2/19/72

Dear Howard,

Read your 2/17 and skimmed enclosure when I was catching my breath after struggling to and from the road. Only for your information, not your agreement, I have included my response to Jerry'd handwritten, one-sheet protest/response. But he was less than honest,as I did not tell him. For example, he immediately sent me a package of file folders, but in such haste and such resentment that he didn't even look for a box for the, rapped them in brown paper, and they were a real mess when they got here-first-class mail at twice the cost of the folders themselves. Jerry must do things his way and he just goes about them in relations with people so there is no toehr choice for anyone. That is obvious every time he is here, when he alone inflicts his desires upon us, sometimes with the best of intentions, sometimes without thinking. When I remind him of thoughtlessness, let me give you an example, to go no further: He has been here with as many as I think 8 people. We just can't afford to feed that many people. He would but what he like, such things as San Gria, which neither Lil nor I like. He would spend too much money on it, and he would feel good because he had given us something to pay us back of show that he thought of us and that. But even in this area, he never brings what he knows we do use, for he usues enpugh of it when he is here. He is more than welcome. I am not throwing this up. I feel of him much as I would a son. But San Gria is a wasted expense for him and nothing for us. I finally persuaded him to stop it. There is only one exception and that one time to the complement I must pay your father. He is the only one who thinks notonly that visitors represent a cost for us but, apparently from your explanation, that we can ill afford these costs. When Jerry brings nothing, which I prefer to San Gria, he becomes a burden. He has a very fine income, and at least he could ask Lil if he can pay her back for the groceries. But when he repeatedly brings San Gria either after noticing that she doesn't like it or not noticing, and thinking he is being thoughtful of Lil, he is not. He is unthoughtful and he is telling himself he is a nice guy. Now you visit him and he could not be finer. But all of this, as I see it, represents an insensitivity for which he is now too old. There is a persisting immaturity I cannot explain except in terms of what is no more than a possibility, the rupture in his family life. His step-sister is entirely different. And she has the same complaints. And also loves him dearly, as much so as a blood sister could.

Lattimer results fine, as you evaluate them. Keep after the political stuff, for he admitted fabrication and Bircher lit from him would be more significant than any medical stuff, nonn of which would be dependable. Fisher, as you should know, says exactly the opposite of the pix and X-rays, that they were to scale and could be and were measure. What I would have done even without this is so far past destruction that further destruction of his medical comment is coaling Newcastle. In my judgement. Think and then follow your own. But say something nice about this if you want to follow it further and then go generally into the essence, the exclusive cause of death. Condemn the sensationalists, but say you have to live with them, and is it possible to say beyond any question that he knows he saw the authentic stuff, all of it so you can put them down. Did he zee pix of the sections made, of the tissue from front and rear non-fatals and of left hemisphere (FYI-there was a ringed bruise in front, to go no further, and he hasn't even said the rear was scorched or burned). Can it on the basis of what he saw be said that beyond any question, That liberal prof of "phisosophy"(use quotes) who said shots came from front and back is wrong? Is it impossible that the wounds represent more than one bullet, one a non-jacketed that exploded on impact? In addition to what you plan an anterior neck, ask him if the data he gave you is from his examination (can't be) and if the front view of the anterior shows a hole in addition to the slit from the knife, so you can lay that to rest. This may be better than asking if he saw a front picture-unless he did! What he says is incredible, for he knows nothing of the position of the head with relationship to the body from my recollection of the description of the pix.Remember what I told you of this before you abused your dad? It might, for a later letter, be good to measure the angle of the drawing with a protractor, add the 4^{o} slope and remind him of it in a question, for I think it is close to the fiction.I can't find my protractor of I would. I have two, both missing. Just remembered where one is and measured. About 12^{o}, making 16, and I think they said 17. That 6.5cm incision can't be

in aut. pix, not from my list! You will note that not pix but Perry is his cited source, and I'm telling you and ONLY you that Perry told me otherwise. The rest of this is great stuff! He tells you virtually nothing of what he claims to have seen. No wonder he could see it in four hrs. I love that "considerably higher" on head entrance. If you want to go into this, booby-trap the bastard for me instead, will you? Ask him does he think that this error in the chart-and don't tell him what he doesn't know, that the chart is faithful to the testimony- accounts for the enormity of what so properly describes as the awful exit wound, that had it, in fact, been lower, it could not be explained as he so clearly makes sense out of it for the first time? On the bullet frags all being on the right side, ask him, if his notes show it, that the pictures and X-rays(non-existent) of the left side show also no exits there, so you can nail that sensationalist propaganda, too. And the Nos of these film/ Tell him what he says, that "there were no bullet fragments in the left side of the brain", is so important! The nuts you have to contend with, make that liberal nuts, claim there was no examination of the left hemisphere, which you just can't believe. Can he give you the nos. on this or these so you can do some throat-stuffing with it. Leave the Z stuff at its present perfect formulation, for there is a limit to what he ll take time for even with flattery. Remember, he doesn't even have time for writing it up, from what he told me! That is a beautiful Freudian slip about being happy not to know the Kennedys or Marshall.

We have a new and more serious problem. I have geard from Graham and will carbon. He now says nothing of seeing himself and is going to ask why Lattimer only? That is fine unless they have gotten another fink to apply, and bad if they do the unlikely, let a real critic see...."Dr.", you did well!

I would prefer to avoid any further discourse with anyone on Jerry's Times peice for reasons othe than I have just written him, conf., enclosed, but not other than I had earlier indicated. I simply can't understand his hangup on this and he is entitled to say what he want, right or wrong, fair or unfair. None of us holds a patent on passion or error.

This is later. Seems like the closest point of measurement on the evening TV news have today's fall as 18 inches and it is still coming down hours later-and we are closer to the center of the storm. Winds have reached 60 mph. I hope we can get dug out tomorrow, but there is so much there is no point in my trying to shovel, and little of that is now too much for me, esp. with this thumb, which I'vehad to re-splint....Current is out for 24-hours as close as 20 miles away. Hope ours hold. We plan to go to bed in time to look at Elizabeth R (BBC) on TV.

Thnaks, and best,

2/17/72

Dear Harold,

No time to respond to many current things, but must write now because the response from Lattimer has come--copy enclosed. It's amazing--the lies, admissions, and the slanders of the other applicants. I'm sure you'll have a great time with it.

I propose a follow-up letter, since he is apparently so willing to write to sycophants. I want to ask more about the front neck wound, like if he saw pictures of it head on, could he tell there had been a wound there, etc.

Re head wound, I'd like to ask him how he could tell the dispersal of the fragments was "in accord with a bullet going forward," what experience he bases that on, and if for. path experts have confirmed.

Any further suggestions? I'll do nothing till I hear from you. Also, I'm writing Rhoads for copy of mysterious report mentioned in his letter, a second copy of which is also enclosed, as you requested.

I'll write more later--when I can--on other matters. The thing with Jerry concerns we too, though I'm not in complete agreement with you. He should make changes, and I'm discussing with him over phone.

Best,

Howard

College of Physicians & Surgeons of Columbia University | *New York, N.Y. 10032*

DEPARTMENT OF UROLOGY 620 West 168th Street

February 14, 1972

Dr. Robert Bietcher
358 Craig
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

Dear Dr. Bietcher:

Thank you for your letter of 3 February concerning the examination of the Kennedy autopsy material.

My sons and I have additional articles on the ballistics of the matter which are in press, but will not appear in the Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine until April, unfortunately. I will send you a reprint when available. I also hope to write up the present matter as soon as possible.

In answer to your question about whether the angles of the bullets through the President and through the Governor appeared to be the same, I can assure you that they did. Like yourself, I was in some doubt as to the actual angle through the President's neck, as depicted in the unofficial drawings, which were made entirely by hearsay. It is not possible to measure photographs the way one would measure the body, so I cannot answer your question about the exact angle of declination but can only tell you that it looked to the eye to be of the same order of magnitude. The discussions in the text of the Warren Commission Report are infinitely more detailed and more analytical than the drawings. Unfortunately, the graphic presentations always attract the most attention and, like yourself, I was somewhat in doubt, because of this discrepancy in the drawings.

The wound on the back of the neck which I described was certainly the one 14 cm. below the right mastoid process and 14 cm. medial to the tip of the acromion process. Again, one cannot measure photographs which are not lifesize, but I saw no reason to disagree with the measurements taken by Commander Humes.

With regard to the exit hole in the front of the neck, it had been cut across by an incision 6.5 cm.

long, which was gaping open about 1.5 cm. This is the hole through which they introduced the tracheostomy tube when they were trying to resuscitate him at Dallas. There was no sign of any circumferential bruise around this area and Dr. Perry, the Dallas surgeon who made the incision to insert the tube, cut directly through the bullet hole and commented that there appeared to be very little bruise around it. Ordinarily, the bullet coming out through the skin might very well stretch the skin ahead of it before it went through, and cause a bruise or ecchymosis, under the skin. The fact that none was seen by Dr. Perry might be accounted for by the fact that the band of his collar held the skin in place and did not permit it to stretch with the bullet, but rather permitted the bullet to come out through a clean hole in the supported skin. This is only conjecture, but it is certainly true that the collar band of the shirt supported the area of exit.

In answer to your question about the head wound, there was an obvious small wound of entrance on the back of the head, considerable higher than shown in the diagrams but clearly a wound of entrance because of the cone-shaped configuration of the bullet hole in the back of the skull. The exit wound was tremendous, approximately 5 inches in length, with a loss of skull and scalp over the upper right side of the head. This wound and the fracture lines in the skull were infinitely greater than those shown in the schematic diagrams which were again made from hearsay evidence. All of the bullet fragments were limited to the right side of the head and were in a configuration in accord with a bullet going forward, and in no other direction. There were no bullet fragments in the left side of the brain, whatsoever. I looked hard for the possibility of a second bullet hole in the head, and could find none. As you know, frame 313 of the Zapruder movie

shows the fragments of the skull going forward out of President Kennedy's head without any doubt, at the moment of impact of the head wound.

With regard to your question about undercover operations, etc., this was only my own characterization of the circumstances under which both actions occurred, one with the intelligence activities of the Confederacy and the other the intelligency activities surrounding the Cuban crisis.

I am happy to report that I do not know the Kennedy family, do not know Mr. Burke Marshall and was totally surprised to discover that I was the only one authorized to view the materials. I can only assume that my publications on the Lincoln and Kennedy matters, involving actual research, might have influenced Mr. Marshall in my favor, rather than those who have done no actual experimentation and have done their "research" while sitting on the seats of their pants.

When I get this written up will certainly send you a reprint, and I would also appreciate a copy of your article, when you put it out.

Our reprint stores are being rapidly depleted at the moment, but anything I can provide you on Lincoln or Kennedy, I will be glad to send.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

John K. Lattimer

John K. Lattimer, M.D., Sc.D.
Professor and Chairman,
Department of Urology

JKL:hlb

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
National Archives and Records Service
Washington, DC 20408

February 7, 1972

Mr. Howard Roffman
357 Craig
University of Pennsylvania
37th and Spruce Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear Mr. Roffman:

This is in reply to your letter of January 19, 1972, concerning the examination by Dr. John K. Lattimer of the X-rays and photographs relating to the autopsy of President Kennedy.

The statement referred to in the San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle of January 9 was an oral statement in response to questions by an Associated Press reporter on the telephone. There was no written statement or press release.

The following answers are numbered in accordance with the questions in your letter:

1. About four hours.

2. The autopsy material listed in Appendix B to the letter agreement of October 29, 1966, between the Administrator of General Services and the Kennedy family representative, Mr. Burke Marshall; a report concerning the autopsy material, which includes a descriptive list, by the personnel of the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Maryland, who were present at the autopsy; President Kennedy's coat, shirt, necktie, back brace, and Ace bandage; and Commission Exhibit 399 (bullet).

3. Employees of the National Archives.

4. No one.

5. None, other than copies of Commission exhibit photographs of the clothing and bullet available to the public that may have been provided to Dr. Lattimer at times before his examination of the material.

6. No.

7. Dr. Lattimer's application to examine the autopsy material was approved by Mr. Marshall, the Kennedy family representative, as provided for in the agreement with him.

We do not provide copies of our reference correspondence or information relating to that correspondence pursuant to the exemption found in the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(6), which relates to "personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

Sincerely,

James B. Rhoads

JAMES B. RHOADS
Archivist of the United States