all the film. From the testimony it can't be all the X-rays. The full-body asked for by Finck are not included. They were taken.

~~One~~ One of the purposes of this hasty, added not is to get a reaction from HR before Smith or others respond. HW 2/4/73