

Document (Description and Date)	Color Autopsy Photography	Black and White Autopsy Photography	"Other" Autopsy Photography	Remarks
1. Receipt from CAPT J. H. Stover to Roy Kellerman dated 22 Nov. 1963 (see attachment # 1)	"8 graphic film holders (4 X 5) containing 16 sheets of exposed Ektachrome E3 film." (Duplex holders hold 2 pieces of film.)	"6 graphic film holders (4 X 5) containing 12 sheets exposed Portrait Pan film." (Duplex holders hold 2 pieces of film.)	"1 roll 120 Ektachrome E3 exposed film."	The typed number "8" describing color film holders has been lined out and changed to "11" by hand; the typed number "6" describing B & W film holders has been lined out and changed to "9" by hand. Both pen-and-ink changes are initialed by "JHS" and "JTS" (presumably J. H. Stover and John T. Stringer). Although the numbers of film holders were changed, the sheets of actual film (extended quantities) were not changed on either November 22, 1963 receipt.
Document 2. Receipt from CAPT J. H. Stover to Roy Kellerman dated 22 Nov. 1963 (see attachment # 2)	Color "11 graphic film holders (4 X 5) containing 16 sheets of exposed Ektachrome E3 film" (Duplex holders hold 2 pieces of film.)	B & W "9 graphic film holders (4 X 5) containing 12 sheets exposed Portrait Pan film" (Duplex holders hold 2 pieces of film.)	"Other" "1 roll 120 Ektrachrome E3 exposed film"	Remarks The same receipt cited above has been retyped (on an unknown date), incorporating the pen-and-ink changes which were made to the number of film holders. (The pen-and-ink changes to the number of film holders listed on the original receipt are the only changes noted in the retyped document.) It is certified to be a true copy above the signatures of both CAPT J. H. Stover and RADM C. B. Galloway, and contains the hand-written annotation: "accepted and approved G G Burkley RADM MC USN Physician to the President."
Documents 3. FBI report	Color "22 4 X 5 color	B & W "18 4 x 5 black	"Other" "1 roll of 120	Remarks Unlike the two receipt documents cited above, this FBI report

<p>(FD-302), File # 89-30, dictated 11/26/63 by SAs Francis X. O'Neill, Jr. and James W. Sibert (see attachment # 3)</p>	<p>photographs”</p>	<p>and white photographs”</p>	<p>film containing five exposures”</p>	<p>appears to record the correct extension for the number of individual pieces of 4 X 5 film, based on either the knowledge, or assumption, that each film holder held two sheets of 4 X 5 film. The total numbers used for color and B & W film in this FBI report indicate that the agents were aware when this report was dictated (on November 26, 1963) of the changes in total numbers of film holders implemented on the Stover film receipts (i.e., 11 X 2 = 22; 9 X 2 = 18). If this report was dictated based only on notes the agents made at the autopsy, then it is proof that the changes to the total numbers of film holders were pen-and-inked prior to the conclusion of the autopsy. What is unclear is whether the entry recording “22 4 X 5 color photographs” on this receipt means that the 2 FBI agents actually counted 22 individual pieces of color film, or whether, knowing there were 11 duplex color film holders, they simply extrapolated and assumed there were twice this many individual pieces of film and therefore wrote down “22” without counting individual exposures. (See item # 4 below.)</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>4. Letter from U.S. Secret Service Agent Robert I. Bouck (SAIC, PRS) to CAPT J. H.</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>“...holders <u>actually</u> contained 21 <u>sheets of film...</u>” (vice the 16 sheets as stated</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>“...<u>Holders</u> contained 18 <u>sheets of exposed film...</u>” (vice the 12 sheets as stated in both</p>	<p>“Other”</p> <p>(N/A)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>SAIC Bouck specified in his letter: “The above discrepancies are called to your attention for necessary correction and possible future reference.” Note: where SAIC Bouck states that there are only 21 sheets of color film contained in the 11 duplex film holders, he goes on to explain that one duplex film holder was loaded on one side only. Because the letter is dated December 5, 1963 (subsequent to</p>

Stover, Jr., MC, USN dated December 5, 1963 (see attachment # 4)	in both Stover receipts, and vice the 22 sheets as stated by Sibert and O'Neill of the FBI)	Stover receipts)		<p>the developing of the B & W negatives and color positives O/A November 27, 1963--see text item #5), it is unclear upon first reading whether Bouck's letter describes sheets of film counted prior to, or after developing. Fortunately, when ARRB staff interviewed Mr. Bouck on April 30, 1996 he was able to clarify that although dated December 5, 1963, his letter to CAPT Stover definitely refers to undeveloped film which he counted on November 23, 1963 immediately upon its receipt from Roy Kellerman, while the film was still in the duplex holders.</p> <p>An unexplained discrepancy exists between the 22 color photographs mentioned in the Sibert-O'Neill FBI report (attachment # 3) and the 21 sheets of Ekta- chrome E3 film in SAIC Bouck's letter to CAPT Stover of December 5, 1963. (See text item # 11 for possible explanation.)</p> <p>It is certain that neither the 2 Stover receipts (dated 11/22/63), nor this 12/05/63 Bouck letter (reflecting a count made on 11/23/63) refer to brain photography.</p> <p>of Ektachrome n of the brain</p>
Document 5. Letter from Head, U.S. Secret Service James J.	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (N/A)	Remarks The statement says that on the night of the autopsy, ASAIC Roy Kellerman received all photographic film from CAPT J. H. Stover, and all X-Ray film from CDR J. H. Ebersole; and

<p>Rowley to Assistant Attorney General (Civil Division) Barefoot Sanders dated February 23, 1967 which forwards joint, signed statement from Roy Kellerman, Robert Bouck, Edith Duncan, James Fox, and Thomas Kelley prepared in February, 1967 (see attachment #5)</p>				<p>that from November 22, 1963 until April 26, 1965 all photos and X-Rays were in the custody and possession of the U. S. Secret Service. Furthermore, it specifies that O/A November 27, 1963 SA Fox took the film to the U. S. Navy Photographic Laboratory where LT V. Madonia, USN developed the black and white negatives, and the color positives; that "a few days later," SA Fox made black and white prints in the Secret Service photographic laboratory; and that subsequent to making the black and white prints, O/A December 9, 1963 SA Fox took the color positives back to the U. S. Navy Photographic Laboratory where enlarged color prints were made. The statement says that SAIC Bouck placed the films in a "combination lock-file safe" in the PRS office spaces at the EOB after developing on November 27, and again on December 9, but does not indicate whether they were in a locked safe from initial receipt early A.M. November 23, 1963 (from Roy Kellerman) until initial developing on November 27, 1963. The statement concludes by stating all photographic and X-Ray films were transferred from PRS to Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln at the National Archives on April 26, 1965.</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>6. Memo from SAIC Towns to U.S. Secret Service Assistant</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>"Other"</p> <p>(N/A)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>This memo appears to be the source for the dates cited above in item # 5 for the two dates the autopsy photographic materials were taken to the Naval Processing Center at Anacostia; although SA Fox seems here to be the source for</p>

<p>Director Kelley of February 16, 1967 which forwards memorandum for the record prepared the same date by SA James K. Fox, Photographer, Intelligence Division (See attachment # 6)</p>				<p>the two developing dates of November 27, 1963 (for black and white negatives and color positives) and December 9, 1963 (for the 8" X 10" color prints made from the color positives), he makes clear that these dates are simply what he can best reconstruct in February, 1967 from memory, saying, "...At this time, I have no way of positively determining the dates and times I handled the negatives and positives." One new piece of information gleaned from this memo executed by SA Fox is that on both occasions when he went to Anacostia to the Navy Processing Center, he was accompanied by Navy Chief Petty Officer Robert L. Knudsen, whom Fox identifies as having been Mrs. Kennedy's personal photographer while she was First Lady. It is perhaps noteworthy that while SA Fox does not mention in his memo having made any black and white prints of autopsy photographs, in contrast the joint memo he signed on February 23, 1967 (attachment # 5) clearly states that he made black and white prints in the Secret Service photographic laboratory in between the two visits to the Navy Processing Center. The joint memo (attachment # 5) does not reveal the source of that information</p>
				<p>does not reveal the source of that information. Furthermore, while both Fox in this memo (attachment # 6), and the signatories to the joint memo (attachment # 5) all state that SAIC Bouck directed that SA Fox take the materials to the Navy Processing Center on two occasions, the joint memo (attachment # 5) does not state on whose authority, or at whose direction SA Fox made the black and white prints at the</p>

				<p>Secret Service photo lab.</p> <p>NOTE: In attachment # 11, the Burkley inventory of materials transferred to Evelyn Lincoln dated April 26, 1965, reference is made in paragraph 9 to a memo dated November 29, 1963 from SA Fox to SAIC Bouck re: the processing of film in the presence of LT (jg) V. Madonia, and also of a memo dated November 29, 1963 from LT Madonia to J. K. Fox re: receipt of certain films and prints and the processing thereof. These memos are of interest for 3 reasons: first, they have never been located and are apparently now missing; second, the date of November 29, 1963 is in disagreement with the date of November 27, 1963 (for the first visit to Anacostia) estimated by SA Fox in his statement of February 16, 1967 cited above; and third, the subject of the Madonia memo references the handling of prints on November 29, 1963 at Anacostia, which is inconsistent with the Fox memo and "joint" memo of February, 1967 discussed above, which both claim that no prints were processed on the first visit to Anacostia O/A November 27, 1963.</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>7. HSCA Memorandum of Interview with Robert Bouck (former SAIC, PRS) written by</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>"Other"</p> <p>(N/A)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>The most significant revelation resulting from this interview was Robert Bouck's recollection, when discussing receipt of autopsy materials (tissue specimens, photos and X-Rays) from Roy Kellerman the day after the autopsy (November 23, 1963), that whereas he recalled that all of the tissue specimens from the autopsy were obtained "...right away..." that he</p>

<p>Jim Kelley and Andy Purdy, dated September 6, 1977 (See attachment # 7)</p>				<p>believed some of the photographs and X-Rays were received later. Bouck further indicated that he did not give ASAIC Kellerman a receipt for items transferred to PRS custody. Bouck told his HSCA interviewers that SA James Fox, his photographer, processed the black and white prints: "...little snapshots...". The HSCA memo reports that Bouck recalled subsequent discussion that some of the film was blank, but "...not that the film holders were blank." This appears to directly contradict what he wrote in his December 5, 1963 letter to CAPT Stover wherein he stated the 11 color duplex film holders "...actually contained 21 sheets of film," and that one duplex film holder was loaded on one side only. (See text item number 4 above.)</p> <p>Bouck revealed in the interview that prior to their transfer to Mrs. Lincoln at the archives, he recalled 2</p> <p>familiarity with the details of where SA Fox got the color print work done, remembering only that the Secret Service lab did not have color developing capability. Bouck stated that he was unsure how many sets of prints were made, but was of the belief that the total number of sets made would have been between one and three sets. Mr. Bouck told Andy Purdy that although he and Mr. Fox were quite aware of the sensitivity of the photographs, he was not under the impression at the time that the photographic materials had to be handled like</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				courtroom evidence, with a very strict chain of custody. hs were viewed
				occasions when the photographs were viewed: once rather early after developing, when they were viewed by two Secret Service individuals (one of whom was Mr. Kelley), and a second occasion in which a representative of the Warren Commission (either the general counsel or a staff attorney) viewed the materials.
Document 8. HSCA OCR written by Andy Purdy on 8/18/78 of telephonic interview with Robert Bouck, former SAIC of PRS (See attachment # 8)	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (N/A)	Remarks As reported in this OCR, in August 1978 Mr. Bouck contradicted what he was reported as having said in his September 1977 HSCA interview, and said he was not certain whether or not Mr. Fox developed the black and white photographs. He further stated that although he and Mr. Fox were very careful with the photographic material because of the sensitivity of the subject matter, he was not under the impression at the time (during PRS custody from 1963-1965) that it had to be handled like court evidence, with a strict chain of custody preserved.
Document 9. Letter from Senator Robert F. Kennedy to Dr.	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (See Remarks)	Remarks This letter requests that Dr. Burkley personally accompany, and transfer all autopsy-related material (meaning tissue specimens, various documents, autopsy photos and X-Rays) in

George G. Burkley (now a Vice Admiral, and still Physician to the President) dated April 22, 1965 (See attachment # 9)				custody of the Secret Service to his (Senator Kennedy's) custody by turning it over to Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln at the National Archives for safekeeping. It is clear from this letter that subject materials are to henceforth be under Senator Kennedy's personal control, following transfer.
Document 10. Memo from SAIC Bouck (PRS) to Chief, U.S. Secret Service dated April 26, 1965 (See attachment # 10)	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (See Remarks)	Remarks This memo discusses the letter from Senator Kennedy to Dr. Burkley of April 22, 1965 (attachment # 9); states that an inventory was conducted prior to the transfer of these materials from Secret Service custody (by Vice Admiral Burkley, Inspector Kelley, SAIC Bouck, ASAIC Miller, and AA Duncan); states the transfer was made on April 26, 1965 by Dr. Burkley and SAIC Bouck; and concludes by saying that after the materials were turned over to Mrs. Lincoln at the Archives, that she receipted for them by endorsing the previously prepared inventory memorandum.
Document 11. Receipt for JFK autopsy materials	Color <u>Item # 7:</u> "27 color positive transparencies	B & W <u>Item # 2:</u> "Envelopes numbered 1-18	"Other" <u>Item # 5:</u> "1 roll of exposed film from a color	Remarks <u>Color:</u> The 27 total 4"X 5" color positives are 6 more than the total of 21 recorded by Robert Bouck in his letter to CAPT Stover of December 5, 1963; see item # 4 above. In order to

<p>transferred on April 26, 1965 from U. S. Secret Service (PRS) to Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln at the National Archives, dated April 26, 1965 (See attachment # 11)</p>	<p>(4" X 5") and 1 unexposed piece of color film;" <u>Item # 8</u>: "27 4"X 5" color negatives of autopsy photographs, and 55 8"X 10" color prints of autopsy photographs."</p>	<p>containing black and white negatives of photographs taken at time of autopsy;" <u>Item # 7</u>: "36 8"X 10" black and white prints-autopsy photos; 37 3.5"X 4.5" black and white prints-autopsy photos."</p>	<p>camera entirely black with no image apparent;" <u>Item # 3</u>: "7 envelopes containing 4"X 5" negatives of autopsy material;" <u>Item # 4</u>: "5 envelopes containing 4"X 5" exposed film containing no image."</p>	<p>understand how 21 pieces of color positive film expanded to 27, and what items constituted the expansion, the reader must jump ahead to the Military Inventory ("Report of Inspection by Naval Medical Staff...") signed on November 10, 1966 (text item # 19 below). One possible explanation for the new total of 27 color positives, based on the November 10, 1966 Military Inventory, is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 color positives (views 26-45) are views of the body of President Kennedy; 6 color positives (views 46, 47, 48, 50, 51 and 52) are views of the superior and basilar views of a brain; 1 unexposed but developed 4"X 5" Ektachrome transparency is noted in Part III(3) of the November 10, 1966 inventory--possibly it is this item, added to the 20 color slides of the body taken at the autopsy on November 22-23, 1963, which together equal the 21 sheets of exposed Ektachrome E3 film reported by SAIC Bouck in his December 5, 1963 letter to CAPT Stover. [The above listed 20 + 6 + 1 = 27, the total number of developed color positives listed in item 7 on attachment # 11.] <p>NOTE: It is important to understand that the brain photographs were taken at a supplemental examination of the brain at least 2 or 3 days after the autopsy was concluded; therefore, none of the receipts executed on November 22, 1963</p>
				<p>Additionally, the one unexposed piece of color film mentioned</p>

				<p>in item # 7 of attachment 11 is almost certainly what is described in Part III(2) of the November 10, 1966 signed inventory (attachment # 19)--namely, one unexposed and not developed 4" X 5" Ektachrome film, originally loaded into the camera but unloaded without being used. Conceivably, this item could be the reason that the Sibert-O'Neill count of 22 color photographs (attachment # 3) became a count of 21 color positives when SAIC Bouck sent his letter to CAPT Stover on December 5, 1963 (attachment # 4)--providing one unexposed color transparency was removed from a film holder because it was known to be unexposed, and another unexposed color transparency was left in its film holder and developed because it was (incorrectly) thought to be exposed film (See text item # 4 above.)</p> <p>NOTE: The photographs of the brain were taken at the supplementary examination of the brain which was conducted at least 2 or 3 days after the autopsy proper was completed. The two photographic receipts executed which are dated November 22, 1963 do not include in their totals these brain photographs, which were taken later. On page 2 of the supplemental autopsy report, Dr. Humes recorded that 6 color 4 X 5 inch photographs of the brain were taken (see attachment # 12). Attachment # 20, the Belcher memo (see Remarks section of text item # 20), reveals that there was no receipt exchanged between</p>
				<p>Dr. Humes and Dr. Burkley for the photographs from the supplemental examination of the brain.</p>

				<p><u>Black and White:</u> Item # 3 in attachment # 11 is almost certainly the seven black and white negatives of the brain which Dr. Humes mentions in attachment # 12, and which are described in the November 10, 1966 signed inventory as B & W negatives of superior and basilar views of a brain (views 19-25). Furthermore, item # 4 in attachment # 11 is clarified in the November 10, 1966 signed inventory in Part III(1) as 5 unexposed (but developed) B & W film negatives which were loaded into the camera as part of a film pack, but not exposed because the film pack was removed in order to insert color film. (See text item # 19.) On 3/21/96, ARRB staff viewed the 7 B & W negatives depicting brain images in the Archives, and they did not have the notches characteristic of individual sheets of film used in duplex holders, indicating they were from a film pack. Since the 5 unexposed but developed black and white negatives referred to above are stated to be part of a film pack, they must be the unused portion of a 12-shot B & W film pack used to film the brain at the supplemental brain exam.</p> <p><u>“Other”:</u> Item # 5 from attachment # 11 clearly corresponds with Part III(4) of the November 10, 1966 signed inventory (film seized and exposed to light).</p> <p><u>Internegatives:</u> Item # 8 in attachment # 11 (27 4" X 5" color negatives) is clearly the “internegatives” made from the 27 color positives (needed to make prints).</p>
Document	Color	B & W	“Other”	<p>Remarks Mrs. Lincoln recalls Admiral George Burkley bringing the</p>

<p>12. HSCA interview summary of Andy Purdy interview of Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln of July 5, 1978 (See attachment # 13)</p>	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	<p>items described in attachment # 11 to her office with one or two other men, one of whom was SAIC Bouck. (SAIC Bouck, in attachment # 10, says that he and Dr. Burkley transported the materials; in attachment # 7, he says that he and Tom Kelley conducted the transfer. Taken together with Evelyn Lincoln's recollections to Andy Purdy, it would appear that Dr. Burkley, Tom Kelley, and Robert Bouck conducted the transfer of materials.) Mrs. Lincoln recalled one or more boxes of materials; SAIC Bouck, in attachment # 7, states that "...possibly two boxes..." of materials were transported to Mrs. Lincoln at the archives. Significantly, in her interview with Purdy she is reported as having said that (quoting Purdy's summary) "...she did not know exactly what the materials were, nor did she open any of the containers to see if the receipt Dr. Burkley gave her corresponded to the materials she received. Mrs. Lincoln said she was very close to Dr. Burkley and took his word that all the materials were present." (Furthermore, SAIC Bouck, in attachment # 7, explained to Andy Purdy that although Mrs. Lincoln signed the receipt, the execution of the receipt was a two step process, with Admiral Burkley's signature "witnessed" by a number of people who were not present when the material was taken to the Archives.) On attachment # 11 itself, Robert Bouck, Chester</p>
				<p>Miller and Edith Duncan signed as witnesses to Burkley's inventory, and attachment # 10, as well as Mr. Bouck at his interview by ARRB on 4/30/96, both make clear that these three people actively participated in and witnessed the entire</p>

				<p>inventory. The operative point, however, is not how stringent the inventory process was at the Secret Service end, but that the three witnesses did not accompany the materials to Mrs. Lincoln's office, and that Mrs. Lincoln did not inventory the materials herself. For all of the above reasons, the author does not place undue importance in the fact that Evelyn Lincoln's signature appears on the receipt for these materials.</p> <p>After Mrs. Lincoln signed for the transferred materials, she told Andy Purdy that the boxes lay unattended on top of one of the file cabinet safes in the security room (apparently overnight for at least one night--author's interpretation). She told Purdy that shortly thereafter, probably within a day, she and her assistants obtained a "flat trunk" from the Archives staff, put the materials into the trunk, and put the trunk into the Security Room.</p> <p>Within a month after the transfer on April 26, 1965, Mrs. Lincoln was telephoned by Senator Robert Kennedy and instructed to turn over the trunk to his secretary, Angie Novello, for safekeeping in another part of the archives. When Angie Novello came by with Herman Kahn to pick up the trunk, Mrs. Lincoln told Purdy that she remembers having Ms. Novello sign a receipt, but did not know where the receipt was at the time of her 1978 interview.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Mrs. Lincoln told Purdy in</p> <p>1978 that she never saw th</p> <p style="text-align: right;">e_ materials again after they were transferred</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				to
				<p>sign a receipt, but did not know where the receipt was at the time of her 1978 HSCA interview.</p> <p>Mrs. Lincoln told Purdy in 1978 that she never saw the materials again after they were transferred to Angie Novello, not even on the day Burke Marshall physically transferred them from the Kennedy family's custody to the National Archives on October 31, 1966.</p> <p>Concluding her interview with Andy Purdy, Mrs. Lincoln stated (quoting Andy Purdy's interview summary) "...she also didn't remember reading the receipt very closely..." on the day the materials were transferred (April 26, 1965). The context of her remarks on page 6 are that she signed for receipt for a group of materials, the details of which she did not concern herself with, since the subject matter was troubling to her. Mrs. Lincoln confirmed to Purdy that when she gave Ms. Novello the trunk, she gave her the two keys (for locking the trunk) along with the trunk.</p>
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
13. Evelyn Lincoln Affidavit dated 16 October, 1978 (and prepared for her by the HSCA).	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	This affidavit mirrors, almost word for word, the HSCA interview summary written by Andy Purdy in July 1978. This document is not provided as an attachment to this memo because it is virtually identical to attachment # 13 discussed above, and contains no substantive changes.

Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
14. Secret Service memo to Treasury dated June 14, 1966 submitting agreed to text to be used in response to continued public inquiries regarding JFK autopsy, X-Rays and photographs (See attachment # 14)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	<p>Anticipating the forthcoming deed-of-gift of autopsy materials to the National Archives, this memo forwards the agreed-to text to be used by the National Archives (which presumably would be used in the future to ward off continued public inquiries of the Secret Service), which will remind the public that the X-Rays and photos made during the autopsy on President Kennedy were donated to the General Services Administration by the Kennedy Family under two conditions: (1) that access be restricted to appropriate government officials; and (2) that after a period of five years has elapsed (i.e., after October 31, 1971), a pathologist and other scientifically trained persons will be allowed to inspect the materials. Significantly, this text predates the Burke Marshall deed-of-gift letter (see text item # 15 below) by more than 4 months, and quite accurately presages the wording used in Burke Marshall's letter (indicating that GSA helped write the text of his deed-of-gift letter, and that negotiations for that transfer were ongoing for some time).</p> <p>An interesting sidelight is that this memo states the autopsy X-Rays were used to brief the Warren Commission staff on the autopsy procedure and results.</p>
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks

<p>15. Letter from Burke Marshall to Lawson B. Knott, Jr. (Administrator of General Services) dated October 29, 1966 (see attachment # 15)</p>	<p>27 color positive transparencies (4 x 5);</p> <p>1 unexposed piece of color film;</p> <p>27 4" X 5" color negatives of autopsy photographs;</p> <p>55 8" X 10" color prints of autopsy photographs</p>	<p>envelopes numbered 1 to 18 containing black and white negatives of photographs taken at time of autopsy;</p> <p>36 8" X 10" black and white prints-autopsy photos;</p> <p>37 3.5" X 4.5" black and white prints-autopsy photos</p>	<p>7 envelopes containing 4 X 5 negatives of autopsy material;</p> <p>5 envelopes containing 4 X 5 exposed film containing no image;</p> <p>1 roll of exposed film from a color camera entirely black with no image apparent</p>	<p>The materials listed at left are included in Appendix B to the Burke Marshall letter--the remainder of Appendix B consists of a listing of the X-Ray materials. (Appendix A details the clothing and personal effects of President Kennedy.) The Appendix B inventory of X-Rays and photos appears to be copied verbatim from the Burkley inventory/receipt document dated April 26, 1965.</p> <p>The author believes it is significant that while the inventory and receipt executed by Vice Admiral Burkley on April 26, 1965 (attachment # 11) lists President Kennedy's organ and tissue samples, one stainless steel container, and various documents, etc. in paragraph 9, these items drop out of the evidentiary paper trail with the writing of this Burke Marshall letter. This omission does not seem inadvertent, in light of the fact that the paragraph 9 materials could not be found two days later when Archives personnel looked for them on October 31, 1966 (the day the deed-of-gift materials were physically transferred). Putting one's self in the mind set of an archivist, if items not found were not formally transferred anyway on the official deed-of-gift letter, then the fact that they were "missing" would become a curiosity, but not a legal problem, since the Archives would not be legally responsible for holding them in the first place.</p>
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks

<p>16. Treasury Department official David Acheson internal memo to Secretary of the Treasury, dated November 4, 1966 (see attachment # 16)</p>	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	<p>This memo describes the convoluted political process by which the autopsy materials (tissue samples, photos and X-Rays) were donated to the National Archives by Kennedy family deed-of-gift. Summarizing, the memo states that since physical possession of the materials had been relinquished to the Kennedy family by the Secret Service, the only way for the Archives to obtain them (short of the unpalatable option of filing suit against the Kennedy family) was to enter into friendly negotiation with the Kennedy family and request that they be donated to the Archives. Mr. Acheson makes clear in his memo that he considers the deed-of-gift process to be an open and forthcoming act which was fortuitously implemented in the nick of time (just prior to a November 2, 1966 legal deadline), and expresses his opinion that the donation to the Archives may have prevented future destruction of the materials and the ensuing suspicion that such destruction would have</p>
				<p>engendered.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that the deadline of November 2, 1966 was a deadline for vesting title of Warren Commission materials in the U. S. Government--the implication of this reasoning is that the autopsy materials should have been considered Warren Commission materials, not Kennedy family property. In actuality, the Warren Commission never used or cited the autopsy photos or X-Rays as exhibits or documents; however, in contrast, the autopsy protocol and supplementary report were cited as exhibits, and as a result were published by</p>

				<p>the Warren Commission (and therefore became available to the public in September, 1964). The author does not understand the applicability of the November 2, 1965 Act regarding vesting of title of Warren Commission materials in the U. S. Government, since the autopsy photos and X-Rays were never labeled or declared Warren Commission materials by the Warren Commission.</p> <p>The real question is whose property the photos and X-Rays were considered to be by those holding them (PRS). On this score the record indicates there was confusion in the collective mind of the Secret Service.</p>
				<p>For example, PRS Head SAIC Robert Bouck indicated in attachment # 7 that it was his opinion that one would have to get authorization from the Department of Justice to “gain clearance” to the materials; he also stated in attachment # 7 that he was maintaining the security of the items for Dr. Burkley, the White House Physician. On the other hand, Bouck told Purdy that his oral instructions were to maintain custody of the materials and not to release them without the approval of the Head of the Secret Service, James Rowley. Elsewhere in attachment # 7, SAIC Bouck indicates that the materials were shown to Secret Service officials on one occasion, and to a Warren Commission staffer on another occasion, and yet he does not mention asking the permission of the Department of Justice or of Dr. Burkley on either occasion. When Senator Robert Kennedy wanted to take over physical control of the autopsy materials, he wrote a letter</p>

				to Dr. Burkley, not to the Secret Service or to the Justice Department. It appears that in the absence of clearly defined ownership over these materials, family pressure and tradition triumphed in the vacuum of government indecision and ambivalence, owing to lack of precedent.
Document 17. Memoran-dum for File dated February 13, 1969 written by U. S. Secret Service Assistant Director Thomas Kelley (See attachment # 17)	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (See Remarks)	Remarks This memo records that the Kennedy family made the autopsy materials deed-of-gift offer to GSA via the October 29, 1966 letter written by Burke Marshall on behalf of the Executor of the Estate of John F. Kennedy. The whole purpose of this memo seems to have been to record the fact that the articles described in item # 9 of Dr. Burkley's inventory of April 26, 1965 (paraffin blocks, tissue slides, 7" by 8" stainless steel container, original autopsy protocol signed by Dr. Humes, various copies of the autopsy protocol and related receipts, and two memos related to the processing of autopsy film dated November 29, 1963 [see attachment # 11]) were missing upon execution of the deed-of-gift when the physical transfer of materials from Kennedy family custody to the custody of the National Archives took place (on October 31, 1966). It is revealed in this memo that the deed-of-gift materials were contained in multiple (more than one) sealed cardboard boxes, and a locked footlocker. When Dr. Burkley was contacted by Thomas Kelley and asked about the missing materials, he claimed no knowledge of this problem. The memo was written in response to a meeting held the day before, on February 12, 1969, at the request of Mr. Harry

				<p>Van Cleve, Jr., General Counsel for GSA. The stimulus for the meeting was not made clear in the memo, but to reiterate, the memo does state that "...when the archivist took possession of and opened these containers (sealed boxes and a footlocker) a careful inventory was made...when the foot locker was opened, it was found to contain articles No. 1_-8</p>
				<p>opened these containers (sealed boxes and a footlocker) a careful inventory was made...when the footlocker was opened, it was found to contain articles No. 1 through 8 listed on the inventory prepared by Dr. Burkley on April 26, 1965. A careful search was made in the Archives to ascertain what happened to the articles described in Item No. 9 of Dr. Burkley's inventory and they cannot be found in the archives."</p> <p>Thus, Thomas Kelley writes that the Archives was aware of the missing tissue slides, paraffin blocks, stainless steel container labeled "gross material," and various documents as of October 31, 1966 when the deed-of-gift physical transfer was implemented. Even though the Burkley inventory was not part of Burke Marshall's October 29, 1966 deed-of-gift letter, the Archives staff was aware of its significance and tried, unsuccessfully, to locate the whereabouts of each item on Burkley's inventory.</p> <p>Although the missing item # 9 materials are not the subject of this study, the implementation of the deed-of-gift O/A October 31, 1966, and the fact that some of the items on the Burkley inventory were apparently found to be missing by the Archives staff, provides context for the National Archives'</p>

				desire to have the autopsy prosecutors, radiologist and photographer construct a meticulous and descriptive inventory of the autopsy photographs and X-Rays by having them meet and review those materials on November 1, 1966.
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
18. Unsigned draft of Military Inventory of JFK Autopsy Photographs and X-Rays conducted on November 1, 1966 (see attachment # 18)	Items 26-52 on this draft inventory represent color positive transparencies, and corresponding color negatives and 8" X 10" color prints (with the exception of item number 49, for which it was noted there is no color transparency present). A total of 27 different pieces of color film are	Items 1-25 on this draft inventory represent black and white negatives and corresponding contact prints and 8" X 10" prints. A total of 25 different black and white views are represented by the inventory. Of this total, 18 views are "body" views, and 7 views are brain photographs taken after November 22,	Listed as "Miscellaneous" on the inventory are: unexposed, but developed 4" X 5" ektachrome transparency; unexposed, undeveloped 4" X 5" ektachrome film; Roll of 120 film, processed but showing no recognizable image; Item number 4 of	See lengthy text item # 11 above for a detailed discussion of how the November, 1966 Military Inventory relates to the April 26, 1965 inventory signed by Dr. George Burkley. (In that text item, the November 10, 1966 signed version is cited, but that signed version is derived from this draft.) With the exception of the roll of 120 film, the many pieces of film mentioned in this inventory which contain no image (and which were first mentioned in the April 26, 1965 Burkley inventory) were not overtly listed on either of the November 22, 1963 receipts executed by CAPT Stover at Bethesda. Explanations follow: In the case of the 5 ea black-and-white negatives with no image, it is now understood that both of the 11/22/63 Stover receipts, and the Bouck letter to Stover of 12/05/63 correcting those receipts, do not list them because they came from a later black-and-white film pack used during subsequent brain photography which had not yet been conducted on 11/22/63--see the remarks section of text item # 11. In the case of the two pieces of Ektachrome transparency film with no image, they are most likely not listed on the Stover receipts dated 11/22/63 for the following reason:

	<p>represented in this inventory. Of this total, 20 are "body" views views</p>	1963.	<p>the donation list represents 4" X 5"</p>	<p>-11 film holders hold 22 sheets of film; -this inventory reveals that 20 of these sheets of film were body photos; -this inventory reveals that there were two unexposed sheets of Ektachrome</p> <p>[One can speculate that in SAIC Bouck's letter of December 5, 1963 to CAPT Stover, that of his 21 color transparencies listed, 20 were body photos and the 21st transparency was the unexposed but developed item mentioned at left. If so, it would mean that SAIC Bouck was listing only developed film, and not undeveloped film, in his letter to CAPT Stover. Similarly, one can speculate that perhaps CAPT Stover, in the two receipts executed dated 11/22/63, refers only to film believed to have been exposed.]</p> <p>One should note that in attachment # 11 (the Burkley inventory) the 5 ea 4" X 5" black and white negatives were listed as "exposed" film containing no image, whereas in the draft Military Inventory, they are listed as "unexposed black and white film." Since autopsy photographer John Stringer participated in the</p>
	<p>are individual "body" views, and 7 sheets of film are photographic representa-</p>		<p>4 X 5 unexposed black and white film- five envelopes with each containing</p>	<p>unexposed sheets of Ektachrome transparency film, one which was developed, and one which was undeveloped; -the sum of the above (20 plus 1 plus 1) = 22; -therefore, it appears that all color film which appears</p>

	<p>tions of a brain taken after November 22, 1963 (for which there are only 6 color positives)...see "Final Note" in Remarks section.</p>		<p>one---[this statement is in error: this item is really item 3 on the Burke Marshall donation list; it is item 4 on the Burkley inventory, not on Burke Marshall's Appendix B]</p>	<p>on this inventory, including the 2 sheets with no image, were most likely accounted for on the 2 Stover receipts.</p> <p>Bouck's corrective letter to Stover of 12/05/63 listed undeveloped film which he counted in the film holders on 11/23/63, according to his ARRB interview of 4/30/96. Since he saw one color film holder only half full and came up with a total color Ektachrome count of 21 vice 22, someone may have removed one unexposed piece of color film from the holder (knowing it was unexposed), and may have left the second piece of unexposed color film in the holder (because they believed it to be exposed). This explanation for the Bouck letter to Stover necessarily posits that Bouck would have failed to sight (and thus failed to count) the one sheet of unexposed color Ektachrome film which had been removed from the half-filled holder. This explanation for the Bouck letter is possible, but can never be proven or disproven.</p> <p><u>Explanation of Another Apparent Discrepancy:</u> In attachment # 11 (the Burkley inventory) the 5 ea 4" X 5" B & W negatives were listed as "exposed" film containing no image, whereas in the Military Inventthe Military Inventory, its explanation of this film as unexposed (but developed--see attachment # 19) takes priority with the author over the description of this film in the Burkley inventory as "exposed film containing no image." The author assumes that this description in the Burkley inventory was simply an error; to believe that both inventories are correct in what was described would present a chain-of-custody dilemma for which there is</p>
--	---	--	--	--

				<p>no reasonable explanation. <u>Final note:</u> the 7 color views of the brain listed in this inventory as separate photographic events or representations is at variance with Dr. Humes' statement in the supplemental autopsy report that only 6 color positives (which he incorrectly calls "negatives") were taken of the brain (see attachment # 12). The resolution to this apparent discrepancy is provided in attachment # 19 (see also text item # 19 below). The signed version of the Military Inventory dated November 10, 1966 (attachment # 19) addresses this discrepancy directly, confirming that Dr. Humes was correct when he wrote in 1963 that only 6 color views of the brain were shot during the supplemental examination of the brain. Specifically, pages 9 and 10 of attachment # 19 clearly indicate that color positive # 47 had 2 internegatives made from it, and that these are labeled as # 47 and # 49 in the numbered collection. Thus, although the wording for photograph # 49 says "no color transparency," it does not mean # 49 is missing--it simply never existed.</p> <p>y ory Inv</p>
				<p>Inventory, they are listed as "unexposed black and white film." Since autopsy photographer John Stringer participated in the Military Inventory, its explanation of this film as unexposed (but developed--see attachment # 19) takes priority with the author over the description of this film in the Burkley inventory as "exposed film containing no image." The author assumes that the description in the Burkley inventory was</p>

				<p>simply an error; to believe that both inventories correctly described different items would present a chain-of-custody dilemma for which there is no reasonable explanation.</p> <p><u>Final note:</u> Upon first reading, the 7 color views of the brain listed in this inventory as separate photographic events or representations is at variance with Dr. Humes' statement in the supplemental autopsy report that only 6 color exposures (which he incorrectly calls "negatives") were made of the brain (see attachment # 12). The resolution to this apparent discrepancy is provided in attachment # 19 (see text item # 19 below also). The signed version of the Military Inventory dated November 10, 1966 (attachment # 19) addresses this discrepancy directly, confirming that Dr. Humes was correct when he wrote in 1963 that only 6 color exposures of the brain were shot during the supplemental examination of the brain. Specifically, pages 9 and 10 of attachment # 19 clearly indicate that color positive # 47 had 2 internegatives made from it, and that these are labeled as # 47 and # 49 in the number</p>
				<p>numbered collection now in the Archives. Thus, although the wording for photograph # 49 says "no color transparency," it does not mean # 49 is "missing"--it simply means that there never was a color transparency # 49, and that this number has been assigned to a duplicate internegative only.</p>
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks

<p>19. Report of Inspection by Naval Medical Staff on November 1, 1966 at National Archives of X-Rays and Photographs of Autopsy of President John F. Kennedy (actually signed on November 10, 1966). (see attachment # 19)</p>	<p>Same as text item # 18 above, except that one very important clarification is made on pages 9 and 10, in the way of explaining why there is a color internegative # 49, but no color positive transparency # 49: "The negative numbered 47 and the negative numbered 49 were both processed from the transparency numbered 47.</p>	<p>Same as text for item # 18 above, with the exception of the wording used for black and white photo # 17, which is different in this smooth version of the inventory than in the draft: see Remarks .</p>	<p>Part III (1): Five 4 X 5" unexposed [but developed] black and white film negatives;</p> <p>Part III (2): One unexposed and not developed 4 X 5" Ektachrome film;</p> <p>Part III (3): One unexposed but developed 4 X 5" Ektachrome film;</p> <p>Part III (4): One roll of 120 film</p>	<p>Although it is unclear when the draft of this document (referred to in text item # 18 above) was prepared, it was on or subsequent to November 1, 1966; this smooth, signed version was clearly signed on November 10, 1966. The changes between the draft and this smooth version are discussed below:</p> <p>The one page introduction, not present on the draft, refers to the deed-of-gift process and states that the X-Rays and photographs shown to Humes, Boswell, Ebersole and Stringer were "...represented to us by Dr. James B. Rhoads, Deputy Archivist of the United States, to be the material listed in Appendix B of a letter dated October 29, 1966 from Burke Marshall...;" whether it was the intent or not, the result of this process, since the Burke Marshall letter does not refer to the Burkley inventory (and indeed, only lists a "sanitized" version of it which excludes the paragraph 9 materials), was that the four persons (named above) who prepared this photo and X-Ray inventory for the Archives and the Justice Department, while creating this descriptive catalogue, did not have to review the Burkley inventory of April 26, 1965 and thus were not officially aware of, and did not have to comment on, the many materials listed in item # 9 of Burkley's inventory which the Archives could not find upon execution of the deed-of-gift. (See text item # 17 above.)</p>
	<p>We assume the negative (numbered 47) was taken by the</p>		<p>(processed but showing no recognizable image) which we</p>	<p>The wording for photograph # 17 which appeared on the unsigned draft has changed in this signed version, as enumerated below:</p> <p>DRAFT: (17) "4 X 5" negative depicting missile</p>

	<p>developer for the purpose of having a negative (of the color positive transparency numbered 47) which did not contain the brush hair shown in the negative numbered 49 and to obtain better color intensity than is shown in negative number 49.”</p>		<p>recall was seized by Secret Service agents from a Navy medical corpsman whose name is not known to us during the autopsy and immediately exposed to the light. This item is numbered as item 4 in Appendix B to the letter dated October 29, 1966 referred to above.</p>	<p>wound over entrance in posterior skull, following reflection of the scalp...;” SMOOTH: (17) “4 X 5” negative depicting missile wound of entrance in posterior skull, following reflection of the scalp...”.</p> <p>In the smooth version, in the Miscellaneous section, the 5 ea 4 X 5" unexposed black and white film negatives are clarified by a pen-and-ink insertion (addition) which reads: “but developed”. Thus, the original statement “unexposed black and white film negatives” now reads “unexposed but developed black and white film negatives.”</p> <p>The following statement has been added to the end of the smooth version which was not present in the draft: “The X-Rays and photographs described and listed above include all the X-Rays and photographs taken by us during the autopsy, and we have no reason to believe that any other photographs or X-Rays were made during the autopsy.”</p> <p>The following typed signature blocks (names) were present on the draft, but are not present on the smooth document signed by Humes, Boswell, Ebersole, and Stringer:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Dr. James B. Rhoads, Deputy Archivist of the United States; Marion Johnson; Carl Belcher, U.S. Department of Justice</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				Ebersole and Stringer: Dr. James B. Rhoads, Deputy Archivist of the United States; Marion Johnson; Carl Belcher, U.S. Department of Justice.
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
20. Memorandum to File (dated November 22, 1966) from Carl W. Belcher, Chief, General Crimes Section, Criminal Division of the Department of Justice; Subj: Discussions with the Naval Medical Staff participating in the Autopsy upon the body of the Late President	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	<p>The first paragraph of this memo parallels almost word for word the first page of the Military Inventory signed on November 10, 1966, indicating to the author that it may have been Mr. Belcher who modified the draft originally written as a collective effort by Humes, Boswell, Ebersole and Stringer. It verifies that the Military Inventory took place on November 1, 1966 at approximately 2:00 P.M., and that Mr. Belcher was present along with Dr. James B. Rhoads (Deputy Archivist of the United States), Marion Johnson of the Archives staff, and Miss Patricia Eve Walkling (Mr. Rhoads' stenographer) along with those conducting the inventory, namely Drs. Humes, Boswell, Ebersole, and Navy civilian photographer John Stringer.</p> <p>This memo explains that Mr. Belcher questioned Dr. Humes subsequent to the inventory, on November 4, 1966, about handwritten notes he had with him during the inventory. Dr. Humes explained that the handwritten notes were quantities of</p>

John F. Kennedy (see attachment # 20)				<p>photographs and X-Rays from two memoranda dated November 22, 1963 (to the author, clearly the CAPT Stover and CDR Ebersole receipts to Roy Kellerman for photos and X-Rays) and one letter dated December 5, 1963 (to the author, clearly the letter from Bouck to Stover correcting the extended quantities of color film sheets). Dr. Humes explained to Mr. Belcher that the receipts in question did not refer to brain photographs</p>
				<p>photographs in question did not refer to brain photographs, which were taken "after November 22, 1963"--Humes did not provide a specific date--and were delivered personally to Vice Admiral Burkley by Captain Humes without a count being made at the exchange and without a receipt being exchanged. Dr. Humes did tell Mr. Belcher on November 4, 1966 that it was his belief that all the items he delivered to Admiral Burkley were sighted at the November 1, 1966 inventory inspection. (Furthermore, the numbers of inventoried items cited by Dr. Humes confirm that there were only 6 color transparencies of the brain, and that # 49 was not "missing," but that it was simply "not present" in the sense that there were only a total of 6 color transparencies of the brain, and that this number, # 49, did not represent one of them.)</p> <p>Humes explained to Mr. Belcher that he did not become aware of the Stover and Ebersole receipts dated November 22, 1963 until November 23, 1963; and that he did not become aware of the Bouck letter to Stover of December 5, 1963 until after</p>

				<p>December 5, 1963. Mr. Belcher clearly pursued in great detail with Dr. Humes the chain-of-custody problems revolving around how to account for the differences between the 21 sheets of film noted by Bouck on December 5, 1963 vs. the 22 sheets of film there should have been if all 11 film holders on the modified Stover receipt of 11/22/63 had been filled with film. (The hypothesis put forth by Dr. Humes, that</p>
				<p>put forth by Dr. Humes, that Bouck had only counted developed films, was disproven during the 4/30/96 ARRB interview of Robert Bouck, since Bouck insisted to the ARRB that his letter to Stover reflected film counted upon receipt and prior to developing.)</p> <p>It is clear that the Justice Department, through Mr. Belcher, was actively involved in the execution of a National Archives deed-of-gift inventory, possibly even proposing introductory wording to the earlier draft of the inventory. One cannot help but wonder if Mr. Belcher was also the source of the added statement (not present in the draft) at the end of the November 10, 1966 signed version of the inventory which states "The X-Rays and photographs described and listed above include all the X-Rays and photographs taken by us at the autopsy, and we have no reason to believe that any other photographs or X-Rays were made during the autopsy." It would appear to be a reasonable speculation, since the wording at the beginning of the signed inventory matches that in the beginning of his November 22, 1966 memo.</p>

				<p>Most significant, however, is the fact that this representative of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department (Mr. Belcher) states that he is the person who took the final draft of the Military Inventory to Humes, Boswell, Ebersole and Stringer on November 10, 1966 for their signature--not an official of the National Archives, with whom the Kennedy family was executing the deed-of-gift.</p> <p>dyfamily was executing the deed-of-giftfffamilyfamilfamily</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>21. "Military Review" of Autopsy Photographs and X-Rays, Relating Them to the Autopsy Report, signed on January 26, 1967 (see attachment #21)</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>"Other"</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>This report relates the autopsy photographs and X-Rays (using the numbering scheme developed at the November 1, 1966 Military Inventory), by number, to the autopsy report (undated) reportedly signed on November 24, 1963. However, there is no new count of photos or X-Rays in this document.</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>22. Privileged Communication,</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>"Other"</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>This one-page, single-spaced typewritten document prepared by Dr. Pierre Finck reports on the process by which he was involved in the "Military Review" of autopsy photos and</p>

<p>typed by Pierre Finck and dated 10 FEB 67. At the bottom of this document, Dr. Finck indicates that he typed it well after-the-fact, based on hand-written notes made in 1967. (see attachment # 22)</p>				<p>X-Rays (see text item # 21 above). In this document, Dr. Finck indicates that he was recalled from Vietnam by Lieutenant General Heaton, Surgeon General of the Army, to conduct the Military Review of autopsy materials. The schedule of events he set forth was as follows:</p> <p><u>20 Jan, 1967</u>: Arrived at Dulles Airport after 27 hours of air travel from Vietnam;</p> <p><u>20 Jan, 1967</u>: Met with LTG Heaton at 0900, then went to Dept. of Justice as directed by LTG Heaton, where he had an appointment with Barefoot Sanders (Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division); Sanders told him he would have to examine the autopsy photos which he had never seen. Justice attorney Carl Eardley was also present.</p> <p><u>20 Jan, 1967</u>: Met Dr. Humes and Dr. Boswell at 1700 at Bethesda Naval Hospital, and ate dinner with them at Bethesda. After dinner, they all went to the National Archives and met at 1900 with Carl Eardley (Justice) and Dr. Bahmer (Archivist of the U.S.), and examined the photographs and X-Rays of President Kennedy's autopsy in his office. The photos examined were 8" X 10" color prints and</p>
				<p>4" X 5" color positive transparencies. Dr. Finck wrote: "We remained in the Archives until midnight, having prepared a statement comparing the illustrations with our autopsy report." Dr. Finck wrote that there were 2 ea 4" X 5" sheets of film with no image</p>

				<p>(consistent with earlier inventories), and that: "I saw no photos of bone of entry; I thought we had photographed the outside and inside of entry wound in skull."</p> <p><u>26 Jan, 1967</u>: Finck met with Humes, Boswell and Carl Eardley at 1700 to sign the written statement henceforth known as the "Military Review;" Dr Finck wrote: "The statement had been prepared by the Justice Dept. We signed the statement." What was not explained in this memo was why this document was not signed until 6 days after the materials were reviewed and the original statement was prepared. It is unclear from Dr. Finck's memo how much similarity there was, or was not, between the statement they signed on 1/26/67 and the version they prepared on 1/20/67.</p>
<p>Document</p> <p>23. President Johnson's Notes on Conversation with Acting Attorney General Ramsey Clark-January 26, 1967-6:29 P.M. (See attachment #</p>	<p>Color</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>B & W</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>"Other"</p> <p>(See Remarks)</p>	<p>Remarks</p> <p>In direct quotations, the following remarks are attributed to Acting Attorney General Clark: "On the other matter, I think we have the three pathologists and the photographer signed up now on the autopsy review and their conclusion is that the autopsy photos and X-Rays conclusively support the autopsy report rendered by them to the Warren Commission though we were not able to tie down the question of the missing photo entirely but we feel much better about it and we have three of the four sign to an affidavit that says these are all the photos</p>

23)				<p>that they took and they do not believe anybody else took any others. There is this unfortunate reference in the Warren Commission Report by Dr. Hinn to a picture that just does not exist as far as we know. I am checking further to see where the pictures were at all times.”</p> <p><u>Analysis:</u> (1) When Mr Clark says 3 of 4 people are signed up on an affidavit, the context indicates he is referring to the Military Inventory signed on November 10, 1966 (not the Military Review just signed on this same evening, 1/26/67), since in November, 1966 Dr. Finck was not yet back in the United States, but Humes, Boswell and Stringer (the photographer), i.e., three of the four, did sign the Military Inventory that November;</p> <p>(2) His concern is clearly over deamissing autopsy photosling with</p>
				<p>month which stated that there were no other photos taken and no photos missing;</p> <p>(2) His concern is clearly over determining whether there are missing photographs, or in dealing with allegations of missing photographs, as evidenced by his quoting the statement added to the very end of the Military Inventory (see attachment # 19);</p> <p>(3) Mr. Clark is clearly confused over who has just signed the “autopsy review” (i.e., Military</p>

				<p>Review) that same evening, since he says “...we have the 3 pathologists and the photographer signed up now on the autopsy review;” Mr. Stringer, the photographer, was apparently not a part of that review process, and did not sign the document now in evidence (attachment # 21);</p> <p>(4) Mr. Clark’s statement: “There is this unfortunate reference in the Warren Commission report by Dr. Hinn to a picture that just does not exist as far as we know” seems to refer to Dr. Humes’ testimony before the Warren Commission on March 16, 1964, in which he is quoted on page 363 of WH 2 as saying that photographs (plural) were</p>
				<p>taken of the 5 cm wedge-shaped bruise on top of the apical portion of the right lung.</p> <p>This document is evidence of interest at the highest possible level of the Justice Department in autopsy photo and X-Ray chain-of-custody issues, and of Presidential interest, as well.</p>
Document	Color	B & W	“Other”	Remarks
24. This “Memorandum of Transfer” of	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	This internal memo forwards to “N” (identity unknown, but either an internal office code, or someone’s initial) 3 documents:

<p>Kennedy Autopsy Material, signed by Marion Johnson of the National Archives Staff and dated 6/30/70, appears to be an internal memo from MJ to N, prepared on a GSA Form 6702 (see attachment # 24)</p>				<p>(1) The RFK letter to Burkley of April 22, 1965 requesting transfer of JFK autopsy materials to Mrs. Lincoln; (2) A copy of the short, one paragraph Burkley cover letter to Mrs. Lincoln dated April 26, 1965; and (3) A copy of the 2-page Burkley Inventory itself (attachment # 11).</p> <p>This memo anticipates public interest in the Dallas casket and indicates that a GSA official told him (Marion Johnson) that GSA had under consideration the question of destroying it to prevent it from becoming an object of morbid curiosity. (Author's Note: it is now clear that the reason for such consideration by GSA was a letter written by Congressman Earle Cabell on September 13, 1965 to the Attorney General which recommended its destruction.)</p> <p>The memo also anticipates public interest in "Item 9" materials. The context of this statement is that the Archives became aware Item 9 materials were missing upon execution of the deed-of-gift O/A October 31, 1965</p>
				<p>1965 (see text item # 17 above). The stimulus for this memo from Marion Johnson about the Burkley Inventory's Item # 9 material (missing autopsy tissue slides, containers, and documents) and the Dallas Casket is unknown. However, its reference to the items actually transferred as "items 2-8" clearly refers to the Burkley Inventory (attachment # 11)--it is</p>

				interesting to the author that a key member of the Archives staff, Marion Johnson (the person physically entrusted with JFK materials), refers in this memo to these materials not by the Burke Marshall deed-of-gift letter which transferred them, but by the Burkley inventory by which they were transferred from Secret Service to Kennedy family custody. Thus, the Archives' focus seems to be on missing materials which were never officially transferred to them, rather than on materials held under the deed-of-gift.
Document 25. This undated NARA document lists no "from, to, or author" and is simply titled: "List of Medical Personnel Who Have Examined in the National Archives the X-Rays and Photographs Relating to the Autopsy on President Kennedy" (see	Color (See Remarks)	B & W (See Remarks)	"Other" (See Remarks)	Remarks Based on the list of names, the list appears to the author to be circa 1975, or later.

attachment # 25)				
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
26. Memo from Andy Purdy to File, dated May 10, 1977, titled: Materials in Kennedy Gift Collection-National Archives (see attachment # 26)	<p>Numbers 26-52 represent color transparencies, color negatives, and color prints (and mimic the November 10, 1966 signed Military Inventory precisely, including "no color transparency for # 49");</p> <p>one unexposed and not developed 4" X 5" Ektachrome film;</p> <p>one unexposed but developed 4" X 5" Ektach.</p>	<p>Numbers 1-25 represent B & W negatives and prints (and mimic the November 10, 1966 signed Military Inventory precisely);</p> <p>Five 4" X 5" unexposed but developed black and white film negatives.</p>	<p>One roll of 120 film (processed but showing no recognizable image); seized by Secret Service agents from Navy medical corpsman and exposed to light.</p>	<p>The items listed on this inventory were verified personally by HSCA staffers in late March, 1977, using the November, 1966 inventory as an organizational guide. The only deviations noted seem to be that the HSCA staffers did not sight and count all of the prints listed on the November 1966 inventory; where they did count prints, the numbers are the same. The author has noted that in November, 1966 (attachment # 19), as well as at the time of the inventory by HSCA staffers (late March, 1977) reported in this memo, there appear to be no B & W prints (of any size) yet made of the B & W brain negatives.</p>

	transparency			
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
27. Andy Purdy Interview Report of May 8, 1978 Interview of Harold F. Reis, former executive assistant to RFK, Nicholas Katzenbach, and Ramsay Clark at the Justice Department during 1960s (see attachment # 27)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	(See Remarks)	Mr. Reis identified himself in this interview as the person who had entered into negotiations with the Kennedy family (through Burke Marshall) on behalf of the Justice Department for a deed-of-gift which would limit access to the photos and X-Rays, as reportedly desired by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. Mr. Reis states that he was chosen for this task because he had accomplished a similar objective with the sensitive Forrester papers in the late 1950s. Mr. Reis stated he was not aware of any missing materials, and did not recall seeing the 1965 Burkley inventory, but that he did recall counting the photos and X-Rays, item by item, against the Burke Marshall deed-of-gift letter.
28. HSCA Transcript of Testimony of Mr. Robert L. Knudsen, former White House Photographer,	Approximately ten (10 ea) color negatives (not color positive transparencies); he remembered 5 duplex film	Twelve (12 ea) black and white negatives from one black and white film pack (not individual sheets of film	N/A	Navy Chief Robert L. Knudsen says he was tasked by Admiral Burkley on the morning after the assassination (which would have been November 23, 1963) to take films exposed at the autopsy to Anacostia for developing, and also remembered the making of color prints (color only, not black and white) the day following that (which would equate to November 24, 1963), at the direction of RADM Burkley, who ordered the prints in the presence of CAPT Tazewell Shepherd (President

<p>dated August 11, 1978 (see attachment # 28)</p>	<p>holders, and possibly one unexposed piece of color film. He concluded that there were therefore either 10 color negatives with images on them, or perhaps 9 color negatives with images, and one without an image. (See pages 26-27 of the transcript)</p>	<p>from duplex holders) (See pages 27, 42 and 51 of the transcript.)</p>		<p>Kennedy's Naval Aide), and a Secret Service agent. His recollections of when autopsy films (and prints) were developed, what type of films were developed, and numbers of photos developed are greatly at variance with the version set forth in the "joint secret service statement" dated February, 1967 (attachment # 5) and the statement of SA James Fox dated February 16, 1967 (attachment # 6). If Knudsen is correct about the dates, type and numbers of film he developed, and if the joint statements of Secret Service personnel from February 1967 (attachments # 5 and 6) are also correct, the significance of the disparity cannot be overstated. See attachment # 28A (comparison chart prepared by the author) for an easy-to-read comparison between these two versions of what transpired during the developing of autopsy photographs; the chart will highlight inconsistencies between the two versions of events without passing judgment on either version.</p>
	<p>pages 26 and 27 of the transcript.)</p> <p>Also remembers, with a fair amount of certainty, developing a set of seven (7) color</p>			

	prints from each color negative. (See pages 12, 16-18, 26, and 48-51.)			
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
29. Record Group 200 and Record Group 233, undated National Archives Documents (see attachment # 29)	26 4" X 5" color positive transparencies; 27 4" X 5" color negatives; 55 8" X 10" color prints of autopsy photographs 2 unexposed pieces of color film	Envelopes numbered 1-18 containing black and white negatives of photographs taken at time of autopsy; 7 envelopes containing 4" X 5" negatives of autopsy material; 43 8" X 10" black and white prints-- autopsy photographs consisting of the 36 listed in	1 roll of exposed film from a color camera entirely black with no image apparent	Record Group 200 is titled: Original Warren Commission Autopsy Materials, Appendix B of the Kennedy Family Agreement; Record Group 233 is titled: Material created for use by the House Select Committee on Assassinations and left in the custody of the National Archives while the Committee conducted its investigation. (Author's note: Record Group 233 is irrelevant to the purposes of this study and is therefore not listed or studied in the columns at left.) The author notes no discrepancies between Record Group 200 and the November 10, 1966 Military Inventory.

		<p>Appendix B to the Burke Marshall letter, and 7 B & W pr</p> <p>5 envelopes containing 4" X 5" exposed film containing no image</p> <p>prints of a brain made by the National</p>		
		<p>prints of a brain made by the National Archives;</p> <p>37 3.5" X 4.5" black-and-white prints of autopsy photographs;</p> <p>5 envelopes containing 4" X</p>		

		5" exposed film containing no image		
Document	Color	B & W	"Other"	Remarks
30. National Archives Annual Inspection of Kennedy autopsy materials dated January 19, 1996 (memo to David G. Paynter, NNR-A signed by Roland Bordley, Ramona Branch, Martha Murphy, and David G. Paynter) (see attachment # 30)	(Same quantities as in text item # 29 above.)	(Same quantities as in text item # 29 above.)	(Same quantities as in text item # 29 above.)	The author did not note any discrepancies between this latest National Archives inventory and the Record Group 200 document cited above.

Document (Description and Date)	X-Rays	Remarks
1. Receipt from CDR John H. Ebersole to ASAIC Roy H. Kellerman, dated 22 November, 1963 (see attachment # 31)	Eight (8) 14 X 17 inch X-Ray film; Three (3) 10 X 12 inch X-Ray film	The typed word and number "three (3)" preceding 10 X 12 inch X-Ray film have been lined out and replaced by hand with the quantities "six (6);" the initials "JHE" (presumably John H. Ebersole) are written by hand next to this change. The original total number of X-Rays typed on this document was 11; the corrected total was 14.
2. Receipt from CDR John H. Ebersole to ASAIC Roy H. Kellerman, dated 22 November, 1963 (see attachment # 32)	Eight (8) 14 X 17 inch X-Ray film; Six (6) 10 X 12 inch X-Ray film	The same receipt cited above has been retyped (on an unknown date), incorporating the pen-and-ink changes which were made opposite the 10 X 12 inch X-Ray film entry. (The pen-and-ink changes on the original document are the only changes noted in the retyped document.) Unlike the original, it is not signed by either Ebersole or Kellerman, but is certified to be a true copy above the signatures of CAPT J. H. Stover and RADM C. B. Galloway. The corrected total number of X-Rays on this document is 14; this is the same total in the Archives today.
3. Sibert-O'Neill FBI Report, dictated on	11 X-Rays	The total number of X-Rays in the

11/26/63 (see attachment # 3)		Sibert-O'Neill Report is only 11, which is the same total number originally typed on the Ebersole to Kellerman receipt, but three short of the total on the modified Ebersole-Kellerman receipts, and 3 less than the total in the collection today. This discrepancy strongly suggests a "late event" at the autopsy, or an event following the formal end of the autopsy, which was not observed by Sibert-O'Neill.
4. FBI internal memorandum from Mr. R. H. Jevons to Mr. Conrad, dated 11/27/63 (see attachment # 33)	"...we X-Rayed the bone (the Harper fragment) and examined it microscopically for the presence of bullet metal but none was found..."	This memo concerns what came to be known as the Harper Fragment (human bone discovered in the grass south of Elm Street on November 23, 1963 and returned to Washington on November 27, 1963); this document is the first indication that the bone fragment was X-Rayed. However, these X-Rays taken by the FBI following the President's autopsy (a total of 3, sighted by ARRB staff in May 1996 in the Archives) are not listed in the paper trail which documents the chain-of-custody of the autopsy X-Rays.
Document	X-Ray	Remarks
5. FBI letter to Rear Admiral George Burkley, dated November 29, 1963 (see	Formally notifies RADM Burkley that "...this piece of bone was X-Rayed..."	This letter simply transmits formally to the President's Physician what was discussed

attachment # 34)		internally in the FBI memo of 11/27/63.
6. Dr. Burkley's April 26, 1965 Inventory of JFK Autopsy Materials Transferred to Mrs. Lincoln at the National Archives (see attachment # 11)	"Envelope containing 8 X-Ray negatives 14" X 17"; 6 X-Ray negatives 10" X 12"; 12 black and white prints 11" X 14"; 17 black and white prints 14" X 17"; all negatives and prints pertaining to X-Rays that were taken at the autopsy"	Item 6 of this inventory contains the verbatim description posted at left. The author does not know by whom the "black and white prints" of X-Rays were made, where they were made, or when. (Speculation: the answer might have been contained in the two missing memoranda from Item 9 of the Burkley inventory, both dated November 29, 1963--but these documents are now missing and the author does not know of anyone living who remembers their contents.)
7. Burke Marshall's letter transferring autopsy materials to the Archives under deed-of-gift, dated October 29, 1966 (see attachment # 15)	(Same as text directly above in textual item # 6)	Paragraph 5 of Appendix B to the Burke Marshall letter is identical to paragraph 6 of the Burkley inventory.
Document	X-Ray	Remarks
8. Draft of "Military Inventory" conducted on November 1, 1966 (see attachment # 18)	6 each 8" X 10" X-Ray films are individually enumerated and described in	This is the first time in which individual X-Rays have been described by part of the

	<p>detail for the first time;</p> <p>8 each 14" X 17" X-Ray films are individually enumerated and described for the first time;</p> <p>"INSERT:" In awkward wording, this draft states that there are two photographic prints of each X-Ray, except for X-Ray number 8, for which there are 3 prints vice 2.</p>	body depicted.
9. Smooth (Signed) Version of Military Inventory, dated November 10, 1966 (see attachment # 19)	<p>Individual enumerated descriptions of the 14 X-Rays are the same, except for minor hand-written annotations which provide greater clarity and detailed description;</p> <p>However, the description of the photographic prints of the X-Rays has been expanded over the draft: "...2 prints of each of the above 8 X 10" and 14 X 17" X-Ray negatives and a third print of the X-Ray numbered 8 above."</p>	Except for the fact that each photographic print of an X-Ray was initialed "JHE", i.e., John H. Ebersole, there are no noteworthy changes to the comments in text item # 8.
Document	X-Ray	Remarks
10. HSCA Memo to File dated May 10, 1977 written by Andy Purdy (see attachment # 26)	Descriptions (in lay language) mirror the individual, enumerated descriptions in attachments # 18 and 19 for both X-Rays and prints.	No discrepancies noted between this document and the Military Inventory of November 1966.

11. Record Group 200, Undated NARA Document (see attachment # 29)	8 X-Ray negatives, 14" X 17"; 6 X-Ray negatives, 10" X 12"; 12 B & W prints 11" X 14"; 17 B & W prints 14" X 17"; Also included are 14 duplicate copies of X-Rays.	This is the first mention of "14 duplicate copies of X-Rays;" the author does not know who made them, or where, or when.
12. National Archives Annual Inspection Results of Kennedy Autopsy Material, dated January 19, 1996 (see attachment # 30)	Paragraph 5 of this document is identical to paragraph 5 of Record Group 200 (attachment # 29)	No discrepancies were noted between this document and the Record Group 200 document.