

Dear Mr. Jolliffe,

8/5/96

While I do not know what reasons there were for the medical chicanery I am inclined they were intended to make a non-conspiracy story more credible. It appears that there were two shots to the head from those 40 dust-like fragments and their dispersal.

I believe that Burkley's is the correct locating of the wound in the back. All we know supports that.

In any conjecture about where any shot from the front originated, remember there are two grassy knolls there. The bridge appears to be impossible from the number of people on it.

With regard to the FBI's tests, do not assume that it did what it was supposed to have done. Nor that it tells the truth. But it did state in court that it gave me all the "results" it has of the testing.

All I remember on the shirt and the tie are hearsay testimony but they may have disclose the spectrographic plates.

Sorry I do not know the answer re that 15x20 mm. "structure."

Thanks and best wishes,

Handwritten signature

August 1, 1996

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I have been an admirer of yours for some years now, and I have purchased all of your books. You are clear and direct (unlike, say, Harrison Livingstone whose writings are convoluted, contradictory, and largely worthless.)

After re-reading portions of Never Again I have some questions that I hope you will have time to answer:

1. I do not understand why it was necessary for the Bethesda doctors to misrepresent the location of the entry wound at the back of Kennedy's skull. After looking at the holograph of the autopsy that you published in Post Mortem, I agree with you that the change from "tangential to the skull" to "laceration" (I am using my memory here - I do not have Post Mortem in ~~front~~ ^{front} of me as I write) is material. What I do not understand, ~~though~~, is how a wound at the hairline would be more likely to incriminate Oswald than a wound of entrance nearer the top of the back of the head. If anything, it seems to me that an entrance wound that was lower on the head (and yet still responsible - in theory - for the massive "exit" wound) would be harder - not easier - for the framers to allege to have come from the sixth floor window.

I think that you are right, namely, that Humes was pressured by Galloway to mislocate that wound. But why? What did that serve? Were those engaged in the cover-up confused? Or stupid? Or am I missing something?

2. The Department of Justice panel's report (as cited by Howard Roffman in Presumed Guilty) locates Kennedy's back wound as at the level of the seventh cervical vertebra - or in the neck. In Post Mortem you cite Dr. Burkely's Certificate of Death as locating the wound at the third thoracic vertebra. Who is right? I am inclined to think that JFK was struck in the throat, and that that missile emerged out his back. This would seem to suggest a fairly level trajectory, possibly from the front left. Any ideas as to where that shot originated from?
3. With the advent of the A.R.R.B., is there any chance of getting the FBI's analysis of the spectrographic tests done on the fragments from JFK's skull? Or those tests done on his shirt and tie?

Does the 13 X 20 mm. "structure" that is depicted in a photograph of JFK's head show up in any of the skull x-rays? I was startled to read of it in Never Again. Is it a bullet fragment? Is it metal? What is it?

I thank you Mr. Weisberg for taking the time to read this, and I hope you respond. In any event, I hope this finds you well, and I hope you continue to write and publish. I donated my copy of Selections from Whitewash to the local library, and it is regularly checked out.

Sincerely,



Paul Jolliffe