

20 February 1974

Dear Tom,

You are becoming adept at finding projects for me!...but this time I have anticipated you. On the question of the autopsy photos and X-rays described at different times by different panels or individuals, I wrote a rather detailed monograph in April 1969 comparing the testimony of eyewitnesses with the Warren Report and the Humes trio 1964, the Humes trio 1967, and the Fisher panel of 1968. The monograph consists of a narrative followed by tables. I could not submit it for publication, as I had originally hoped to do, because much of the material came from Weisberg and he did not agree that I should seek publication, even though I gave him complete credit.

The monograph and its tables could now be up-dated by the Berkeley death certificate, the Finck testimony at New Orleans, the Lattimer findings and the Wecht findings. However, the manuscript remains, as marked, strictly confidential and I am trusting you to treat it as such and to return it when you have taken the data you need.

While rummaging for the manuscript, I encountered my correspondence with Lattimer 1966-1968. Although it is marked "Duplicate Set" I could not find the original set, so I will need this back also, after you have read it. I think that you will find the correspondence of some interest, if only as a demonstration of how Lattimer slithers away from addressing himself to a specific argument, and for other illustrations of his style.

Turning now to the Paul Scott article and my unacknowledged rebuttal---I haven't the vaguest idea where I have filed the relevant papers and I don't have time for a real search. My impression is that this matter dates back many years. I am therefore puzzled by the two closing paragraphs that you quoted, referring to "President Nixon" and "Attorney General John Mitchell". I do not recall those sentences (which is not to say that I had not seen them before---it may only testify to the increasing deficiency of my memory) and it is my impression, subject to correction, of course, that the Scott article and my rebuttal occurred during the Johnson presidency, well before Nixon's election. I agree that the portions you quote invite thought and suspicion.

Please return the enclosures, Tom.

As ever,