

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Md.

31 March 1969

Dear Harold,

I have mailed back to you under separate cover, insured, the ms. of Post-Mortem III. Thank you for offering me the chance to read it. As you know, I had read the ms. of Post-Mortem only a week earlier, and that proved to be regrettable in that there was too little time lapse between the two readings to produce the maximum attention-span for PM III.

Nevertheless, I can say in all sincerity that your attack on the 1968 panel report is a tour-de-force of the highest order, in vigilance, relentlessness, detail, and scope. Not a comma, not a speck, has escaped notice or interpretation. The 1968 panel report is such a feeble, sloppy and disgraceful document--not in terms of its avowed purpose, which cannot be a serious yardstick for its examination, but in terms of its implicit purpose of cover-up and whitewash--that the scorn you heap upon its authors and your moral indignation at the insult they have offered to the intelligence of the critics and the public is certainly understandable.

However, I have some doubt of the wisdom of sustaining throughout PM III a kind of continuous tone of rage at boiling-point, however justified the rage may be, for though it is intended to assault the federal authorities and their servant-surgeons, it begins to assail the reader--which is not intended or to be desired. You know that I am not advocating antiseptic, unemotional writing--not at all. I am only suggesting that the rage and sarcasm should be carefully and strategically injected, as punctuations to an otherwise calm, objective exposition of fact and analysis, in order that the emotion, when expressed, has its maximum impact and at times may even be anticipated by the reader's own anger. The ms. really does need some greater variation of tone and mood.

Of course, you wrote PM III at fantastic speed, that is obvious. But what is achieved in terms of rapidity may sacrifice clarity of writing, organization, and economy. I feel sure that if you had the luxury of time, the ratio of verbiage to factual and analytical content, and the tone and style, would have benefited. Unless you were writing against a deadline, you might have forced yourself to take it more slowly in order that the finished ms. would have the best prospects for publication. I understand and share your desire to build a record but it is also important to reach the public, to strike while the iron is hot. In my view, the major points of conflict and deception should be extracted from the ms. and embodied in an article of magazine-length (e.g., the differing inventories of the photos and X-rays, the black negatives with no images, the missing X-rays of the four extremities, the four-inch shift in the location of the so-called entrance wound in the head, the alleged bullet fragments in the neck area, the position of the entrance wound in the back and analysis of vertical and lateral angles and the failure of the 1968 panel to address itself to the specific points of contention which were supposedly the *raison d'etre* for its examination of the autopsy evidence).

The JFK Autopsy: Verified, Re-Verified, and
Verified Again

Sylvia Meagher
April 1969

Explanatory Foreword

The report of the 1968 medical panel on its examination of the JFK autopsy photographs and X-rays has been the subject of a searching critical analysis by Harold Weisberg, author of Whitewash and other books on the assassination. Mr. Weisberg shared with me the results of his study, in conversation only days after the panel's report was made public on January 16, 1969. At the end of March he was good enough to invite me to read his full-length manuscript, Post-Mortem III, a compendium and critical analysis of all information and documents available as of the present time on the autopsy, including the photographs and X-rays.

That Mr. Weisberg produced a work of great scope and microscopic detail with such astonishing speed testifies to his commitment and his conviction that the full truth about the Dallas assassination must be pursued and that all misrepresentation must be tirelessly exposed. His manuscript, in its mastery of the staggering complex of the forensic evidence and pseudo-evidence which continues to burgeon and proliferate in the case of the JFK assassination, is a tour de force of the highest magnitude.

In preparing this article, I have merely retraced the work which had already been done by Harold Weisberg. The exclusive credit for the methodology and the findings belongs to him. His book-length manuscript should be published and become available to the public. But publication is not yet prospective. Some of the findings are therefore indicated in this preliminary, interim survey of the examinations of the JFK autopsy photographs and X-rays.