PH, re your 5/29/70 memo om Entry 52: instead of annotating Bud's copy, I'm writing and will give him that and this.

First, when you go over your notes, I know that some of the autopsy materials I forced out are filed elsewhere. You have them, but tell me what is here so I can keep tabs. I believe I have the Simmons receipts and that this deels with one of my major fluffs. Except for the findsheild receipt, the contents of the other items is important to me. Can you recall this or have you notes on that they say?

Now, on the Johnson-NND 10/24/60, I think I can make sense out of this for you and if ohnson represented as you represent, it is by no means a distortion. Here's the story: I kept after both A and SS for tgis stuff A said it didn't have. Eventually, Rowley or Kelley wrote me (you have letter) telling me that they had given A everything. Thus I was able to tell both they could not both be telling the truth, and to A I said if SS is not lying you must have this.

If this is correct and what was bugging MJ, I cannot account for his interpretation this was proof the WC had it, however. It would require reading too many files to determine positively, but I do not recall ever believing, after the beginning of my work, that the Commission had had this stuff. I think I believed the contrary.

These things I did force out: an original proctocol (copy), the Burkley stuff I sent you and the more recent Burkley stuff plus the Burkley file. I have not kept a separate file of what I have forced out, filing it by subject or intended use.

What interpretation did A ssk SS not to have in its cover letter, that the WC had had this stuff, hadn't had it, that this was copies of originals, was originals? This could have significance for me.

Was there any reference to enything you do not here note? This also is important for Kelley told me personally that he had sent more than you mention and Johnson told me personally that GSA, not A, was sitting on it. You will note I am not telling you what, but I will. My purpose is only to avoid cluttering or complicating your recall.

Dear Harold,

At your request, I am setting forth the circumstances of my examination of Entry 52 min at the Archives. As you know, I would rather not have Marion Johnson know that I have in discussed this with you.

On May 4, I told Mike Simmons (in writing) that I would like to see Entry 52, among others. At roughly 11 a.m. the next day, I talked with him; he explained that he would bring it up right away and that he had to stay with the file while I examined it, since it contained original documents.

In front of the autopsy material as described in Johnson's inventory, there were 14 sheets, many of which looked familiar to me. I do not have copies, but from my notes they are as follows:

James B. Rhoads to Tom J. Kelley, 11/12/69, 1 page

Kelley to Rhoads, 11/3/69, 2 pages

Marion Johnson to NND (sic), 10/24/69, both sides of 1 page
(As I recall, this related to the problem of whether the material
being sent over by the SS may have been copies of material the Warren
Commission had. Weisberg had interpreted the Secret Service's
letters to him as proof that this had been given to the Warren Commission,
and the first SS cover letter, or draft thereof, had implied that only
additional copies (or originals) were being sent over. The Archives asked
the SS to have its cover letter not reflect this interpretation.)
Rhoads to Kelley, 10/30/69, draft, 2 pages
Marion Johnson, receipt for windshield, 12/2/66, 1 page
Rowley to Bahmer, 10/2/67, receipt for original autopsy report (I think),

Rowley to Bahmer, 10/2/67, receipt for original autopsy report (I think), 1 page, and 3 pages of receipts signed by Simmons

Kelley to Rhoads, 10/24 (year not noted by me), 2 pages

Weisberg to Rowley, 10/17 (year not noted by me, but 1969, I think), 1 page. It was explained to me later that these were internal administrative papers

and should not have been given to me with Entry 52.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Hoch

cc: for Bud only

CONFIDENTIAL