17 July 70

Dear Howard (cc Weisberg)

I am still heartlessly (i.e. without heart) whipping my thesis into shape for final submission, so please excuse if I don't reply to all that your most recent correspondence contains.

This is in response to your xxxx foolishly seeking to revive the notion that JFK's front-neck wound may be a wound of exit, or anything other than a wound of entrance caused by a bullet fired from the front. If you consider that anything else is even possible, I think that you will get yourself helplessly and irretrievable bogged in diversions and trivia.

I don't know how you or anyone can vitiate the assertion that if JFK was hit before Z202, then he was hit in the front of the neck by a xxxx bullet fired from the front-- and you know that he was hit before Z202.

Item: JFK was wounded before Z202 (Willis 5)
True... False... (check one)

Item: SS agent Bennett saw a bullet enter JFK's back sometime after Z 202
True... False...

Item: JFK had the following wounds:
--entrance wound in the back
--entrance wound in the back/top of head
--large defect on right side of head
--small wound in front of neck
True... False...

Item: Both head wounds occurred at or near Z313
True... False...

If you checked all those items "true" (as I believe from your correspondence you would), then you cannot reasonably consider anything except that JFK was wounded in the neck from the front. And you must catagorically reject the validity of anything that might indicate otherwise-- catagorically. If you want to vitiate the conclusion to which these items inescapably lead, then you must show wherein any of the items is false. If you cannot do that, then you must know xxxx beyond the shadow of a dream of a doubt that the front-neck wound is a wound of entrance, and cannot be anything else.

Why? Because these items necessarily imply that the front-neck wound was a wound of entrance. JFK received the back wound and the two head wounds after Z202. We know, however, that he was wounded before Z202. Where? All of his wounds are accounted for in the Items except the front-neck.

In pointing to these items I have reduced the evidence (which I consider to be true evidence and demonstrable) to a bare minimum. Do I have to remind you that all the other xx reliable evidence that we have about that wound fully corroborates what these few items imply? The few things that seem not to corroborate it (although none refutes it) are derived from sources that you know you cannot trust-- e.g. the autopsy and Panel docs, among whom are those who saw that front-neck wound when the corpse

was in their hands, and yet implied (did they ever really say?) that they did not see it. They saw it, and they knew-- more surely than you and I-- precisely what it meant.

Never mind whipping the docs, nor the coorborating evidence. Take only the Items, and tell me, I beg you, where my reasoning is at fault in deriving the conclusion that I did. Am I imposing my conviction on the evidence, or is the evidence imposing its conviction on me.

I am not setting this forth as a belligerent challenge-- I really want to knew if that reasoning can be faulted. Or if you think that any of the Items are false, or if any of them can be false. I think that they are true (and I think you do, too). The conclusion to which they lead is so compelling, so sound, so irrefutable, I think, that if anyone were to produce what appeared to be positive evidence to the contrary, I would piss on it as phoney. The evidence is already positive that JFK was wounded in the front of the neck by a shot fired from the front. If those four Items are true, it cannot be otherwise.

If you are playing around with any other notion, I think that you are foolishly wasting your precious time. I admire you well enough to bebadly upset whenever you do, for in many ways your loss is mine too.

Duty (blech!) calls. Stay well.

Still,

Dick