

Memo on Rowley's 10/2/67 letter to Bahmer/transfer of autopsy 10/12/69
holograph to Archives

Herewith is my original of this letter. I would like it returned. I am giving it to you rather than a copy because my machine is not functioning well.

Here are a few comments.

Rowley does not explain his belated transfer of these records, ordered 10/31/66, a year earlier, by the executive order of which I gave you my copy. I suggest that in my correspondence with Rowley and Bahmer you will find the belated inspiration. If taken literally, this means the Archives has an added assassination archive, "your file relating to the investigation by the President's Commission". It may be the special language of investigators, but Rowley does not say the file of the investigation, and as this letter makes clear, he very well knew this material was in evidence. (This, I also note, is an exception to the rule that the FBI was to have the original exhibits.)

The description "handwritten notes by Dr. J.J. Humes which includes the holographic draft" con, from what is in the file, cover only one other item, the single page of what is described as "Humes' notes on his phone conversation (there were two, not the one he testified to as the only one) with Dr. Perry. I suggest this evasion is designed to deceive while paralleling Humes' testimony. There are no other notes of any character by Dr. Humes in this file. This description also omits the Finck head chart, which is on the reverse side of and is not part of "the autopsy description sheet", although under "(B)", there is this added description "(1 Sheet written on both sides)".

Technically, what he transferred may not be "the original autopsy report (Commission Exhibit #397", but one of the eight original copies. I suggest we also examine this. The distribution of the other seven originals is unknown.

The receipt, which is page two of this letter, is in error under "(A)" and is evasive. While the first item is identified as "Exhibit #397", Exhibit 397 is not described as Exhibit 397. The description in Humes' testimony is of more than is published as Exhibit 397. Further, there are more than "six (6) pages" to that "original autopsy protocol".

It seems odd that there is still another receipt covering the same materials, attached and headed "receipt". It also appears to have been prepared by the Secret Service. It also is described as "Commission Exhibit #397".

The description of "(A)" is erroneous, the error, again, designed to coincide with Humes' testimony and make it appear that the notes he testified to having made himself ("in part during examination of the late President's body") are all here. Actually, there is but the single page of notes. The other 13 pages are not notes but are the draft of the protocol. A fact, this paragraph is specific in so stating, "...the original holographic draft of the Autopsy Protocol". Here also Rowley lies and conveniently cites the proof of his lie. He says these are the original pages of the protocol. Humes testified exactly the opposite, saying he burned the original. I include a copy of 2H372-3 for your convenience and mark this in red as "1". The other markings existed in my volume. That these are not all the notes is proven by Humes' description of what Specter headed him "as Commission Exhibit No. 397", "these are various notes in long-hand,

or copies, rather, of various notes in long-hand made by myself, in part during the performance of the examination of the late President, and in part after..." The quotation above is my recollection, not direct. This is from page 372 (marked 2). Now the notes of his conversation with Ferry are after the examination. What I seek are those "made by myself" and "during the performance of the examination of the late President". Nor can this be eliminated, as the Archives later sought to, as my correspondence shows, because Specter, after eliminating the phone notes and the draft, asks (373), "And what do the next two sheets represent?" To this Humes replies, "The next two sheets are notes actually made in the room in which the examination was taking place. I notice now that the handwriting in some instances is not my own..." He is shown "two sheets". The autopsy descriptive sheet is but one sheet. He also says of these two sheets, "in some instances" their handwriting is not his. This leaves at least one sheet with Humes' handwriting on it and made "in the room in which the examination was taking place". (Marked 3). Further excluding the possibility of error or loose talk (marked 4) is Specter's next question, "...did you review all the markings on these papers and note them to be present when you completed the autopsy report?" Humes' reply was affirmative. Specter's question is of plural "papers".

"(B)" in the receipt eliminates the possibility the single sheet of the descriptive sheet was regarded as two sheets because it is written on both sides. Here, in the single paragraph, in a single sentence, the second, it is twice called a single "sheet". And here also Rowley engages in propaganda, as a means of providing the Archives' doctrine in responding to my insistent demands. These are strange words in a "receipt", an unnecessary receipt at that, for the second page of his letter is a complete receipt:

"Described by Dr. Humes as notes actually made in the room where the examination was taking place. (Page 373, Volume 2, Hearings, etc."

At no point on page 373 is there description of or reference to an "Autopsy Descriptive Sheet", the words of this paragraph of the "receipt". There is, rather, the reference to two entirely undescribed sheets, aside from the references to the handwriting, as that of Humes and that of another or others. Thus Rowley is also lying, for this sheet has none of Humes' writing on it, the face being in that of Boswell and the reverse by Finck.

I suggest we also sue the Sec ret Service for these missing notes, of one or more pages. Here I also suggest you read my letters to Rowley on this point.

"(C)" also contains a lie of some significance. This is "original certificate" (first words) and "This certificate is portrayed on Page 47, Volume XVII". The consists in the fact that the original also bears notations of approval by Burkley which have been eliminated in the printed version. How nice this would be with Rowley as a witness!

"(D)", same comment on this certificate, which is printed 17448. Burkley's approval has been eliminated in the printing.

I would dearly love for this intelligence to remain entirely secret until the trial, when we either have Rowley on the stand or, if he can get out of it, we show this is why he could not dare take the stand. That would focus even more attention on the destruction of evidence by the Commission (or for it by the feebees working for it). The explanation of how this was eliminated might be interesting. I suggest when we examine these we also examine the printer's copy of the certifications and the holograph, to see what kind of picture the FBI took (see my other memo dated today).

Please note also that none of this duplicates Nichols' suit.