Dear John,

Thanks for the carbon of your letter to Bernabei.

How awful, it must have been for an active man not to be confined to bed and to have to stay in a darkened room, presumeably not using his eyes!

When we met at Walter Reed we discussed the possibility of our filing a joint suit. I again encourage this control for a number of reasons. As you know, I have planned this for two years, as soon as I could. I thought I'd made the arrangements with a representative of a group of lawyers a short while back but haven't heard, so I do not know when. We should not wind up either competing or at cross purposes. I may have established certain things that law and lawyers sometimes require that you may not or may not have in the same way. In addition, I have other things than you have that bear very much on this, including what I did not have when I saw you, things of recent origin.

The lawyer I consulted is a constitutional expert and he sees some possibilities in that direction also.

Since we discussed this I have learned that some of the things we have been told of the pictures and X-rays are not factual. I have proof of certain decisions that were made that are contrary to what has been said of them in public. I have some material so hot I haven t even shown it to the lawyer I saw pending hearing his decision, and believe it is so relevant to this:

There are other considerations I press upon you, and that is what I alone know that can be used in a trial. Remember, saids from what you read in POST MORTEM, and what I showed you, I have between a third and a half that much to add. I have delayed doing this while writing two other books, now both in first draft, and I think it would be beneficial, whether you agree for us to sue jointly, for you to understand what this new writing, which does not address the medical avidence directly, actually means. It puts everything in a special

Hope you are completely recovered.

Sincerely,

Herold Weisberg

Dr. Richard Bernabei Department of Classics Queen's University Kingston, Ontario Canada

Dear Doctor Bernabei:

Please allow me to thank you for your letter of September 4. Yes, Mr. Weisberg sent your letter (or a Xerox copy) to me.

The principle you set forth is entirely correct. However, the gun is such a poor shooting weapon, the telescopic sight such a poor sight and being attached by only two of the available screw holes, Mr. Oswald being such a poor shot, the target moving, etc., there seems to me a large element of chance in the bullet(s) striking the President. Even an occasional neophyte may score a bull's eye hit with a gun having a maladjusted sight.

Most of my shooting has been at 30 feet with the gun bolted to a log for rigidity. The target is adjusted, not the gun!!! The barrel of my gun has 3 inches sawed off so the speed of the bullet is the same at 30 feet as that of Mr. Oswald's at about 190 feet. This has been confirmed by chronograph.

To do the experiment you require would exceed my primative set-up. However, I do believe ballistic tables exist which would show the rise and fall; or the trajectory curve, of a bullet weighing about 150-160 grains and with a mussle velocity of about 2,000 feet per second.

I have had an inflammation of my right eye and have had to stay in a darkened room for the last three months since about the time Mr. Weisberg was here. However, I am now beginning to resume work but medical students have arrived! Do hope to get a suit filed against the Federal Government to study the x-rays within this month. Shall be delighted to send you a copy of the brief. Enclosed is a reprint on the late President's adrenals which may interest you.

Sincerely,

John Niengi

JN:1c cc: Mr. Weisberg // Enclosure