

Dear Howard,

5/17/77

Rowley's 11/17/63 to Acheson and Kellerman's 12/1/66 to Rowley are written as though the Attorney General had not promulgated his executive order on the transfer of all evidence to the Archives yet both are dated after that order had been very well publicized.

(Note also that Kellerman seems to have received a promotion at this point close to his retirement.)

The subject of the Rowley mem is "Photographs and X-rays of Autopsy of President Kennedy." The subject is not once mentioned in the short memo.

If I have Acheson's of 11/4 I do not recall it.

Taken literally and taken in context the third graf refers to the windshield only.

With the earlier transfer of the photos and X-rays it would not seem possible for them to be the evidence referred to.

And there are no visible signs of masking to obliterate content of the memo.

What had happened just prior to this and what just might have triggered the 1966 transfer is that the Saturday Evening Post, then of some influence and circulation, had gotten interested in the assassination story. Dick Whalen had been spinning his wheels in Dallas and elsewhere until his friendly editor of the right Mike Mconey sent him to see me. Dick told me of having been promised access by Acheson. You have probably read the copy of his notes he gave me.

Then, suddenly, Acheson could not keep his word.

I don't know if this would be clarified by the Acheson letter or what is not provided but Rowley said was attached, his letter to DJ.

Richman's 11/28 may be the response.

One might conjecture over the reasons for the inapplicable description of the memo but I think there is no reasonable doubt that the description does not fit.

This leads to how come - what conjectures?

Best,