

Dr. Gary Aguillar
909 Hyde St., #530
San Francisco, CA 94109

Confidential

6/26/94

Dear Gary,

I did notice that on the envelope with your 6/22 and enclosures you asked for confidentiality. So I've stapled all that together and marked it all as confidential. If there is later reason for us to refer to this I'm putting it in my "Posner, about" file.

While you are justified in referring to Posner as a fool I do not think that explains him and what he did. Except that after The Green Apple it can be said he was a fool to have anything to do with you.

If you'd seen what was cut out of Case Open you'd know that the Judenrat is an uninhibited and not very clever liar. That kind of carelessness can come from the feeling of power or from feeling protected or from the belief that it makes no real difference and he is merely making a record for his own file to cover himself with those who are not informed.

But you did very well to make a record with the bastard.

I do have several Ferrie and CAP files and Posner could easily have copied them. But I do not recall anything in them justifying saying they could ~~not~~ "show" that "Gswald could not have known Ferrie." That question did not come up in the records I recall. I think that either Scheim, who has never been here or spoken to or written me, or Posner, made that interpretation from the fact that Ferrie was not then active in the CAP. Why not ask Posner again for copies of those records, reminding him that you'd asked him earlier?

It is a surprise that you had any connection with his mother's 6/15 surgery. You told me he'd told her to get another ophthalmologist. (By the way, my wife's second cataract was removed a while back and her new glasses are ready. Without glasses her eyes are now 20-40 and she's been gunking out with no glasses for more than a month! We call it "magic" and for us it is!)

I suppose Roger told you about one case over the book. I think you should tell him about Posner saying there are two. And while I have no knowledge that justifies it, I note that he says there are two suits "currently" which leaves the possibility of another already settled out of court.

I do not recall that Trisha interviewed me but I cannot say she did not.

In the draft of your letter on which you wrote "need advice" I wonder if in the penult. paragraph "occurred" is the word you mean. I'd add what I suggest above, that giving you copies of those CAP records cannot involve any "lawsuits over an advertising campaign" and thus he can return the favor so many granted him by giving you copies. I'd add that if he does not there would be a reasonable suspicion that he has an entirely different reason for not letting you have copies.

Thanks and best wishes,

Herold

On envelope Gary says this is
GARY L. AGUILAR, M.D. *Confidential*
909 HYDE STREET SUITE 530
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109

TELEPHONE 775-3392

6-22-94

DEAR HAROLD,

PRETTY WACKY
HAIR?! WHERE
I WAS SYMPATHETIC
TO THE NOXON HE
WAS ACEPTFUL,
I DIDN'T ALSO EXPECT
HIM TO BE A FOOL.

Gary

IF POS KNEW
THAT I'D BE
SENDING HIM
~~THE~~ THIS
LETTER HE'D
PROBABLY NEVER
HAVE WRITTEN
ME.

Gary L. Aguilar, MD
909 Hyde Street, #530
San Francisco, California 94109
415-775-3392 or FAX 415-563-4453
2 May, 1994

SECOND REQUEST-CERTIFIED MAIL

Dear Gerald,

While I am very late in acknowledging your S.F. appearance, it was good of you to come out for a few words with others of us who share your interest, if not your conclusions, in the JFK subject. I thought to write to you sooner after your talk at the Green Apple last fall, but between work and family obligations, I never got around to it. If you're willing I'd like to ask a couple of simple questions.

I was very interested in your comment to me at the Green Apple that JAMA had put you in contact with JFK's autopsy pathologists. You may recall that they refused to answer my questions in my October 7, 1992 letter to JAMA's editor. Could you tell me who at JAMA aided you in contacting them? Also, as per your comments before the Conyers committee, will you be releasing copies of your tape recordings, or notes of interviews, with Humes and Boswell? As you can imagine, your comments have attracted some deserved attention. Finally, did you conduct the interviews in your book?

Please extend my warmest wishes to your mother whose absence from my practice is a source of sadness for me. Please also mention to her that Annie, Marcie and Karen, my ophthalmic tech, my receptionist, and my office manager respectively, also send their personal warm regards.

Many thanks for any help.

Best wishes,

Gary Aguilar

PS. Please feel free to contact me at home. My home address is 360 Poett Road, Hillsborough, 94010. Home # is 415-342-8920. Home fax is 342-4536. My wife's name is Maureen, however, Stacey (female, 4.5 yr. old), Rebecca (2.5 yr.), or Russell (2.5 yr.-yes, twins) may answer. Conversation with them is usually more intelligible, I'm told, than with me, so there should be no problem.

PPS. I spoke to your lovely mother today (6-15-94) who mentioned that you had gotten my letter and have been very busy, but that you would write me back. I eagerly look forward to your letter. As you know many Warren Commission loyalists have roundly condemned JFK's pathologists for ineptitude. Should they also be viewed as untruthful? I spoke with Boswell after you mentioned to the Conyers' Committee that you'd spoken with him. He said he'd never spoken with you. He also unequivocally told me that he has not changed his mind about the low entrance location of JFK's skull wound. You, of course, said that he had. Humes also reaffirmed to me by phone his JAMA claim that JFK's skull wound was low, and I also spoke with Humes after your comments to Conyers. (JAMA did not put me in touch with them.)

OCD

NEO

AS OF
6-15-94

NEW

So you see I am stuck. Are Humes and Boswell not telling me the truth? If you would release the recordings or notes of your interviews with Humes and Boswell, as you mentioned to the Conyers Committee, this issue would be laid to rest. If I do not hear from you, however, I will be constrained to place greater faith in the pathologists's statements to me. I also hope that in the soon-expected paperback version of *Case Closed*, you will clarify the pathologists's statements to you on the location of JFK's skull wound. You failed to mention it in the hard cover version, and as a physician, I believe it is of enormous significance. Perhaps Dr. Lundberg should not have 'totally believed' JFK's pathologists.

PPPS. David Scheim seems convinced that Oswald's CAP records that you claimed you found at Harold Weisberg's showing Oswald could not have known Ferrie do not exist. I am reluctant, of course, to believe that you would invent such a thing. In the spirit of Weisberg's generosity to you in sharing his research, can you not also share the CAP information you gathered on Oswald? I promised David that I'd mention this to you. Again, as with the pathologists, if I do not hear from you, I will have little alternative but to allow my faith in David's supposition to grow, and my pocketbook to shrink. I told David that if I do not hear from you by 6-26-94, he wins \$5.00. I bet him that I'll hear from you by then and that you can and will produce the CAP records. Will you help me out, Jerry? If you do, I'll send you a copy of David's check to me. If you choose not to, I'll send you a copy of my cancelled check to David.

(Note: in original two lines above read, "..help me and out, Jerry....". I correct it herein and will send this by certified mail. If I lose my bet to Scheim, as he and D. Lifton believe I will, I want to know I lost honestly and fairly.

cc. D. Scheim, D. Lifton.

6/15/94

Dear Dr. Aguilar -

My mother told me you were wonderful to be during her surgery earlier today (thanks) and it reminded me of how late I am in answering your May 2 letter. Sorry, but I've been traveling a lot on 2 magazine articles - not Kennedy related - (and it should only get worse through the summer).

There must have been a misunderstanding about JAMA putting me in contact w/ Hanes and Boswell. I actually talked to them months before the JAMA publication. It will not be revealing any notes on those conversations, or any other part of my research, until there is no litigation on the book. Currently, there are 2 lawsuits over an advertising campaign for the book. Let's see what happens when those suits are finished.

By the way, I did do all the interviews in my book. My wife, Trisha, often sat in on them, and she did one on her own of Harold Weisberg.

We are unlikely to ever agree on who killed JFK and why - but as long as we can debate the facts and ignore personal attacks, I'll be adding to the discussion in the future - until then - Jim

Dear Gerald,

ROUGH
NEED ADVICE

Thank you for your hand written letter which I received today. I must admit surprise and disappointment at your claims in that letter regarding when you interviewed Humes and Boswell. You said, "I actually talked to them months before the JAMA publication." May I remind you that JAMA published its interviews with Humes and Boswell on May 27, 1992, after interviewing them three months before. You credit an interview with Humes November 2, 1992 (Ref 50, Chapter 13.) which was thus at least 5 months after the JAMA interviews.

You made no mention in your book of their changed opinions on the location of the head entrance wound, an astonishing oversight on a crucial evidentiary matter for someone so well versed in this case as you. Moreover, you made no mention in your book that you'd spoken to Boswell, and Boswell told me directly that while you and he had played 'telephone tag', he never actually spoke with you. Am I now to believe that you spoke to Humes at a time other than the time cited in your book, and that he told you JFK's skull wound was in a different location than he subsequently told Lundberg it was? Am I to believe that Boswell, whose opinion of the location of the head wound has never changed in 30 years, suddenly admitted to you that he was wrong, that the wound was 10-cm higher than he told the Warren Commission, the HSCA, Harrison Livingstone, George Lundberg, and me?

As you said you'd conducted "all the interviews" in your book yourself, please inform Mr. James Tague of your interview with him on January 19 and January 20, 1992. He told me that not only had he never spoken with you, he has never changed his mind about the fact that he was not, as you believe, struck by the first shot. As Tague told the Warren Commission, Harold Weisberg and me, he knows not which of the other shots hit him, but the first shot did not hit him.

Unfortunately, you have left me little option but to regard your statements with incredulity: Neither Humes nor Boswell, with whom I spoke, agree that they ever told you that the President's skull wound was 10-cm higher than stated in the autopsy report, and Boswell told me that he never spoke with you at all. Tague denies ever having spoken with you, and he also denies the statement you attribute to him. I distinctly recall you're having told me that JAMA put you in touch with JFK's pathologists as it was important to me, and you deny this. Moreover, you mentioned in your letter you interviewed the pathologists "months before the JAMA publication" when your book states it was 'months after' JAMA's publication. Am I thus left to believe, Gerald, that I am party to a conspiracy among some with whom you claim to have spoken to either deny what you claim they said, or to deny completely that they ever spoke with you?

I hope you don't mind my skepticism, but these inconsistencies are as impossible for me to swallow as the official explanations for the cover up of JFK's death which even Newsweek and other major media outlets now agree occurred.

I am very disappointed in you, Gerald. I hope you do not mind my pointing out these inconsistencies to others. I believe it would be in the interest of the truth for me to do so.

Truly yours,

Gary