

Dear Gary,

3/18/94

Early this morning I went over the Ebersole appearance before the House assassins medical panel and found it very useful. Because I preserve all official records exactly as I receive them for archival purposes I put a paperclip on each page and made copies for the writing I plan, an additional ^{to} the book NEVER AGAIN! that as the last word I got will be published in September. While this takes more time I want such records to be pristine. So, aside from again thanking you I would like to know, for purposes of adding to these records, if you got them and if so about when. Also, whose notes are on the first couple of pages? Were they there when disclosed, i.e., the committee's? If you did not ^{get} them, I'd like to have the same information about your ^{source} and I'd then say thru you. But I do want the proper credit recorded for the future when I can do that. *and in the books.*

What I found that confirms what I've said includes that the family did not impose any autopsy limitations. You'll see the special significance in this when that book is out. Also, as I published in Post Mortem and add to in the new book, that Humes lied in telling the Commission that he did not know of the anterior neck wound until Saturday a.m. when he first phoned Perry. *He said!*

At several points there are references to Ebersole's lack of experience in that kind of radiology (remember the crack about his ability in an interview I referred to in writing you yesterday?) and the presence of artifacts and how they are reflected in the X-rays. ^C This is the kind of thing I was getting to in the caution for Mantik. If he has not done so I hope he'll go over this as his own devil's advocate.

There were to me some amazing disclosures about their concept of a full autopsy. No X-rays except in the search of a bullet!

The Secret Service insistence on them is also interesting, important, as also is its insistence on duplicating them. I am inclined to believe that the unnamed man was Kellerman.

Not that anything new ~~was~~ ^{do} ~~needed~~ needed to it but this again proves the phoniness of the basis of "ifton's theory. As some of the other records of interviews also do.

I'll get to the "inck appearance before that panel in the morning before I write anything about this but I've written to the publisher recommending an Afterword. Because this come from an autopsy participant I think it carries more weight.

Again thanks, *Harold*

Do you recall whether any Commission records reflecting that Specter questioned Ebersole have been disclosed? Or whether the HSCA panel's report includes any of this? That long since I read it. My recollection is that it does not.