CHAPTER47
The Creators of the JFK Assassination Industry

Those who invented the JFK Assassination Industry, on the working rather than the policy level, were assistant counsels.

Most were young and for them it was a career opportunity.

The closest to an authentic liberal was Arlen Specter, former Philadelphia assistant district attorney. He was then a member of the liberal Americans for Democratic Action. When he left the Commission he switched, quit the ADA and became a Republican. As a Republican he was elected district attorney and then United States Senator from Pennsylvania A few of the older assistant counsel were somewhat inclined toward liberalism and some were rather conservative.

Once the Report was out most remained silent about their work on the Commission and on its Report that they wrote. The exception was David Belin. The Report and his own work on the Commission were his dybbuk. For him exorcism was possible only by verbose proclamations of his purity. He wrote two book and he was always welcome on the oped pages in his continued rewriting of our history – and of his.

When Oliver Stone's movie JFK was a smash international sensation the Commission's embarrassed assistant counsels held a coast-to-coast press conference in which they all issued their joint proclamation of their honorability on the Commission. Along with the other writing on which I was then engaged I researched enough of the record of most of them for a planned book, Honorable Men, in the Shakespearian sense of "honorable men."

Then we had a furnace blow~back. It deposited a fine soot on every surface of our

house and on everything in it. In any home that is a major cleanup job. In ours, with two overcrowded offices in it and with a full basement that was part publisher's warehouse and mostly the repository of some 40 file cabinets, innumerable boxes of records and quite a few of office supplies, it was a major operation for the professional crew recommended by our insurance company. It had crews of as many as seven people at a time engaged in it over a period of about three weeks.

Because the file cabinets in my office have no empty space and because I am relatively immobile I use boxes for researched information. Some were where I sit to type, within easy reach on the floor near my chair.

By the time the cleanup was finished we had no idea where many things were and among what I could not locate was the research and a little writing for Honorable Men..

I continued with other writing. NEVER AGAIN! was a rather long book. So was whatI next wrote, although it was published first, Case Open. As I continued on Inside the JFK Assassination Industry it grew to at least 200,000 words. Case Open had been close to that 1ength before publisher butchery. I'd written a long article, Senator Russell Dissents and had started enlarging it into a book when the box that held the Honorable Men research was found.

This book was already too long to include all that in it so instead, when there was an appropriate occasion, I wrote David Belin the long letter than follows, using him, the most vocal of the former assistant counsels, as illustrative of them all:

I was more unwell than usual then and it shows:

Mr. David Belin
Belin, Harris Lamson McCormick
200 Financial Center
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
1/8/95

Dear Mr. Belin,

I am sure you remember our debate at Vanderbilt University toward the end of 1975.

You may remember that I was then not able to stand while I spoke. I was only recently out of the hospital after suffering the first of a series of venous thromboses. I'd been released for travel too soon. The next morning I could not get a shoe on one foot. When they saw me at the airport I was single-loaded and a nurse who was on the plane was brought to sit with me. It is because I'd been unwell and required to keep my legs elevated that I was not able to shorten my prepared remarks. These medical problems also account for both my typing and my writing. My legs are elevated when I type and when I write and thus when I read and correct what I have written it is on a clipboard in my left hand, in the air, and I write with my right hand. So I along with explaining why my typing is so poor, as I do with all others, I apologize for it.

As you may not know, despite that and subsequent medical problems I filed more than a dozen FOIA lawsuits. As a result I obtained about a third of a million pages of previously-withheld records, mostly those of the FBI. I make them freely available to all writing in the field, along with the also unsupervised use of our copier. I do this despite knowing that almost all will write what I do not agree with. Several of those suits were precedental and one was cited in the legislative history of the 1974 amending, of the Act as requiring the amending of the investigator files exemption to return it to tho meaning of the Act as originally drafted. If this is news to you, then you may be interested in the fact that the Senator who saw to it that the legislative history is clear was the sole surviving Kennedy brother.

Contrary to your usual representation, that those who do not agree with the official mythology to which you contributed so much are "sensationalist" as you know from my books I restrict myself almost entirely to the official evidence, including a not inconsiderable volume of what you contrived. You at least have my Post Mortem because you had it at Vanderbilt and said you then had read half of it. I've just checked the index. I refer to you in that book 13 times. I do not recall that any one of those times I had occasion to speak well of your work on the Commission but I have not heard a word of complaint or correction from you.

As I recall it was about midnight when that debate and a little conversation after it ended. That was on a Thursday night. The earliest you could have been home was sometime Friday. You then announced that you would hold a press conference the next day, a Saturday, and you did. You then called for a new investigation. That after more than a decade you did the first possible moment after our debate, after I detailed your record to your face. What I did and after what you had read in Post Mortem - and I do not recall that with the fine opportunity you had at Vanderbilt you made any protest over what I wrote or attributed any error to it - leads to the belief that there was a cause-effect relationship.

Rabbi Sam Silver is a dear friend of my youth. He sent me your letter to him of August 10, 1993. Aside from the limitations we both have and are lucky to have survived we then were preparing for guests who wanted to be with us on the occasion of our being awarded honorary doctorates inhumane letters for the work we have done on the assassinations. Then, as I again busied myself with

work, I forgot about what I regard as a like evasion and a false description of my work. It is a description you knew was false when you wrote it. By then I had published six books on the Kennedy assassination. Your words are, referring; to me, "he regretfully, is inaccurate." With those six books giving you ample opportunity, I herewith solicit from you justification for your words. I am asking you to show me any significant error in those books. At this time I have a special interest in that.

Several years ago, when it was clear that the time remaining to me cannot be long, I decided to use all of that time I can perfecting the assassination record, including that of the investigations of which you were part, to the degree that is now possible for me. I have several book-length studies completed, each dealing with a different aapect, and I am now working on another. Its title is Inside the JFK Assassination Industry. While it is not possible to be all-inclusive in this, I do treat with the books of both extremes and am adding the participation in this industry of the Commission, which really both got it started and made the rest possible. It was in this connection that I revealed your letter to Sam.

I got it out. You also included several of your needless articles that stripped of their sanctimony boil down to "I am right because I say I am right. I intend to use what quote above of your letter and what you say in those articles in this writing. I will be using this letter and any response you may make. I will use what you may send in facsimile so that there may hot be any self-serving accusation that I was not faithful to it or made any changes in it.

If you do not respond I'll use this letter and say that I heard nothing from you. Your explanation to Sam of your not making any specific response to whatever he said or in explanation of your saying I am "inaccurate," is as we both know, not in accord with the facts or with your extensive history of using any and every excuse possible to get an article or oped piece published and of writing innumerable letters to newspapers all over the country. I have copies of them that were sent to me. You not only do not "respond," you also do not respond in what you cannot respond by saying, that I am inaccurate, because you claim not to have time. You find all the time in the world for self-serving attention in all the media and for more articles or any kind and letters than any, if not in fact all of your former Commission colleagues. What I am saying

is that you could not and knew you could not document your insult to me and to my work to my dear friend so instead you resorted to evasion and untruth.

Remember, I am soliciting your documentation of what you say and of what you refer to as my inaccuracies, with the intention of using them entirely unaltered.

You used your letter to Sam, in addition to in effect calling me a liar and sensationalist to give him several of your self-serving and I say without any equivocation false and inaccurate articles.

In referring to the ao-called magic bullet, Commission Exhibit 399, and to Governor

Connally's wounds in your New York Times oped piece June 25, 1993, you say that "Allthe physicians who treated Mr. Connally for his wounds agree that he had been struck by just one bullet, fired from behind." I go into that testimohy in the last two chapters of my first book. It was completed in mid-

February 1965. What you say is not true and in saying it you should have known it is untrue. Rather than take the time to cite all those who said the opposite of what you attribute to them, because that book fell open to pages 172 and 173 I see there that one of the doctors who treated Connally, Dr, Gregory. I quote from his testimony as I report it on the next page:

> "It was 'extremely unlikely' that it could have been the bullet to lodge in the Governor' s thigh. (2h376)"

On the same page of my book I quote him as saying of your magic bullet that in the official mythology cause all of Connally's wounds he says a second bullet hit him.

Not only did Dr. Gregory say other than what you say he did, he also said it was not possible at the point in the Zapruder film you say it did.

On page 176 I quote testimony by Dr. Shires, who was in charge of Connally's treatment, (Sorry I mean, Dr. Shaw) as not agreeing with the made-up single-bullet magic. When further questioned by Allen Dulles, who asked if there had been two bullets Shaw's reply, contrary to your representation of it, answered Dulles, "Yes; or Three".

I could go on and on with this but I think these are adequate to prove that you knowingly misrepresented your own testimony to serve your own purposes and that it was less than honest.

My inadvertent references to Dr. Shires above I use to call to your attention what I believe cannot be accidental mistakes you made.

The only Connally fragments you refer to are those "removed from his wrist." In this, to you are less than other than honest. You know very well that Dr. Shires attested to a fragment remaining in Connally's chest and you know too, that there was one in his thigh. You do not mention them because it is obvious, as the doctors whose testimony you misrepresent did testify, all the fragments without them came to more than was missing from that Magic bullet.

You then go into Dr. Vincent P. Guinn's HSCA testimony knowingly using- I say misusing what serves your purpose and eliminating the grim actuality of what he said, that "the fragments removed from Mr. Connally came from the bullet found in the hospital which were ballistically proven to have come from Lee Harvey Oswald's rifle." This is an absolute impossibility and I would appreciate it if you explain it as coming from your ignorance of ballistics testing of it you said what is not true deliberately. Those as you say correctly "postage-stamp weight specimens were not capable of ballistics testing. You did say of them that Guinn subjected them to neutron activation analysis.

You are familiar with this testimony and you are much less than honest in what you suppress from it. Because it is easier for me to report the Washington Post's story, for which I prepared George Lardner as best I could, anticipating what I correctly did anticipate, I cite it. The date of the issue is September 9, 1978.

What you suppressed, and I submit it has also the effect of lying about his testimony and what it means, is what I refer to.

Guinn's tests also created a new mystery, however. The fragments the FBI tested in 1964, he told Fithian, have all disappeared. Guinn said he had carefully weighed the bits and pieces of metal brought to him by officials of the National Archives last year and not one of them matched the fragments recorded in the FBI data."

"The Pierces brought out by the Archives did not include any of the specific pieces the FBI analyzed,' he testified. 'Where they are I have no idea."

At this point I believe it is not inappropriate for me to cite the Unabridged Random House definition of shyster;

> 1. A lawyer who uses unprofessional or questionable methods; 2. One who gets along by petty, sharp practise."

In one of these articles you boast that know more about the ballistics evidence than anyone else, dubious at best but that is not unique for you. You also use, which is to say misuse as here with Guinn, that HSCA testimony. So you do not seem able to claim that it was through ignorance that you misrepresented entirely the results of Guinn's testing and his testimony. Knowing it, referring to it as you do, I asked you to tell me how this was less than "sharp practise" by you. I ask you also if this is accepted or "unprofessional or questionable methods."

Those tests of 1964 you legal eagles on the Commission did not even get! I sued them and I did get them. Anticipating a possible defense you may make, Neutron activation analysis does not consume the specimen.

I also deposed four of those FBI Lab agents. Gallagher, who did the spectrographic examinations and supervised the NAAs, testified as you say that postage stamp weight is all that is required. In measurements he gave it no moro than a millimeter.

If as you should have, and if there is any basis at all for your boast about both your knowledge and your expertise, you did examine Bullet 399, which seems to me to be a requisite for any claim of subject-matter expertise and for what you say about it and of course it was examined and testified to at your Com-mission and you saw that Frazier gouge, an ever so much larger than necessary for the core specimen. Of this you Hawkshaws did not even ask him after seeing it, and you did nothing to learn why he took so much and what happened to it. You did not do what I think is required of lawyers, seeing to it that the evidence is pristine. The need for you to have done that is apparent from Guinn's testimony-the part you personally suppress in your self-glorification in this and in other oped pieces.

Now an additional and side issue I raise with you is did you impose upon the trust of the Times? You did on the trust of the people who read you article the most minor criticism I can think of about it is that it is inordinately boastful and self-serving.

On deposition Frazier testified that he did not have any special reason for taking what is so obviously too much, that he did not weigh it, and that he did not know what happened to it. I'll come to the direct quote, but you say you are the expert on this evidence.

Yet the Commission did not go into this at all. In all 26 volumes it has not a single reference to Frazier's having removed any specimen from the bullet core. Did none of this suggest to you. a self-proclaimed expert, that questions had to be asked, why so much was taken, why it was not weighed, and that the FBI now cannot account for what happened to it?

I also got from the FBI, as you know from my publishing it in Post Mortem, a clear photograph of the front of the President's shirt. Not only did I present the evidence that it was not caused by any bullet, the picture itself shows the layman, less than the expert you say you are, that those slits are not and could not possibly have been caused by any bullet. They were caused by a nurse's scalpel as Dr. Carrico told me and as I report in that book. Is it possible that if I could see this with the naked eye that all of you Sherlock Holmses did not see that?

Frazier and Shaneyfelt, the Lab photo expert, were Commission witnesses. There was not a single question asked about this shirt collar damage that in any related to what is so very obvious in it.

We showed that picture to Frazier, something none of you Hercule Poirots did when you should have, and asked him about it. He testified readily that as soon as he saw the shirt he had questions and that he referred them to a hair-and-fibres expert, Paul Stombaugh, for Stombaugh to do the Lab work and report on it. That Stombaugh report was withheld from me, but should you Inspector Masons with law degrees, have conducted enough of an investigation to have learned of and have gotten that report?

As you should have and did not ask the obvious questions about that shirt collar-damage?

Or how the nick on the tie got there? You Sam Spades not only assumed it was caused by a bullet-you told the people that and your entire report is based upon it!

Now the pictures of that tie the FBI gave you were described to me by the Archives photographer as requiring all the great skills of the FBI to make them so bad, so meaningless. But you Perry Masons had the actual tie to look at.

Now, lawyers that you all were, former prosecutor that Specter was, did none of you think to see whether there was a hole through tho tie as required by that very basis of your report, that the exiting magic bullet went slap dab through it? The is no hole in the tie. Rather is there a mere nick. And it, on the knot, is at the upper left extreme of that knot as worn. Yet the slits you pretend were a bullet hole when they do not coincide in either length of their positions on the buttoned neckband, were not at

all where that nick is. How in the world, even it those slits were a bullet hole, could theft one bullet go through the middle of the neckband and not touch the tie at all except for that nick at its upper left extreme -- that is also as far from the center as it could
be and exist at all?

You knew the bullet left spectrographic traces in th back of the President's coat and jacket yet with that endless magic left none at all on either the shirt front or the knot. Did it not occur to any all you Paul Drakes to ask tho FBI how it could possibly be that the bullet had the magic required to decide where it would and would not deposit traces?

Those NAA tests that all you managed not even to learn about, such being your Agatha Christie competences, resulted in the admission that the scrapings from the inside of the windshield no longer exist. That was FBI specimen Q15. What kind of investigation did you conduct if you did not learn that it had disappeared and why?

I could say more about the results of those FBI NNAs that I got and none of you gave a damn about but I restrict myself to one, one that is not new to you because I report it in Post Mortem. The Dallas police made paraffin tests including to the byproducts of firing a rifle from Oswald's cheek. The last minute effort to make nothing of this by the Commission was to call Gallagher as its last witness, as I recall on September 15-when tho Report had to have been in page proof for the index in it. It was only nine days later that a copy was given to the President. Gallagher testified that paraffin tests are not conclusive. He was not asked the obvious question about that as should have occurred to the kind of expert you say you are, the best of all you say. It is a well-known fact that they are not incriminating and to this extent Gallagher told the truth. But they have been recognized as definitive exculpatory evidence for at least 75 years.

Well at Oak Ridge they had a number of people fire that rifle. They than made and tested paraffin face casts. And as you saw in Post Mortem, <u>each and every one of those</u> hold the normal <u>byproducts of firing a rifle!</u> I call to your attention that you write Sam that I am "inaccurate," in effect do not know what I talk about, after, long after you had read Post Mortem. Almost 10 years later, after all those letters and articles wrote, after all those appearances you made on TV, and you then wrote your Final Disclosure: The Truth About the assassination of President Kennedy. You have no mention of this in that book. You have none of what I say about the damage to the President's clothing or what you should have investigated and didn't, the substitution of other for the specimens that were removed from the Connally wrist. Final Disclosure? Full Truth? Do these words apply to you? I suggest your use of these words is like love from the mouth of whore.

To the Times you quote yourself as saying there is "nothing inconsistent between Mr. Connally's belief that the second shot had struck him and the findings of the commission..."

This is so outrageous a lie and to your knowledge a lie you are self-described as a liar! You have become so obsessed with exculpating yourself you have become lost in it and what it drives you to! You know very well that absolutely basic to the Commission's conclusions is it that only the second

bullet missed in that mythology. When you pull something like this you are concerned with conning people into not thinking you failed to meet your obligations you are insensitive to your self-condemnation in history in what you say. Or of what may be thought of your children if you have any. I have for years watched your irrationalities you inflict on the people through the media that trusts you but that you could lie this brazenly really does astound me.

This lack of contact with reality is manifest in the first words of your Wall Street Journal "Counterpoint" piece of January 16, 1992:

> "I have more firsthand knowledge about the key witnesses and the physical evidence of the assassination of President Kennedy than anyone else. I am the only person in the world who has had access to everything in the Warren Commission files and CIA files about the assassination."

You know, as a lawyer, that the most important part of the investigation of a homicide is the part of the Commission's work that Arlen Specter handled, without you. You also know that Wesley Liebeler conducted more depositions that you did, and as best i recall, to mention just two of them, he deposed Abraham Zapruder, whose film was so basic in the Commission's work, and James T. Tague, who was slightly injured by the missed shot. How much more important "physical evidence" did the Commission have than Zapruder's film? And who was more of a "key witness" to one of the three shots the Commission admits than Tague? He was wounded slightly by it.

However you may torture words to give "physical evidence" a special meaning they do not have your knowledge of it cannot begin to compare with that of the FBI that did most of the Commission's so-called investigation for it and all of its Laboratory testing, ballistics studies, hair-and-fibres examinations all all its photographic work. You have been so irrationally driven to seek self-justification that you either lose contact with reality in saying this or it has come to the point in your obsession that you cannot tell the truth even by accident!

I have what I believe most people would regard as the best authority in the world for saying that your claimed knowledge of those matters is inferior to mine - the FBI and its Department of Justice counsel in my C.A, 75-226. In an opposition it told that court about me, the plaintiff,"plaintiff could makes such claims ad infinitum since he is perhaps more familiar with the events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the FBI."(If you want to know the circumstances surrounding this exceptional evaluation by an adversary in court let me know.)

I used FOIA to get and I did get what it was your (plural)obligation to get and you not only did not, you did not have either the personal courage to tangle with the FBI to get what you knew it had and had not given you. One of many examples is the above cited NAA results. You timid souls either never did learn that those tests were made or you lacked the integrity to tell that to the people. That they were made is not to my knowledge indicated in either the Report or in any of those massive 26 volumes of supposed evidence appended to it.

All of you gumshoes together are such demon investigators you could not find pubic hair in an overworked and undercleaned whore house - at rush hour.

"As for the Journal's allegation that the Warren Commission was 'less intent on truth than in unifying the nation,'" you told it, describing that as "hogwash when it is the obvious, and well-established official fact, beginning with the Commission's own outline of its own work. Always boastful, you then say, "I was one of the people selected by Earl Warren," trading on his name here, "to serve as counsel to his Commission."

You were not "counsel to his commission." You were one of the assistants to him, J. Lee Rankin, who was its general counsel.

Warren selected you? Of all the country's young, ambitious and upwardly mobile lawyers he knew about you in Des Moines and just had to have you on his staff? Is this not what you told the Journal? Are you sure you did not apply for the job? Or that some political figure recommended you for it?

You quote "One of the most vivid memories of my professional career" in a knowingly inadequate reference to "our first meeting with him, "when he uttered five words I will never forget: 'truth is our only client'." First, are you saying that in that "professional career" of which you boast you'd never heard that cliche before? Come now, get back on tho ground, out of that stratosphere in which you float sublimely unaware of the spectacle you make of yourself.

Now it just happens, as you know if you have my fourth book of the Whitewash series, that none of you career-oriented and minded assistant counsels did I did in bringing the

Commission memos on that meeting to light. I do not remember one from you in the Commission's files, either, is it seems to me reflects just how "vivid" you considered it then. As you know if you have the book, one of the two staff memos I found on that session of January 20, 1964 I reproduce in facsimile on page 24 and a different one on the next page, also in facsimile. Neither of those memos say what you say Warren said at that meeting, but of course those two of your former associates may not have found the well-known cliche as "vivid" as you did.

What you do not say that Warren told you at that meeting I believe most people, including the Journal's editor, would have found much more significant. He was telling you why he took the job of heading that Commission when he not only knew it was wrong, that he should not, but also because he'd polled the Court and to a man they urged him not to. (At that point, in addition to why no Justice should take such a role on, the Jack Ruby case was headed to that Court and Warren would have had to disqualify himself. This is to say nothing about what Ruby counsel might have argued about whether the Court could be considered impartial when its head was so parti pris.

Your former associate Melvin Eisenberg says of what Warren then told you what

you somehow then, now or all the time, found less "vivid" that the cliche. He was explaining why he took the job when he should not have. The reason, in Eisenberg's words, is that if he did not it "could conceivably lead the country into a war which could cost 40 million lives." That without there having been a conspiracy? And how many potential adversaries were there capable of waging a war in which there could be so many lives lost? To say nothing about other casualties and damage?

Howard Willens' memo is on the next pages. He must not have found what Eisenberg emphasized very "vivid" because he makes no mention of it. And neither quotes wtat you say was so "vivid" to you.

Republican that you are you cannot and do not overlook the dishonest opportunity you made up to at one and the same time hold Robert Kennedy responsible for your Commission's conclusion, and trading on his name. In the course of criticizing Oliver Stone's JFK you refer to the alleged and I tell you nonexisting "fact that Robert Kennedy had someone from the Justice Department serve both as counsel to the Warren Commission and as liaison with Justice."

If you did not know this was in all parts untrue from your work on the Commission you did see the Commission's records I use in the Post Mortem chapter "Hades not Camelot." The Commission started trying to get Kennedy to endorse the part it had not yet written not later than June, 1964. You were, of course, men of principle practising. the highest standards of lawyers in this. The truth is that Robert Kennedy was, and I think correctly, entirely detached from the investigation of his brother's assassination and he made this clear in the Commission's records published. He in fact did not endorse your report. A minor oversight on your part in what I quote from you? That is not a "questionable method," not "petty, sharp practise," counselor?

Because this is so vile, trying to make the victim's brother privy to if not in some way responsible for your Commission and its conclusions -why else do you use his name when it is a lie? I am blunt in this and tell you you are a liar. If you had done even a fraction of the work you boast about having done and in that having acquired more knowledge than anyone else, you would have known that it was not Robert Kennedy who got that idea and selected Willens. It was Nicholas Katzenback, then Deputy AG, and I have his records on that.

You make this even viler in next saying, "Robert Kennedy wanted to know who killed his brother." Who didn't? What smidgeon of proof do you have to use his name this way, as I quote your words to the Journal?

He was and he remained detached from the investigation and he not only was not involves in your Commission's work your own records I published and you have make it clear that he intended to preserve that detachment.

In the light of this truth, the truth you should have know or you could not decently or ethically or morally say what you say, and especially because you are of the party that opposed him, I think that

what you do here is so dirty it cannot be condemned

Have you no shame?

On Oliver Stone, by the way, it was I, not you, who began the criticism of him. I did not Oppose his making a movie or saying in it what he wanted to say. I opposed it because in announcing it he described it as non-fiction. He was not sufficiently informed to do a nonfiction movie about the assassination and as I assured him in advance of his shooting by several months, that was impossible if based on the Garrison and Marrs books.

I suggested that it be exposed to George Lardner of the Washington Post, not you. I gave Lardner a copy of the script that had been mailed to me and access to all my records, including particularly on Garrison, including an even worse offense by him I blocked at the request of several on his staff when they failed.

I go back to one of your earlier lies, and I mince no words, it was a knowing and intended lie, to cite what is a public record and is not as specific in my books as it later was when I got a copy of the press conference of two of "the physicians who treated" President Kennedy. You refer to only those who treated Connally o tell what the FBI itself makes a lie of as you should have known because the first copy of it I got from your Commission's file and reported in my first book. You say of the bullet that hit Connally, and you say there was only one, the bullet that you and your Commission said was from the back, the one you both said exited through his neck, shirt collar and tie, the single-bullet fabrication you continue to endorse in these articles, hat those doctors said the exact opposite of. At that press conference as soon as they cleaned up. Malcolm Perry, the only physician who had occasion to examine the wound in the front of the President's neck- he made the incision through it for the tube to assist breathing -was asked three times if that neck wound was caused by a shot from the front. Three times he said it was and all three times he was confirmed by the hospital's chief of neurosurgery, Dr. Kemp Clark. The AP carried that, the New York Times and the Washington Post, among most if not all the nation's papers reported it.

This of course, is your made-up history of that magic bullet. You say it caused all seven non-fatal wounds on both victims. The FBI and the Secret Service disagreed with you before your Commission got started and from the records I have never changed on this. As the five-volume report LBJ ordered of the FBI the night of the assassination and is Commission Document 1 in those files, could not be more explicit in saying, the first and third of these admitted shots hit Kennedy only and the second shot hit Connally only.

There is nothing more essential in what the Commission concluded and is in just about everything you write than the single-bullet myth Arlen Specter made up. Without that there is not any lone gunman. These words and your renewed endorsement of that myth are the last words in your letter to Sam. You say this in different words that mean the same thing in your Times oped piece. Above you words saying it the Times has this subhead: "The single-bullet theory is solid." You used these words in the Journal article you sent Sam with your letter, "Lee Harvey Oswald as the lone gunman..."

You could say this because each and every one of you lawyers should have known what you suppressed from the Report you assistant counsels wrote your own evidence that proves beyond question that it was impossible. In what I will say I do, and I want you not to be under any misapprehension about this, believe it established "petty sharp practise and is the use of "unprofessional or questionable methods," the words of the definition of shyster. If as I believe is not possible you did not know what I go into from your Commission work it is in my first book you have to have to justify in your own twisted and obsessed mind what you say of my writing and it is in Post Mortem, which you do have and said you did read.

Secret from your Report is the fact that the Commission had the NRA produce the country's very best shots. All were rated "master." The Oswald rifle was overhauled and they still could not make the sight work. It was not made for that rifle, which was not intended for a telescopic sight. They had to shim the sight to be able to use it. Their tests for you were at the Aberdeen proving rounds. The test conditions were rigged to make it easier to duplicate the shooting you attributed to Oswald. Who, by the way, was in your own records evaluated by the Marine Corps officially as "A rather poor 'shot.'" The elevation was half that of claimed reality, and the steeper the shot the more difficult it is. That made it easier. Thet shot from rugged platforms rather than from behind a window tho sill of which was only about a foot from the floor, with all those cartons around it. Their targets were fixed in the ground, which gave them all the time in the world to adjust. And, of course, they were not moving and there was no fully-leaved live oak tree in their way. Even then, not one of these country's best shots could duplicate the shooting all of you attributed to Oswald! This is in your own testimony, the testimony of Ronald Simmons. It is in my two books I cited above.

And it is not in anything you ever wrote in your veritable torrent of misrepresentation of the truth, of the grim reality.

Referring to this as shysterism is, I believe, to praise it, it is that unconscionable.

Again I ask, "Have you no shame?" Is not what you say and were part of worse for the nation than even McCarthyism?

In what you said and I wrote above in which you seek to give the impression that you are the world's best extpert in "the physical evidence," (which those tests are, by the way, are they not?) you say you read every word th CIA had.

If you did not know that was neither true nor possible when you headed the Rockefeller Commission's whitewash and coverup, then you were not even as good as a Keystone Kop as an investigator.

The first of those CIA records, and they are restricted to Oswald only, that the CIA deposited under the 1992 law at the National Archives, was 18 1/2 feet thick. That means about three stuffed file cabainets. It had and has ever so much more, but take just these three file cabinets of records could you

have read them and done anything else in many months?

In my FOIA litigation I got about a third of a million pages. I know how long it takes just to read them, leave alone make the notes that are indispensible in my use made of them.

Again I ask, "Have you no shame?"

But what did you do with the records you did get? First off the bat I say you suppressed the CIA's evidence that disproves the Commission's made-up "solution" in terms of the shooting, as captured on the Zapruder film. Using it you (plural) said it shows that the President was hit by the first shot at frame 210.

When I reprinted my third book of l967, Photographic Whitewash in 1976 I used some of your Rockefeller Commission records you suppressed. (pages 294ff)

You got from the CIA's National Photographic Interpretations Center, and I quote its handwritten reference on page 299, where I have your record in facsimile. They gave you "the four photo briefing boards made from the Zapruder film of President Kennedy's assassination." They gave you a tabular frame-interpretation, typed in six columns relating to four of the panels. Not a single one says that any shot was fired at Frame 210! And without that your Report is a fraud.

They gave you a written, columnary version of their conclusions, and those of LIFE Magazine which bought the Zapruder film rights and of "Other Possibilities."

Their interpretation is that the first shot was fired at Frame 206. The last column says the same thing from "other possibilities". At that frame the President and his limousine were completely blocked by, were invisible through that densely-leaved live oak tree.

This is to say that the nation's best photo-interpretation experts say your Report is impossible.

The records i publish in facsimile are copies of your Rockefeller Commission records, his is to say, you knew. Moreover, you regularly boast of having read and understood it all. So I ask again, Have you no shame" when you suppressed this from your report?

You have a great time without "Rosetta Stone" concoction coming from your first book. You say that the Tippit killing is this Rosetta Stone of the JFK assassination.

You, personally, made the time-reconstruction case the Commission used to get Oswald to the scene of that crime in time to do it. I published what I say without comment from you and I said it to your face at Vanderbilt, and you could not wriggle your way around it. Creating condition favorable to your preconception with no valid base for them, even then you could not get Oswald there, by the time you said he, Tippit, was shot!

And if that is not "Rosetta Stone" enough, in this you suppressed from the Report a document

you had and I got from your files, the affidavit of T. F. Bowley. If you by any remote possibility missed that in your boasted-of reading of all the Commission's records, which means 200 cubic feet of them did you invent speed reading?- I published it in facsimile in what you have and read, Post Mortem. Don't take the time to use the index. It is on page 493.

Your Commission specialized in having as file copies what disproved its conclusions close to illegible copies when in fact it had legible originals. An earlier illustration of this that I also published in facsimile is the handwritten memo with which Secret Service agent John Joe Howlett forwarded to Washington the night of the assassination a copy of Zapruder's film. In it he said that Zapruder told him he actually felt a bullet pass over his right shoulder from that grassy Knoll. In and of itself this disproves your Report, you had it on file, you did not ask either Howlett or Zapruder to testify to it-you suppressed it from your Report and from your deliberations in preparing for that Report.

Want a real "Rosetta Stone"-- here it is!

Your file copy of the Bowley affidavit is close to illegible. You should recognize the number 11 at the bottom of that affidavit as an FBI numbering they used in collections of records into volumes. Because I pinpoint you, personally, in what I wrote, instead of giving you my typing that I regret cannot be any better I attach a xerox of that page. While the text of the Bowley affidavit from your files in pretty poor, the footnote I added is quite legible. In it I accused you of suppressing that evidence, that affidavit. I said that you said that Tippit was killed at 1:15 because "Domingo Benavides reported the killing over Tippit's radio 'at about 1:16 p.m.'" (Did you not shade even that a bit to make your case?) I then say, "Yet Benavides had told

Belin that another man had placed the call" and I cited the testimony, at 6H449. Now this was your area. I then say, "That man, T.F.Bowley, was never questioned by the Commission and is never mentioned in the Report." (No wonder, huh?)

Bowley looked a his watch. He was on his way to pick his wife up. It was then 1:10 p.m. and Tippit had already been shot. That, I then say, means "Oswald would have had no more than 7 minutes to walk almost a mile to the scene of the crime, an impossibility as Belin was well aware. What better reason for Belin to ignore Bowley and pretend the killing took place later?"

I went into this earlier, again 100% from <u>your</u> Commission records, in "The Tippit Murder" chapter of my first book. In it (page55) I get into your <u>personal</u> timing by beginning it earlier than the evidence permitted. That was to give Oswald more time, wasn't it? And I quote your own time reconstruction as taking 17 minutes and 45 seconds! (Page 56). Even with your hoked-up beginning time you could not get Oswald there to do it, in your own figures not mine or Bowley's, until two minutes and 45 second after it was on the police radio. Which nobody could get to work for a while and that <u>after</u> Tippit was already killed!

Here is your real, the only real Tippit Killing Rosetta Stone and you, personally made it and you, personally misrepresent it entirely in your "solution" to the JFK assassination!

Mack Sennett would have envied you!

I have herein limited myself to only some of what you foisted off on the Times and Journal's trusting editors and through them on the still-suffering people if you do not believe it, come or send someone to go over my files of correspondence. It should be clear to you that I have even greater possibilities. But aside from your endless running off at the mouth without regard to fact and truth, you are not at this stage of my life worth it. You have the impartiality and dependability of a Judenrat and in our society that is close to the role in which you cast yourself. Nobody held a gun to your head or threatened your family and you did not yourself face the gas chambers. But you did kill the truth and you intended to kill the truth in your obsessive quest for vindication and with the record you made, of which I have only a part in this, vindication for you simply is not possible.

No matter how you twist, distort, misrepresent and lie, your record is there in other than your less than honest version of it and you are going to have to live with the truth, not your fabled version of it.

You told my friend Sam that I and my work are "inaccurate." I am now 81, in serious impaired health. I've written this off the top of the head, and I solicit from you refutation, from your own evidence, of what I say which is also from your own evidence.

I suggest it is well past time for you to learn to keep your mouth closed and not damage your reputation even more and just to live with what you did do rather than try to persuade the world that you did not do it.

Ever boasting, you said to Sam, as you have to others (without any mention of any tax laws) that, "All royalities from it (your book) were set aside for charity.

That is a pretty tricky formulation, counsellor. Does it means that you are getting interest on it? And if it is for charity why in the world did you not give it to the charity you have in mind and let them get the benefit of it rather than setting it aside?

You are proud of that, huh? It makes you unique, is that what you are saying in your boasting? Well, you are not unique. You are a successful lawyer, a man of means compared with me. I did all the work I've done with no support, with no financial contributions - and do I have to tell you the cost of filing more than a dozen FOIA lawsuits some of which were stonewalled for a decade?-and although I usually find no occasion to mention it, what you are going to give away is peanuts, rancid peanuts being their source, compared with what I have. I have deeded all my work, the rights to all work, all those third of a million records I got from the government and all my work with and on them plus our property to a local small college that is also one of the best by the US News annual peer evaluations. Aside from our house we have 5+ acres where t is not easy to get a building lot for $100,000. The college already has those of my records I cannot now use. This includes, by the way, another of your Judenrat-like failures when you headed the Rockefeller Commission and were supposedly investigating the CIA and what it did. Frank Olson was a local scientist who was killed by the CIA when it slipped him, without

his knowledge, an overdose of LSD. I knew one of hos sons, both of whom are professionals of outstanding reputation, when he was a fine boy in high school. So I got what record the CIA dislosed. It is not possible to read them without seeing that it was responsible for his death and that its own investigation of itself was a whitewash and a coverup. As you should have seen in the papers recently, after the exhhumation of his body and careful and detailed examination of it by outstanding forensic experts, they concluded while they did not find a case of murder they could take to court, they have no doubt that he was murdered by being thrown from a hotel window from 12 stories up. Without your investigating it at all.

Although I do not expect any reply from you, I will respond to any denial or any mistake you allege and I will use any response you make in facsimile, as I will also report that if you make no response, I intend this as a direct challenge and we'll see if you are man enough, professional enough, informed as you boast you are uniquely informed if you do respond.

I regret that reading and correcting this will take some time.

I really do feel sorry for you,

/s/ Harold Weisberg