

Dear Dick,

6/4/92

I'm very sorry to hear about your father. I hope it is not accompanied by great pain. As you know, such things intrude upon my mind from time to time. I am very much aware of them from what others would not notice. Just this morning, when the large and heavy door of an auto loaned to me while mine is in the shop closed on my worse leg, just above the ankle, leaving it swollen and hurting a little. For me a simple thing like that can mean trouble. So, while I can't apply it to others, I am very much aware that such times do come to us all. But I do hope it is as easy as possible on him and on all of you.

On what I think of as JAMA-aborie I've not even thought of an outline because none is necessary, my formula is that simple. I've got a handwritten beginning scrawled in odds and ends of moments while resting during my walking, even while being driven to Johns Hopkins yesterday. It is general and background, mostly to introduce the reader to Byzantium on the Potomac. Also a bit on something in the JAMA article that fits this and raises questions about truthfulness. I'm at the point now where I'm into the meat and I'll be carving that all the rest of the way.

I have read the JAMA and as I said about Stone and Garrison, they have trouble telling the truth even by accident. The overt lies are of a magnitude I can't begin to exaggerate. So for a working understanding please believe that with almost everything they lied and that many of the lies are simply enormous and unpardonable. If you want I'll give you some in advance.

What I have in mind is a very simple formula: going over the article almost word-by-word, bracketing what it says with documented and often documentary proof

One of the things I mean by intellectual judo is this, their strength to become their weakness.

The formula provides a means for as much speed as I'm capable of now. It also provides for publishing, I strongly believe in facsimile, official proofs entirely unknown except to the small number of people who have read and still remember Post Mortem. But because JAMA said these things that are so grossly false; because it became inappropriately political; because it abandoned all the principles of pathology; because it ignored all but what it asked the prosecutors of what they included in their autopsy report - which makes all they omitted relevant, for example the certificate of death, it becomes at once an exciting and authoritative, really definitive and entirely new book that with any attention at all will make it impossible for the official solution to be adhered to any more, and a means of telling people what they did not know about the truth, the actualities, the dishonesties without even having to refer to them this way.

By following the article it will break into chapters. I am certain of this and all else I've said and I'd hate to have to take the time to make any real outline of it now. I want to get it on paper. It would perhaps be better if I could just dictate it if there were someone who could transcribe it. As I've thought of this, and as for the most part

^{What}
I'll do as I write, I'll indicate evidence to be picked up and inserted, the other side and the truth, the real fact.

After doing this with the article I'll be writing; inserts from the news accounts of the press conference. I do hope through a friend to be getting a transcript of it, which will be much better.

For example, what I'm about to get into as soon as I can, they said that none of the doctors had said anything for 29 years. They all did. I interviewed three myself and in 1966 I prepared a Baltimore Sun reporter to interview Boswell, the No. 2 man at the autopsy. One of the things I primed him for was the single-bullet theory and the official autopsy body chart, which shows the wound on the back where it was, down on the back and not in the neck, as they testified and illustrated to the Commission any say again in JAMA. Boswell's explanation is that in haste he'd made a simple error that he would not have made if he'd had any reason to believe it was important! The whole "solution" rests entirely on this and he says it was not important, that he'd made a simple mistake about something of no importance. In an autopsy? On a PRESIDENT?

When he realized that he'd gotten away with this with the Sun reporter somehow the AP got interested and before the Sun story could appear the next morning it went all around the world on the AP wire!

And how about that breaking those 29 yrs of silence when he in 1966 alone had these two interviews that were published so widely?

And here is where the death certificate becomes important: it locates the back wound exactly where that chart does. And it was hidden! It was not used by the Commission, which hid it where I found it the one place nobody would ever look for it, with the copy sent to be printed! along with the remaining original holograph of the autopsy.

In this they lied and I won't go into all of that now but I will illustrate why what I published in Post Mortem and is unknown fits so beautifully. They said they were not told to make any changes, were not pressured at all. (I'm here skipping the other relevant and quite important new lies about this business.) In the office of the commander of the Navy hospital, Admiral Galloway, Hughes was told to make the changes that are visible. You can see how many there are and that they are substantive. It begins on p. 509. All reference to "puncture" wounds are removed. And as an indication of the magnitude of some of the other ordered changes, look at what was done to the head wound on 515.

Hughes says, as he testified before the House assassins, that he destroyed his notes because they held the President's body fluids. Well, those same fluids are on the body chart and it was not copied over. He says he wrote those notes out all over again and he did not and they do not exist. My checking of this includes even the Navy hospital. What he really destroyed is the first draft of the autopsy, about which in time alone he also lies IN JAMA. That was as soon as he knew Oswald was dead and there would be no trial. I

have the receipt for those notes!

What I have in mind, to make it definitive on JAMA and its pathologist editor, is to use some parts of Post Mortem to make it obvious that with any investigation at all what JAMA needed to be honest and truthful instead of a propaganda arm or errant government was readily available to it. (I gave white wash to Borzell in 1964, he knew, too!)

It just occurred to me that this will have much importance in validating my earlier work.

I've just heard from my doctor. I drove 41 there so she could be with her sister when she is examined for her back trouble. I asked her to ask the doctor if I should come in because of this new injury to the more damaged leg and I have an afternoon appointment.

Another hunk out of the working day!

This book will make a scandal, in addition to being a new and definitive book on the JFK assassination and its investigations, of a magnitude hard to exaggerate. There will be, among many other outraged, many doctors whose indignation will be monumental. That their major professional organization could do something as bad, as unprofessional as this?

and, of course, it becomes a means of bringing the most definitive fact to light, fact unknown to almost all and to virtually no reviewers. If any. There may be an exception like Lardner, but in context that with him will mean nothing at all and may show him how to write an even more significant review.

Like so much, this is off the top of the head. I hope it is clear enough and tells you what you want to know.

It is quote literally true that all involved lied about almost everything of any importance at all when the truth, on JAMA's side, was available and, obviously, was known to the lying doctors.

And this is NOT the trash of theories about which my recent mail is full of praise for me for sticking to fact and advancing no theories.

So many things become appropriate with this simple formula! Like the Katzenbach memo on spelling out the need to lie and coverup. On that I now have the LBJ phone logs. I think you remember the memo. Well, Sunday night - Katzenbach spoke to Hoover as soon as Oswald was dead - Moyers phoned LBJ, after which, immediately, LBJ phoned both Hoover and Katzenbach!

In haste I'll read and correct this to be able to mail it when I go to the doctor.

With regrets about you father,

One simplification is that this book will prove without any question at all that the autopsy was deliberately faked. ^{and} lied about then and since and now by JAMA, which means AMA.

Harold