

May 24, 1992

Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Now that finals have finished I have been able to secure copies of all the materials I borrowed and thus I return them to you. Thank you very much for the opportunity. The materials will prove to be very useful. I have also included the *Newsday* articles as promised.

I recently spoke with Jim Lesar and was able to provide information to him which he incorporated into his testimony before the Senate. It seemed to slip everyone's mind that even if you release all the HSCA records the investigators would still be bound by their oath of secrecy and subject to criminal penalties. Hopefully now that order will be rescinded.

I saw that you were mentioned in the *Washington Post* and *Washington Times*, the latter in a not so favorable manner. I have been following the story's development since it first was made public. I am very interested in reading the entire article, however, I have already noticed some serious discrepancies that I fear will not be addressed.

First, if Humes is to be believed then Finck perjured himself on the stand at the Shaw trial with respect to who controlled the autopsy. I finally found one article that stated Humes felt Finck misidentified the President's military aides as that of Admirals and Generals. I find it very hard to believe that a Colonel in the U.S. Army can not distinguish aides from Generals or Admirals, not to mention the fact that under cross examination, Finck mentioned individual names.

Second, Humes' answer that the brain was buried with the President at the time of the funeral can not be accurate. How then was a supplemental autopsy performed two weeks later? Why then was the brain listed on the transfer papers in 1965? Perhaps at sometime it was secretly buried somewhere but not at the original time of JFK's burial.

Third, my understanding is that the article ignores the single bullet theory entirely. When Humes was questioned by Specter in 1964, Humes felt one bullet could not have caused the wounds of both men. In fact, I believe the three autopsists all concurred that one bullet was unlikely (implausible I think was the word they used) to have caused seven wounds. Why was this not discussed?

Finally, what about the moving head wound? I recall very vividly Humes' astonishment, during the HSCA hearings, that the Clark panel had moved the skull entrance wound 10 centimeters from where it was indicated on the autopsy face sheet. I doubt this was explained in the article either, but it is so very crucial in understanding the accuracy and skills of these pathologists.

The article's significance has been incorrectly touted by the media as usual. It does not offer any evidence that Oswald was the assassin. It does not offer any evidence that the President's death was not at the hands of a conspiracy. It does not refute the conclusion of the HSCA with respect to a missed fourth shot. What it does is lend more confusion to an already confusing subject, particularly since the two interviewers assumedly had no knowledge of the many inaccuracies with respect to the autopsy and how they related to the many theories.

I will probably send a letter to Dr. Lundberg and bring to his attention the above problems. Perhaps he will question his good friend Dr. Humes further.

In any event, I trust all is well with you. I graduate from law school this Saturday and I must begin to study for the bar examination this week. By the way I have been hired by the Mayor of Albany to coordinate foreign affairs for the City, specifically the sister city program. We have sister cities in seven foreign nations.

Furthermore, I finally received my FBI file after 18 months. The file consists of 9 pages dated from June 1988 to January 1989. The last page was withheld entirely and most of the remaining eight pages were redacted for national security reasons! The FBI investigated me for potential criminal activities and it is my assumption it had to do with my activities while working for the British government during the Spring of 1988. Most of my work related to South Africa and believe it or not, I think one of my college professors reported I might have been supplying vital information to the South African government.

Obviously, the FBI determined there was nothing to the allegations and closed my file. I have filed an appeal with respect to the redacted sections.

All my best to you and your wife.

Sincerely,  
*Manz*

Dear Mark,

5/30/92

Congratulations of your graduation and on your getting a worthwhile job!

And thanks for the return of what you borrowed.<sup>ed</sup> Only next time it has to be understood, as I thought it was this time, that you would physically return them to where you got them. It is too much for me and I have no help now.

Your comments on the media blitz/event by the AMA are perceptive and you remembered one thing I did not and wish I remembered whether I have it and if so where filed. It is the doubts about the single-bullet theory by the autopsists. I recall using the one in which Specter stated more explicitly Dolce's refusal to go along with it. If you have this I'd appreciate a copy because I do intend to do something about that nasty, unprofessional propaganda adventure. And you talk about things I had in mind using, along with much more.

In this regard, if you can still plug into that remarkable Lexis, I'd appreciate a copy of the press conference transcript.

The JAMA is available now. If you cannot get a copy I'll have one.

From the stories I've read they do not entirely ignore the single-bullet theory.~~gltt~~ But they seem to want to and probably did to the degree they thought possible.

The FBI may have invoked the national-security~~xxx~~ claim over its source(s), in your FOIA records.

Good luck with your bar exams!

Our best,