

9 December 1970

Sylvia Meagher
New York

Dear Sylvia:

I have a little time, so I'll spend it commenting on a matter that you raise in your 16 November letter to me.

In that letter you pass Thompson's comment that my thesis depends upon the accuracy and truthfulness of the description in the Panel Report. I understand that Thompson does not set that forth as an objection, but let me treat it as though it were, for I think even now-- without independent corroboration of the contents of the head X-rays-- that as an objection it is groundless.

The Panel conflicts with WC records ~~only~~ only in respect of their location. The WC records state or strongly imply that the fragments were distributed throughout the brain, whereas the Panel says they were concentrated in the front (with perhaps none at all near the rear head wound).

Two things establish the validity of the Panel's description: the qualifications of the doctors on the Panel; and (what is more important to me) the independent knowledge that JFK was hit by somebody who fired from the knoll.

I need not emphasize that in respect of qualifications the Panel swamps ~~the~~ Humes, Kellerman, Sibert, and O'Neill. In this respect, you could justifiably say that the WC's records just don't count when they conflict with the Panel Report. The WC's reporters are one up on the Panel docs only in this: they saw more X-rays than the Panel saw. But the Panel saw enough to make an accurate determination-- two left-lateral X-rays taken on slightly different projections, and one X-ray taken from the top of the head. All of this is good enough to convince me that the Panel's description is more accurate than that of the WC's reporters.

The second point is, I think, even more important. The evidence that JFK was hit in the right-front part of his head was conclusive ~~even~~ before I brought up the matter of the location of the ~~frag~~ fragments. If we know (a) that the bullet burst into very small particles, and (b) that JFK was hit by someone firing from the knoll, then we can hardly ~~w~~ escape the conclusion that the fragments were located in the front. What the Panel describes is the natural and predictable ~~outcome~~ (and predicted) outcome of a shot fired from the knoll. If it were otherwise, I would have been confused about the Panel's description as I was about that of the WC records. The Panel's account makes sense, the WC's does not. With fragments that small, there has to be some sort of concentration-- a discernibly concentration.

Must stop. Sorry for haste.

Dick

cc. Thompson