

26 October 1966

Dr. Cyril Wecht
1417 Frick Building
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219

Dear Dr. Wecht,

I believe that when I sent you a transcript of your broadcast on the Long John radio program we had some discussion or correspondence about the matter of the President's blood type and the fact that the information was not available when he was in the Parkland Hospital emergency room. At that time I referred to the testimony of Secret Service agent Roy Kellerman (II page 80) and his statement that he did have the information and gave it to one of the doctors.

Just today while leafing through a volume of the Exhibits I noticed a report written by the Presidential physician, Admiral Burkley, on November 27, 1964, detailing his activities on November 22nd (CE 1126, XXII pp. 93 ff.). This report includes the following statement:

"The team was working to supply "O" Rh negative blood and I informed them that his blood group was "O" Ph positive."

This certainly suggests that you and your fellow-participant in the broadcast, Dr. Miller, I believe, were quite right in your criticism. Again, here is a conflict in the evidence that was not resolved, and perhaps not even noticed, by the Warren Commission.

I received the Journal of Forensic Sciences some weeks ago and found it very interesting indeed—especially the excerpts from the letters exchanged between Dr. Osterburg and J. Lee Rankin. I had occasion to do two broadcasts earlier this month, one in Philadelphia and one in New York City, in which I mentioned that correspondence and urged that the Academy of Forensic Sciences should be asked to participate in any reinvestigation of the case. Representative Theodore Kupferman was a participant in the New York City broadcast (the Barry Gray program) and I stressed your published criticism of the autopsy and the other papers in the Journal because, as you know, he has introduced a bill which calls for a joint Congressional committee to examine the Warren Report and the charges and criticisms made against it, and to see if a new investigation is warranted. I would not be very optimistic about such a new investigation unless independent outside experts were utilized and unless it was in the framework of an adversary procedure.

The Warren Report has become discredited or at least subject to serious question, thanks to the efforts of many individuals working independently who refused to remain silent. You and your colleagues in the Academy have made a most valuable contribution. A new investigation, if there is one, should have every possible safeguard built-in, lest we have only another inadequate report at the end. I have a piece called "Notes for a New Investigation" coming out in the December issue of ESQUIRE. If you get a chance to look at it, I should be grateful for any comments or added suggestions (I did utilize already what you told me about the neutron activation analysis).

With warm personal regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 St. NYC, N.Y. 10014