

January 15, 1973

Dear Mrs. Meagher,

The day after I sent my previous letter, I received a note from Dr. Wecht and a reprint of his summary of his examination of the autopsy material. The article appears in the November 27, 1972 issue of "Modern Medicine", pages 28 thru 32.

He stressed that certain materials, supposedly prepared by Humes, et al, were not among the inventoried material turned over to the Archives, in April 1965, by Adm. Burkley. These include photographs of JFK's chest-interior and microscopic tissue slides of the area around the "entry wounds." He also commented on the incomplete sectioning of the brain-area.

Dr. Wecht also mentioned the fact that reenactment photos showed that Connally had to be moved too far to the left (viewed from rear) to be hit with CE 399 after supposedly unaltered path thru JFK's neck. The Commission said this item was taken into account, but there was no excuse for not using the limousine with the jump seat. The Phil Willis slide shows that Connally was nowhere near the middle of the car in the area of Z 210 - nor was he turned far to his right as in reenactment.

It wasn't mentioned in the WR, but there were a number of other windows open on the 6th floor - toward the west end, of the lateral angle thru Connally's chest would line-up fine from that area.

(2)

I found another set of notes I have made while going thru various books of articles and your book was among them.

① The Walker shooting was a hazy affair, at best, but I noted that although the FBI did not claim to have any interest in the incident until the discovery of the famous note in-the-cookbook on Dec. 3 '63, and Marina's interview on the subject, that according to the WR 186, the FBI requested the "Walker bullet" on Nov. 30, 1963. This was rather a quick reaction to the German news article of late November, if that's what it was.

② Your "Guardians of the Border" on pages 313-315 drew my interest insofar as the disclaimer of the Customs Agents regarding any "interest" in Oswald's Mexican trip by another Federal Agency. The chronology of the FBI's contact with Oswald is cited on pages 434-442 of the Report. At the top of page 438, the CIA telegram of 10/10/63 is noted with the follow-up, that the FBI had no earlier info suggesting that Oswald had left the U.S.

I don't have an up-to-date list of the items withheld in the Archives, but a 1969 list shows an unusually large number dealing with the Mexican trip - including C1) 785 - FBI Report - Oswald in Mexico - 7 photos attached. Certainly, everyone who goes to Mexico doesn't have their photo taken regarding their movements. The FBI is named as the withholding agency on this item.

(3.)

Perhaps they're CIA photos, but I thought that they had said the famous "Odum photo" was believed to be Oswald as far as the CIA was concerned.

(3) In your book, page 239, you mentioned the discrepancies in Marina's testimony of interviews, both FBI & Secret Service regarding her knowledge of the Mexican trip.

At the bottom of p. 239, a portion of CE 1792 was reproduced, showing the report of A. Service Agent Gopadze.

"She was asked whether she had any knowledge of Lee's trips to Mexico or Washington, D.C. She replied in the negative..."

I didn't find any reference in the Report regarding a trip to Washington; was it mentioned in the Hearings of Exhibits? You can't tell from Gopadze's statement whether he is talking about something he knew had occurred, or the possibility of such a trip.

(4) I have to congratulate you for your examination of the evidence relating to Oswald's dealings with the State Department. The lookout-cards business is too much. Regarding Oswald's acquisition of his June 1963 passport, in New Orleans, I have a question.

On WR 744, the June 1963 analysis of Oswald's finances appears. June 1963 shows no expenditure of \$9 for the passport fee and the \$1 filing charge.

Does this show up anywhere in the Hearings of Evidence?

The reason I mentioned this was, that I noted

(4)

in the law regarding passport-procedure in 1963, that an individual on official business with the Government, who submitted a letter from his employer did not have to pay the \$9 passport fee.

Perhaps this item was merely overlooked in totalling his expenditures - but much smaller items were listed, regularly.

As far as I could discover, in The Report, no one from the New Orleans Passport Office appeared before the Commission, was deposed or gave an affidavit.

It might be helpful, if the 26 volumes show the information, whether Oswald worked a full-day, or at all, on June 24th, a Monday, at Wm. Riley. The hours would indicate, whether in fact, he appeared in person at the passport office.

If you can answer the questions, I'll try to follow them up.

Ed Slemmer