

Mr. Stephen Rosenfeld, editorial  
The Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick, MD 21702

7/14/97

Dear Mr. Rosenfeld,

The Post shames itself in publishing the Bernard Sussman letter in support of the official JFK assassination mythology, which is what without any question at all it is. To write an adequate, factual response—which the Post would not publish in any event—takes too much space and at this stage of my life and health, too much time. I've survived two congestive heart failures since I last wrote you, among other things over which my doctors marvel, and I'm 84 now.

As you may remember, all I've published on the JFK assassination, and I am alone on this, is and is from the official evidence. No theories, <sup>(A)</sup>aw you may also remember. I remain the lone and lonely man in the middle.

Sussman does not know what he talks about and doesn't want to or he'd not lie, as he does, for example, in saying that "The description of the entry wound as at the neck is corroborated by the autopsy photos." I have them, and they are among the endless official proofs that the Commission reached a predetermined conclusion that it could not help disproving in its own work. Those autopsy pictures, taken with the body in the wrong position for autopsy purposes, show the bullet hole well down on the back and consistent with the body chart about which Sussman has nothing correct at all.

It is not "Exhibit 397" but is only a part of it. It is not "a standard hospital form" but is a form of the Navy, similar to what is used elsewhere. (It may interest you to know that before publication of the Report much of Exhibit 397 disappeared, as also did the Commission Document that was to be identical, if I remember correctly CD371. I published this without a peep from anyone on the Commission or its staff in 1975.)

No forensic expert would locate a wound by an object that moves, as the mastoid does, because it would depend on where the head is or how it is moved or positioned.

Sussman is also wrong about the body chart. In fact the Boswell need for autopsy purposes was for precision in placing that dot to represent the place the bullet hole was. Also hidden and I found and published in facsimile in 1975 was the official copy of this body chart. The location of that bullethole on it is "verified" by the President's own physician, who was in the autopsy room as he was also in the Dallas emergency room. Not only is this the fact but the also hidden (and also rescued) death ~~certificat~~ certificate that with <sup>the</sup> more than 10 million words it published the Commission did not include in its evidence

places it at the third thoracic vertebra, and that is well down on the back.

Your subject-matter ignoramus Sussman, like the Post, is silent about a President being assassinated and the official investigation of it hides the most basic evidence, including of the autopsy, evidence that <sup>disproves</sup> ~~disproves~~ the official "solution," thus my invocation of Orwell.

Sussman says that the measurements <sup>U</sup> ~~Baswell~~ wrote on that chart --and he does not say that most of the raw material for that autopsy also has disappeared -- "out the entry (sic) wound in the fleshy part of the neck above the shoulder bone."

With the FBI as my authority I tell you that rather than this being the case the bullet holes (which Sussman does not mention) in the jacket and on the shirt are about five and a half inches below the collar. As Sussman puts it, this is "a little above the collar of the shirt."

Boy do you pick 'em!!!!

Now in support of this I cite the FBI's evidence, that the bullet hole in the back of the shirt and in the back of the jacket both had spectrographic traces of bullet.

He says the bullet hole in what he says is the back of the <sup>U</sup> ~~neck~~ is one fourth by one eighth of an inch." Not so. Or has he his own version of the Warren Report?

Sussman says ~~it~~ the bullet did not strike bone, which the <sup>U</sup> ~~Commission~~ did say, Only that was not true according <sup>report of the</sup> to the panel of experts appointed by the Justice Department. I published it in facsimile in Post Mortem, in 1975. It is unequivocal in stating on its page 13, 592 in the book, under Neck Region, that "several small metallic fragments are present in this region (sic)," according to the X-rays. When the autopsy pathologists saw this film and wrote their report on it, also in facsimile in Post Mortem their language was a bit tricky. They wrote of these X-rays that they "revealed no evidence of a bullet or of a major portion of a bullet," to which I commented, how many minor parts of a bullet? They saw the fragments, as did the panel, and they are not magic, as that bullet was supposedly in so many ways.

Among what is and from the first has been missing is the notes of the autopsy. What I say a <sup>U</sup> ~~rescued~~ above was hidden where ordinarily nobody would look for them, in what was sent to the printing office, which none of that was. All copies of the death certificate were there, as was the remaining original of the autopsy holograph (the first was burned as soon as <sup>U</sup> ~~Oswald~~ was killed) and a number of incredible certifications of ~~destruction~~ <sup>destruction</sup> all approved and verified by the President's own physician.

From my <sup>U</sup> ~~experience~~ when I was able to travel and speak to collegiate audiences, in some places <sup>assassination</sup> ~~disassociation~~ with the government was greatest over

the JFK assassination. Mostly it was second to Viet Nam as the cause of dissatisfaction. This is also true with regard to disenchantment with the media.

As it should be apparent to you, under our system the assassination of a president, any president, is a de facto coup d'etat. It is inevitable and it was the fact with the JFK assassination. He and Johnson differed on many major policies, one of the reasons JFK selected him to run as vice president - because he could appeal to the voters where JFK did not.

As it has almost from the moment those shots rang out and it certainly is in printing this flaunting of ignorance and prejudice by Sussman, the Post is in support of a coup d'etat, the greatest subversion in a country like ours.

I had hoped to live long enough to see some element of the major media confess its error and ask to be forgiven, but it is clear when you publish this kind of wretchedly false information that what I'd hoped to see I'll not see. Not from the Post in any event.

I intend no personal insult but I ask you to ask yourself how this differs, other than in degree, from what we detested so much in other societies. And about what they happened in those other societies.

After more than thirty years it is past time for the Post and for other papers to face the reality and to begin to be honest with itself and with its trusting readers.

How can you, individually and collectively, think and care so little about your country and its system? About your responsibilities to both and to yourselves as journalists?

Or expect other than the widespread contempt for the press by so many people?

As you may remember, my typing can't be any better. Sorry.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg