

DAL McGUIRK  
93 PAH ROAD EPSOM  
AUCKLAND 1003 NZ  
PH: 0-9-625 4844

Auckland, 22/01/93, Friday morning

Dear Harold,

Like you I write letters in instalments that come together as I have time and I realise now I did not complete the letter I posted to you yesterday. I meant to write another page, but forgot to do it in the rush of going out that morning.

Thank you for your invitation to visit you if and when I get to the States. I will call on you, have no doubt. However, it looks more and more like early 1994 rather than late 1993.

I am glad you liked the little calender of NZ. It is a pity you cannot pay us a visit in NZ. I am sure you would like it, both the country and the people are quite pleasant to know.

This last day or so we have seen on our TV quite a lot of the inauguration of Bill Clinton as president. I cannot help but wonder to what extent he will be influenced by the military and those who produce the means of making war. Clinton is to a very large degree compromised or captured by the continuing effects of Bush's policies, especially in the Middle East.

Since finishing the letter I posted yesterday I have been reading bits of pieces of the "Whitewash" series, and looking into "Post Mortem" again. I found there some of the answers to the questions I posed in my last letter. I am always impressed almost beyond description by the amount of work you have done to have the insights you write about in your books.

But what I wanted to write about in my last letter and then overlooked when I hurriedly sealed it to post was something I thought of when reading the appendices to the Bonar Menninger book. He reproduces the statements made some days after the 22nd Nov. by the Secret Service agents who were riding in the cars with the presidential and vice-presidential motorcade.

There is quite a bit of common language in these reports, that would indicate the agents must have at least talked to each other about what they saw and heard, and presumably would be writing in their statements. For all that, I found it very interesting that some described the initial sound of gunfire like that of 'firecrackers' (or 'a firecracker').

When I was a child 'firecrackers' meant strings of small red crackers (we called them 'bangers') tied together with their fuses plaited to make a lot one could either let off at once, which made a noise like a battlefield- a combination of quick single rifle shots and short bursts of automatic fire. Very few kids had enough money to be able to afford to let off the who lot, so we used to untie them, and let them off either singly or in small lots of three or four at a time.

Now here I go with some conjecture again, which I know is very unscientific, but bear with me.

Is it possible that the 'firecrackers' reported by the Secret Service agents were in fact several shots fired very closely together. Why else say the sound was like a 'firecracker' or 'firecrackers'? A firecracker is after all still quite a loud report, like a gun in fact as I recall, though without the echo-like reverberation of a rifle shot. To me a 'firecracker' still has shades of meaning that include more than detonation very close together. Two rifle reports together may give the impression of a loud firecracker, being an unfamiliar sound, changing the distinctive sound of a single rifle report. It may have been that as the presidential car reached a certain pre-arranged spot, say one of the road centre stripes, then all gunmen fired at once, or maybe two at once. There would have had to be quite a lot of careful planning by the gunmen and their masters to co-ordinate their fire. They dare not fail, it had be done in such a way they could not fail. What do you think?

Descriptions of how the first shot sounded to these agents:

a) SA Clinton Hill, in presidential follow-up car, to Specter on verbal examination; 'seemed to be like a firecracker'.

SA Clinton Hill, in presidential follow up car, written statement, 'I heard a noise similar to a firecracker'

b) SA Winston Lawson, in lead car, written statement; 'As the Lead Car was passing under this bridge I heard the first loud sharp report and in rapid succession two more sounds like gunfire.'

c) SA William Greer, driving presidential car, in written statement; 'I heard what I thought was the backfire of a motorcycle behind the president's automobile'.

d) SA Roy Kellerman, front passenger seat president's car, in written statement; 'when I heard a noise, similar to a firecracker, exploding in the area to the rear of the car.'

e) SA Samuel Kinney, in presidential follow up car, in written statement, 'there was a shot'

f) ATSAIC Emory Roberts, in presidential follow-up car, in witten statement; '12.30pm, first of three shots fired'

g) SA William McIntyre, in presidential follow-up car, 'the first shot was fired'

h) SA John Ready, in presidential follow-up car, in written statement, 'I heard what appeared to be firecrackers going off from my position.'

i) SA Paul Landis, presidential follow-up car, in written statement, 'At this moment I heard what sounded like a high-powered rifle from behind me, over my right shoulder.'.....  
 ..... 'I recall Special Agent Jack Ready saying, "What was it, a firecracker?" I remarked, "I don't know, I don't see any smoke." '

j) SA Glen Bennett, in presidential follow up car, written statement, 'At this point I heard what sounded like a firecracker' and later, 'At the moment I looked at the back of the President I heard another fire cracker noise and saw the shot hit the President about four inches down from the right shoulder.'

k) SA George Hickey, in presidential follow-up car, written statement, 'I heard a loud report that sounded like a firecracker'

l) SAIC Youngblood, in vice-presidential car, in written statement, 'I heard an explosion- I was not sure whether it was a firecracker, bomb, bullet, or other explosion'

m) ASAIC Thomas Johns, vice-presidential follow up car, written statement, '....I heard two "shots", not knowing whether they were firecrackers, backfire or gunshots'

n) SA Jerry Kivett, vice-presidential follow up car, written statement; '....I heard a loud noise, someone hollered "What was that?" It sounded more like an extremely large firecracker in that it did not seem to have the sharp report of a rifle.'

o) SA Warren Taylor, vice presidential follow up car, in written statement; 'when I heard a loud bang which sounded to me like a possible firecracker, the sound coming from my right rear.'

24th January, 1993, late Sunday night

Since writing this we (i.e. my family -we call ourselves 'the CIRCUS McGUIRKUS') have spent two days at a beach house we borrowed from friends for the weekend. When I was not walking on the beach with my children or playing puzzles and games in the house, I have been reading again your POST MORTEM.

Please, may I ask you a few more questions? These questions relate in the first instance to what I have been reading in POST MORTEM these past two days, and nights.

\* -what do YOU think happened to the two bullets that must have been lodged in Kennedy's body, behind the frontal neck wound and behind the back wound?

- \* -unless they were both exploding bullets, soft-nosed lead, the intact bullets must have lodged in the body because there was no evidence of exit for either bullet, right?
- \* -what evidence is there to show what happened to Kennedy's corpse from the time it arrived at the Naval Medical Centre in Bethesda until the time the autopsy started?
- \* -Is it possible that in this time some persons unknown could have interfered with the corpse and removed these two bullets, and maybe even tampered with the skull (and the brain too)? I remember FBI agent Sibert had mentioned 'surgery to the head area' in his report. If this was so, and it was not done in Dallas, then it had to have been done in Bethesda (or...?) before the autopsy.

In the Nigel Turner TV programme there was an interview with somebody (I can find out his name if you are interested) who worked as a medical technician at Bethesda in 1963 and whose duties included helping at autopsies. He told Nigel Turner that he thought the corpse arrived at Bethesda by helicopter shortly before the autopsy and was delivered in a standard army coffin and in a body bag which he personally handled. He did not say so, but the implication was the coffin that had arrived from Dallas earlier at Bethesda could not have contained Kennedy's corpse.

If these two bullets were removed before the autopsy, it makes a very strong case for a military conspiracy to assassinate Kennedy organised from high up in the US military. Somebody with authority to arrange access to the corpse must have been in touch with accomplices in Dallas and known of all the early developments concerning Oswald- the three cartridge cases, the rifle, the scenario of a 'lone assassin', the bullet found on a stretcher at Parkland Hospital, the Tippit killing, known nearly everything in fact to have seen the possibilities in building a case around 'evidence' that pointed to three bullets fired by the one gunman firing from the rear. The unique ballistic evidence in those two bullets would need to be destroyed too. This is almost too much to consider as a likelihood, it is so fantastic, but I would still like to know what you think.

- what other explanation is there??

If I can once again return to the Nigel Turner TV programme, he showed a section of the Mary Moorman photo in a computer colour-enhanced enlargement of the vicinity of the picket fence. There is a clear image of a person wearing what seems to be a police jacket who is hatless and in the act of aiming what could be a rifle in the very instant of firing. Even more chilling than this image of a killer is the less distinct image of a figure standing beside the man apparently firing a rifle. This second figure seems to be wearing a hard hat and the type of shirt used by railway workers, and he is not looking in the direction that the apparent gunman is firing at, no, he is looking up to his left, up to some point to his left and above where he is standing. In the instant that the person

beside him is apparently shooting the life out of the President of the United States, this second person is more interested in something he can see further away higher to his left. What sort of man is this, with cold detached attention to checking some other part of their plan as more interesting than witnessing the shot that killed the President of the United States? That question troubles me. There is no answer to such a question of course. Do you know this particular computer-enhanced enlargement of the picket fence in the Mary Moorman photo? It is quite clear, well, clear enough.

I am groping towards some sort of idea of what things I can personally do to make more people informed about what I have discovered since reading your books. That was why I suggested asking your help in writing some feature stories for the local press here later in the year. It is not my intention to make any money from this writing, I would be happy to give you any money paid to me.

It amazes me how many people here I talk to about the JFK Assassination adopt a ho-hum attitude, as if it is old history and as if it is something they already know something about. When I question them I find they know very little if anything, and most think Oswald was involved even if they think he was not the only gunman! Amazing!

By the way, I wish to retract something I said in my last letter. I think I wrote that Jean Hill's book was a waste of time. That was not true. No book can ever be a waste of time. I meant to say I did not learn anything I felt was important or significant. For all that she was an eyewitness, she has apparently over the years steadfastly maintained she heard five or six shots, and that she heard shots coming the direction of the grassy knoll. If anything, I think far less of the book by Bonar Menninger than Jean Hill's story. That is a really incredible claim, of Donahue's, that one of the Secret Service men shot Kennedy in the head by accident.

? | There are many things that haunt me about the assassination and the following cover-up, but I have a haunting image that relates to the autopsy. That is the possibility that one or more of the primary and active conspirators were among those senior military officers who witnessed the autopsy. It is a grotesque thought, something even more 'evil' than the assassination itself, if that is possible. Given that the autopsy took place in a naval establishment, the navy would have to be involved somehow, would it not? Whatever the outcome of the autopsy, the very fact that it was conducted by military personnel at a military establishment meant that the military were able to control much of the information (sic) that came out of the autopsy. Regardless of developments in Dallas, the opportunity was there to exploit possibilities that came up in the wake of the assassination, to influence events through the 'investigation'. And so it goes on.

I look forward to hearing from you again,  
warm regards,  
Pat.