

if I have prolonged it in order to comment more critically it is because of my genuine concern that work as penetrating and decisive as your autopsy on the 1968 panel report should have the best possible opportunity to make its impact. If these suggestions offend you or raise any doubts in your mind about my good faith or good will, you may be sure that I will not venture into such commentary again. Meanwhile, I do urge you to review the entire ms. before any publication of it, to modify and vary the general tone and to restructure sentences to inject greater clarity.

My point about sentence structure and clarity applies to page 1 line 1, which should read "...had charged that a prominent..." (These examples are literally at random.) Page 6, para. 6, line 1: "Here, with the subtlety characteristic of lawyers, Marshall really says that he was not..." Page 8, para. 5: "As I said in a letter to Marshall afterward, it is a contract not in the family's interest, conceived under the most dubious circumstances, and given to the New York Times -- in open violation of regulations -- on what was, for all practical purposes, an exclusive basis."

Page 27, para. 4: "Despite obfuscation at the outset of the report and omission at the end of the document, we can determine beyond doubt by persevering through the verbiage that the task performed by the panel was entirely different from the task it was asked to perform. This is stated in the first paragraph as a request

to examine various photographs, X-ray films, (etc.)"

After the quotation, Harold, I think you should make it clear why the conclusion (that "the photographs and X-rays...support the above-quoted portions of the original Autopsy Report...") is in conflict with the stated purpose ("...to examine...and to evaluate their significance..." etc.). I realize that you have made your point as to the fate of the "original Autopsy Report" and the other points, but you have dispersed your comments and furthermore created a distraction by discussing, immediately after the quotation from the first paragraph of the panel's report, its reference to the death rather than the murder of the President.

Page 44, para. 4: "The most superficial "examination" of the photographs and X-rays raises questions which the panel should have answered and which an honest panel would have felt impelled to answer. One simple but basic question is, did the panel have before it all the film?" Same page, next paragraph: "A proper "examination" of the four exhibits under "bullets," an examination warranting the weight and force which the panel knew would be attached to its conclusions, required prolonged time and effort, including the search for and mastery of the relevant detailed testimony and documents."

These examples will suffice to indicate the kind of editing and re-writing which would, in my opinion, greatly enhance the ms. But in closing, I want to reiterate my tribute to your tenacious, all-inclusive, fast of scrutiny and exposure of 1