Dear Tink.

Thanks for your letter of the lat and also for the copy of your holograph letter to Tom Bethell of 30th July. Wisard that you are, you have found for yourself the explanation for the discrepancy in the position of the wound as measured during autopsy as against the holes in the clothes. I had hoped that PLAYBOY would accept the ms. for publication but they turned it down, so we are now trying another periodical. I wish I was not bound to secrecy on the author's findings; since I am so bound, I will only add that in further developing the thesis, he presents data which leave the Commission's conclusions about the shots and the wounds in wreckage, despite the reconciliation of the seeming contradiction in the position of the bullet wound in the back, and which eliminate the sixth-floor window as the source of that shot.

Regarding some of the points in your letter to Tom: I called attention to the singular fact that the measurements were written in the margin of the autopsy face sheet solely in the case of the bullet wound in the back, on the occasion of the debate on 9/30/66 in which Popkin, Sauvage and I took on Liebeler, Griffin and Dwight Macdonald; and also in Accessories. I have looked upon this as a very significant manifestation and I am glad that you too attach importance to it. However, I was not awars of the apparent difference in the pen or pencil used to annotate the measurements and the other writing on the face sheet (xerox copy of which you saw in Austin); if it proves to be different and presumably a belated addition, that strengthens the point. Nor was I sware that Dr. Rose got a copy of the autopsy report on or about 12/7/63 and will be glad to have a zerox of his certificate of death when you get back to Haverford.

The SS on-site tests of 12/5/63: The source of my statement that the tests were conducted to determine how he was hit in the throat by a bullet from behind is Joe Loftus of the N.Y. Times, who asked an SS agent what the tests were about and was given that reply. I cannot take the time to dig up the story Loftus filed at the time—he may have repeated this in his dispatch, or he may have given the information verbally, but I no longer recall which after the passage of so many years. (Afterthought: Just checked Accessories and find that the N.Y.Times story by Joe Loftus on 12/6/63 p.6 indicated that the SS on-site tests were for the acknowledged purpose of ascertaining how he was hit at the Adam's apple from the window after the car had turned on to Elm.) I do feel certain that Loftus did not infer the purpose of the tests but was told explicitly by one agent that they were for the stated purpose.

Tour comment to Tom that you are convinced something was going on which involved Oswald and Ferrie in the summer of 1963 in New Orleans: I am open-minded on that and have been sensitive to Ferrie's possible role from the time I first read the H & E—in fact, I indexed Ferrie in the supplementary name index in the Subject Index to the WR & H & E. However, I have yet to see firm evidence of any contacts between the two of them, in 1963 or at any earlier time. (I do not, of course, consider Russo's story anything other than a gross fabrication; and the very fact that only such a crude contrivance has been offered as evidence of a link between Oswald and Ferrie tends to make me lean toward the belief that there was no link at all.)

A few words to Tom Bethell, to save a separate letter: Thanks for your comments on Epstein's article. The allegation that a camera was planted opposite Ferrie's residence was made originally by Rosemary James in PLOT OR POLITICS? I assume that this was Epstein's source. As to the Quiroga visit to Oswald: McLaughlin of The New Yorker called me on that and I gave him the specific references in the H & E, which showed only one visit, although Bringuier suggested more than one. (See CE 3119, page 14.) He seemed so overjeyed to have this explicit information that I cannot understand why the correction—that only one visit was made by Quiroga—was not made.