

Kevin Walsh *r. see under*
PO Box 15069
Washington, DC 20003-9997

9/22/96

Dear Kevin,

I have not read Knudsen's NSCA testimony, which I should do before offering a definitive opinion. There is also what some might consider makes me biased, as I think I am not, so first I go into that.

Some time before NEVER AGAIN! was finally published I was familiar with some of Randy Robertson's work and rather liked it. I refer to his belief there were two shots to the JFK head. I suggested how he could strengthen what he had done by duplicating some of what I had published on that in 1975 but by using an independent expert. I believe he did not do that.

When I knew that NEVER AGAIN! was finally going to appear and when it was not safe for me to try to go to DC for a press conference on it I asked Jim to hold one for me. He agreed. I offered Randy participation. I did not ask him to say a word about my book. I did offer him that opportunity to present his case for a second shot to the head. I also asked Chip Selby to appear and he agreed. When Chip was working on his documentary I told him about Dolce, where he was, and suggested that Chip go interview him. He did. If you read NEVER AGAIN! you know that Chip gave me the full transcript of his full interview so I could use it and I did use much of it. Randy said he wanted to first explore the possibility of first publication in a professional publication. He said he'd know by the end as I now recall of April, 1995.

Jim developed an imagined fear, that he did not know enough to hold that press conference. I told him to say that he was doing it for me because it was not safe for me to go to DC, that he'd been my lawyer in all those FOIA lawsuits, I gave him copies of documents from the book to use and give out, wrote out what he should say about them, and told him to refer any reporters who had any questions to me by phone. He agreed to that and then did nothing. Copies of the book were late reaching him but that did not interfere with the news value in what I gave him to give out. What his real reason was I do not know. I think he missed a real opportunity to inform people but I also think he has his own hangups. I think also that Randy missed a real opportunity to get some attention for his work.

I believe these matters do not make me prejudiced about the Randy review.

You say you do not recall evidence of probes. In fact there was and it was the most influential in what the FBI said and never stopped saying about the assassination and about the autopsy. It is in CD 1. They could not get a probe in the back. I explained why in Post Mortem. They could get a little finger it for

Perhaps one joint if I remember correctly, but only that little. That was because they probed with the body prone whereas it was wounded when erect and the scapula moved ^{that} as ^{access} blocked the path of the bullet.

There is testimony and there are documents on this that are well known. I believe they should not be ignored in any commentary and that criticism would be legitimate if they are ignored.

With regard to that 1967 Fox statement, that may be the result of a deal Tom Kelley of the Secret Service and I made. I promised if they answered certain questions and provided certain records I'd not use FOIA to sue them. He wanted to avoid that. His compliance was aborted by the Archives and Justice but because he did make the effort I kept my word. I published what he told me about the printing of the autopsy film in Post Mortem. As I now recall it, Fox used the Navy lab to develop the black and white film but that the Navy did the color work for him. I think this is what Mark Urouch says Fox told him.

I believe that at Bethesda there was no delay in the discovery of the wound on the back. It had to be seen as soon as the corpse was removed from the casket and unwrapped. I have questions about Randy's conjectures at this point, including that one in particular. He is wrong in saying that Humes did not phone Perry until after midnight, and Andy and the HSCA knew that, and the Perry/Clark press conference was aired live by radio and repeated often, including in the early editions of the morning papers, which were out not much if at all after the autopsy was begun. The paper that Humes uses in his protocol stated there was a wound in the front of the neck. Humes merely omitted that.

A staff interview is not "testimony."

I think if this is used the conjectures should be dropped and what is omitted should be stated in that space, like what the official evidence is about the impossibility of getting a probe in the wound in the back. Plus Galloway's orders that they not track the wound through the body, as was required by the autopsy.

I have read Hasty's Pudding. He is a subject-matter ignoramus, a propagandist. He was, as he had to be, removed from the Oswald case on which he'd done nothing except go see Marina, as soon as Oswald teed off on him. Even the title of his book is not true. His was not that assignment. It was a dead case until they learned Oswald was getting or had written the Daily Worker. That is all they had to open it and the case file had not reached Hasty from N.O. until the morning of the assassination. You'll have to wonder about the truth of anything he says. I do.

We hope that you can come out some of these days. Our best,

Harold