Dear Tom,

Paragraph D on page 2 is imprecisely worded and creates confusion about who was near enough to whom to receive powder burns. My own impression is that the intent of the paragraph is to suggest that RFK was near enough to Cesar to receive powder burns if Cesar not only drew his weapon but fired it.

Cyril Wecht, who advised Dr Noguchi before the RFK autopsy (at Noguchi's request) on requirements and procedures to ensure against a Humes-type debacle, told me that he and Noguchi were baffled to this day by the fact that RFK did sustain a powder burn at the site of one bullet entry which was inconsistent with his distance from Sirhan. On the other hand, neutron activation tests had established that all bullets had come from Sirhan's gun, which was considered conclusive evidence that Sirhan alone had done the shooting.

The lawyer who filed this suit on behalf of Charach, Godfrey Isaack, was also the lawyer who represented Dr. Noguchi against the lurid charges made in an attempt to dismiss him. The charges were ultimately withdrawn or found to be without foundation, I forget which, and Noguchi was fully vindicated and reinstated as medical examiner. The fact that Isaac was Noguchi's lawyer seems to invest this suit with more credibility than at first glance it deserves, because it suggests that the plaintiff has knowledge of the autopsy results and that Noguchi might have created an uproar at the Sirhan trial had hen not been obstructed by the DA's line of questioning.

I am not leaping to conclusions one way or the other, in the light of the disappointments we have experienced in other situations which at first sight seemed promising. If anything exciting develops, I'll let you know.

Newman is to discuss his book on Wednesday at midnight (the 24th or really the 25th of June) on NBC radio, the Long John program. I had briefed Paris Flammonde rather fully so that he could at least try to expose the fundamental weaknesses and paranoia of Newman's work; then, Flammonde told me that Kieron O'Dougherty, the local mad-dog of the "conservatives," was also to be on the discussion, which means they will probably get bogged down in propaganda and invective of the most invidious kind. Hardly worth listening to, I fear.

Regards,