

473-8186

NEW ADDRESS: RT 2, FREDERICK, Md. 21701

Dear Dr. Nichols,

Your letter of 10/5 has been forwarded. We have moved, live in the midst of chaos, and for a little while longer my work will be interrupted, but not completely.

A hasty glance at your suggestions indicates they are helpful.

On your Medical World News letter, without handicap of scientific qualification, I think it is possible to argue that Halpern is wrong on disclosures of other than bullet-wound data simply because this was a President and by the time the scientific tests were completed, rumors of the wildest sort were rampant. With a Presidential murder these are inevitable and within the anticipation of public authority. Further, and please do not use this, the Kennedys waived all such rights. In the autopsy of a President there should be no secrets.

Your MWN paragraph on the autopsy authorization is technically correct but not precisely so, for the name of the widow was typed in, as was that of Captain Canada. The only signature was that of RFK.

If you add my finding of this authorization, I'd suggest you leave in what you have and add that I found only a misfiled, remote copy. I think it is important that it be understood that this authorization does not exist in the numerous files of which it should be part, that it does exist in the archive to the murder of a President only as an accident.

Do you think you can delete from the fourth page the last sentence of the carryover paragraph? I think it can be confusing and misleading and misused, including against you, in the future, for there were no Kennedy reservations stipulated in the authorization. I think this amounted to sanction, particular because this was the autopsy of both a murder and a President. I think it not essential to your thought.

Again in confidence, Admiral Burkley is more than the physician to whom "the complete protocol had been submitted by the Navy pathologists..." and the President's physician. He was at the autopsy. He initiated and used the word "approved" where, I am confident, you would not have. I have just obtained a Xerox of what is described as one of the original copies of the autopsy, of which record of eight exist. I have been prodding in my own way on this and on other things. I think I have a Xerox of a Xerox at the very best, but it is much more distinct. He initiated several places. And he wrote notes on some of the appended papers (nothing not in published evidence). I have not yet had a chance to really study these new papers. I hope I will remember to write you again after I do. I feel there is considerable significance in the annotations per se and in context, either or both. I feel this particularly because in POST MORTEM I identify 23 competent autopsy witnesses (aside from Sivert and O'Neill) not call. All civilians were put out and kept out of the autopsy room!

As your work will be delayed, so will mine. The "scavenging" has been less remunerative than it is touted, and I doubt I can risk the additional debt for the immediate printing of POST MORTEM because of the greater than ever pressure to suppress. All sorts of nasty things have been happening to PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH in commercial channels. They never stopped with the first two books. Dell apparently has been reached because they have yet to give me even the accounting on the first book due in April! In short, we are without income and are well saddled with debt. This involves a minimum of an additional

debt of \$3,500. When I consider the uninterrupted pace at which I have been going for more than three years, I wonder if I dare subject my wife to its potential. I have made no final decision. I think it is vital that the book appear, as soon as possible. I will go ahead and get ready for that. It will be a little time before we can complete the retyping of the ms for offset. Perhaps by then I will have made the decision, or perhaps by then a fairy or a foundation (all I've approached have declined or not answered) will appear, and with the appearance, these problems will disappear.

Aside from the obvious and quite comprehensible reasons for my desire to preserve the benefit from my work for ourselves, it is also an essential, for we have made a tremendous investment in it and it is only from it that we can hope to bail out. However, I customarily make what I have available to those I think I can trust. I also believe that particularly on this subject, it is vital to share knowledge. Therefore, if you can get here, prior to publication, I will give you access to all I have. That may not be feasible. As an alternative, I have an indistinct spare copy of the ms that my artist is reading, rather slowly. The Washington office of the Times of London has asked to see it when he finishes. After that, if you'd like, you can read it. It lacks only the postscript I have drafted and to which I will add. I cannot redo the ms to work my newest discoveries in.

There is a third alternative that may or may not be feasible. As soon as my third book, which will be the fourth in order of appearance, does come out, the small publisher is sending me on a brief tour. If the possibility of my getting on TV in a major area existed, I am confident he would send me there. This, I think, would also be the case with a paid lecture. If either of these things is possible, Kansas City is not far out of the way, nor is St. Louis, for I'm to go to both New Orleans and Chicago. Perhaps, were this to eventuate, we could get together and talk for a while.

My initial hunch has now become my firm belief, that the most vital missing evidence is ~~not~~ the pictures and X-rays, essential as they are, but the autopsy notes, which were not destroyed. I may yet smoke them out, but, if they are as contrary to the official account as is possible, may not ~~be~~ ^{be}. Recently, I thought I'd get them. I am not stopping, will make another effort today.

Your handwritten postscript is justified but I think it is premature, on the basis of what we know, to say that "In suppressing ~~the~~ part of the autopsy report, did not Robert Kennedy censor the Warren Report?" I have contrary evidence on the pictures and X-rays, evidence indicating that ~~REK~~ did not refuse them to the Commission and, in fact, was willing for the Commission to have ~~them~~ under what, from his point of view, were not unreasonable conditions. I'll tell you more of this when we meet or in the book, whichever is first.

Sincerely,



UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER

RAINBOW BOULEVARD AT 39TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66103 • AREA CODE 913 • ADams 6-5252

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND ONCOLOGY

October 5, 1967

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Coq d'Or Press
Hyattstown, Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:


Please allow me to thank you for your letter of September 18. My delay in answering is due to press of work. Your generosity staggers me.

I am happy that you have found the autopsy permission, but, of course, I should have preferred to have found it myself! My ~~arm~~ ^{own} work has been slowed down and my manuscript will be delayed. Therefore, there will be no problem of our work overlapping. I am eagerly looking forward to an early copy of your work.

I have made some changes in the portion of the MS you sent which you might want to consider. Also enclosed is Xerox copy of two letters which appeared in current issue of the JAMA also a Xerox copy of a letter appearing a year or so ago with editorial comment. You will notice that Admiral Burkley refused to answer Doctor John Talbott, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association. This is not to be expected of an Admiral of the U.S. Navy. It also is not the way such a medical journalist is treated.

Enclosed you will also find edited copy of my letter to the editor (Dr. Fishbein) of Medical World News. You can see that he has cut it down. Of course I was surprised that he would even publish it. I have left the statement stand where I indicate the autopsy permission is not in the Archives - I will correct this later and cite it as your find.

Sincerely,


John Nichols

encl.
JN:mc

*In supprising part of the autopsy report did not Robert Kennedy
cover the Warren Report?*