Dear Mr. Remington, 7/12/95

Thanks for the thoughtfulness of the SASE.

Your letter of the 10th reflects the problme all face in trying to figure out anything about the ssassination without a solid grounding in the established official fact. Plus the problem created by what is reflected in the first chapter of NEVER AGAIN!, that crime crime was never investigated officially, thus there are no leads for private persons to follow.

Your are correct in stating the central Commission hypothesis but what it actually appears to be based on is the fact that since nobody was able to duplicate Oswald's shooting with three shots the limit, there was no possibility at all with any more than three shots. That the official evidence establishes this impossibility I brought to light in my first, my 1965 book, and that made no diffeeence in the major media accept acceptance of the official mythology.

On the curbstone impact, you did not fully understand what I wrote in my 1975 Post Mortem. Perhaps it will be easier to see in NEVER AGAIN! The spectrogrpahic analysid of what was scarped from that curbstone was a knowing phony and did not in any event disclose even the core of a bullet. It was patched. There is professional endorsement of my work on that in Case Open, where I publish the engineering report. They all knew it. The concrete paste used in making that patch forever denied the evidence of the actual impact. As they all knew.

I'm familiar with the Frazier testimony you thoughfully enclosed. At that same point you will find the official report on the official impssibility of the shooting attributed to Oswald, Simonds' testimony.

I fear there will always be a mystery about the sources of those fragments. The offical myth is that they could have come from the bullet that exploded in the head. That kind of bullet could not have left the deposits recorded on the Xrays.

So while I do not criticize your analysis, what you do not realize is that it is not new. Four shots is the absolute minimum from the official evidence itself.

If you would like to discuss any of this, please remember the convoluted hours that require me to be abed by six p.m., which means I should be off the phone before then. Our phone is 301/473-8186.

Senators Russell and Cooper did not believe the single bullet theory. I have a lengthy article on that on a diskette if you'd like to borrow it and I can find it.

The real problem is getting attention for the truth. If I could get any attention for NEVER AGIN! it could have an impact but I know of no review or of any major media interest. Not even a ~~phone~~ talk show has phoned me. This is the reality I hope you can adapt to and not let it create a feeling of futility. Meanwhile, if we can get a little of the truth around, it can help and that can in time help our people.

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold Weisberg

July 10, 1995

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for your extraordinarily timely June 29 reply to my letter of June 26 requesting your assistance for information about Messrs. Goldberg and Marmor, staff members of the Warren Commission.

With some apprehension for your welcoming another uninvited inquiry, I nevertheless write again. This time I am seeking your advice concerning an argument which, if sound, could possibly lead to destruction of the Warren Report's single assassin hypothesis for the Kennedy murder.

In my understanding, central to that hypothesis is the claim that only three shots were fired, a claim ultimately based upon retrieval of three cartridge cases from the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building. Reduced to essentials, the Commission Report claims the following:

(1) One bullet passed through the neck of President Kennedy, and was ultimately recovered as a jacketed bullet in virtually unmutilated condition;

(2) One bullet produced a massive mortal wound to the head of President Kennedy; and

(3) One bullet missed entirely both the automobile and its occupants.

Clearly, if it can be demonstrated conclusively that a minimum number of four shots are necessarily entailed in the Commissions's testimony and exhibits, then the Report must collapse from its own unbearable weight.

I am attracted to the argument that there were at least four shots involved. It is developed from the process of elimination:

1. The unmutilated bullet from (1) above is excluded as the source of any front seat fragments from a jacketed bullet;

2. The extent of the damage to the President's head precludes the possibility of the bullet in (2) above as being a jacketed bullet; and

3. Mr. Hoover, Director of the FBI, himself assured the Commission that no copper was found in the bullet mark on the concrete curbing on Main Street near the Underpass. (I note here your own citation and quotation from Mr. Hoover's relevant letter of August 12, 1964, in Post Mortem, at page 455.) Clearly, the bullet alluded to in (3) above--arguably the bullet that caused minor injury to Mr. Tague's face--was not jacketed at the time of impact with the curb.

However, expert testimony by FBI Agent Robert A. Frazier, on March 31, 1964, established that two bullet fragments found in the front seat area of the Presidential limousine were fragments from at least one **jacketed** bullet (3H432-437). Attached are the relevant excerpts and the photocopy for verification.

By process of elimination, the unmutilated bullet from (1) above is excluded as the source of the fragments in the front seat area; the frangible nature of the bullet in (2) above precludes its status as a jacketed bullet; as for the bullet in (3) above, the absence of copper with the lead bullet mark on the curbing removes if from identification with the source of the jacketed bullet fragments found in the front seat area of the limousine.

Accordingly, this argument concludes that jacketed-bullet fragments found in the limousine entail a fourth bullet. And given the Commission's acquiescence in time constraints operating against one shooter getting off four shots, this argument claims the Commission's Report is hoist on the petar of its own expert witness testimony.

If you feel so inclined, I will very much appreciate your analysis/ critique of this argument.

In closing, I thank you for apprising me of your most recent book, Never Again!. And I look forward to reading it with the same enthusiasm I had in reading your earlier works. With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

Robert A. Remington

Rodger A. Remington, Ph.D.
Professor of History
Aquinas College
Grand Rapids, MI 49506-1799

Attachments: (2)

P.S. If you do choose to evaluate this argument, but prefer to speak by phone rather than write, please forward me your number, and a convenient time at which I may call you. Conversely, if you are unable to accommodate my request for such an evaluation, I will understand clearly that time is simply too precious a commodity for you to spend on random inquiries not of your invitation.