

8/21/69

Dear John,

Enclosed are a copy of the autopsy authorization and the letter with which it was sent me. This is not the copy I thought I showed you in Silver Spring, although it is identical. I am carrying this further in correspondence. As a matter of fact, for my own purposes I have done much work around this. You can now get it for yourself, if you'd prefer a copy from the Archives, by merely selling for it.

As you know, I have planned a suit since 11/1/66, when I began to lay the foundation. The only reason I didn't file suit on this and a number of other items is lack of counsel. You may recall I suggested to you that we join forces on this. It has taken Bud a year to decide to proceed on some of the items, not competitive with your suit. He has agreed and is taking the first steps. This will deal with my own work and what has been denied me, that I have asked for personally and been refused or lied to about. There are ramifications in what I have done and there will be overtones in this suit that are unique. I think there may have the possibility of leading to something.

If you and your lawyer feel you must use this, I hope you will credit it to the book in which it is, POST MORTEM: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY AUTOPSY.

I expect to be at Archives in about a week and will seek to confirm Dick's observation.

Check on Autopsy Manual. I'll ask someone to get it.

Your letter to Paul is fine. We can redistribute. It may be that I will excerpt enough of Finck's for others in the future, in one of the books, that is. I have done this with Wecht's in DC. I got to go over more of Frazier's testimony yesterday on the plane. How those guys can avoid suicide! I marked it up, which will facilitate my future use, and with a Xerox to use in photocopy, where that is desirable in a book, this is the best of possible worlds! I am at a loss to explain or understand Jim's or his office's failure to make this available, without the request, though that was early made.

If and when Bud gets things to the point he'll have something for you and/or your lawyers, I am certain he'll send it.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg



## UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER

RAINBOW BOULEVARD AT 39TH STREET  
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66103 • AREA CODE 913 • ADams 6-5252

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND ONCOLOGY

August 19, 1969

Harold Weisberg, Esq.,  
Route 8  
Frederick, Maryland.

Dear Harold:

Many thanks for your letter of August 15, which arrived yesterday.

About the "authorization for the autopsy" I recall you telling me in my Silver Springs Motel room that it was apparently misplaced in the files at the Archives but that you either had a copy or could put your finger the item in the Archives. I am not certain which of the latter you told me. I asked you for a copy but you told me you wanted to preserve it for your own surprise. I had intended to ask you for this at the very last before I publish and possibly at that time trade you some of my undisclosed items.

You have not provided me with a copy but only some oral details on it. Should I write to the archivist and request a copy and possibly include a Xerox of his previous letter telling me that he does not have it?

Further on CE 562 & 564 and Mr. Frazier's confusion. Prior to going to the archives I wrote that I wanted to examine these two exhibits. After registering I told Mr. Johnson that a few months previously I had purchased 8x10 glossy of these exhibits and upon arrival inspection of them revealed that someone had taken a picture of them as they are printed in the report on pages 252 & 253 of volume 17. I told him that the grid lines of the screen of the copper half-tone plate were quite obvious. ✓ Mr. Johnson protested and told me that this was not the case, but, instead, the prints sent to me were made from the same negative as the prints of the actual exhibits which were sitting on the table before us as about 12x14 photographs (or so) mounted on two-ply Bristol Board. A short discussion revealed that we were on a collision course so I asked him to take the mounted exhibits on the Bristol Boards and make negatives for me for which I paid and the negatives

*I left them in Kansas city and could not show him,*

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
MEDICAL CENTER

and the negatives arrived about two weeks later. These negatives are not the ones from which the original exhibits were printed but are the ones our photographer made the prints I forwarded to you in which he attempted to bring the left hand sides (C7 & C38) to about the same magnification. I did not ask Mr. Johnson to show me the negatives from which the original exhibits were produced and he, of course, did not show them to me.

Of course, photographs are correctly supposed to be taken thru the comparison microscope onto a single negative and the line is optically produced by an arrangement of prisms or beam splitter. However this can be done by bringing (pasting) two separate negatives into apposition. If Dick says there were two negatives pasted together I would accept this until I have inspected the negative(s). Someone should confirm this in the Archives.

As to my unacceptable prints provided by the archives, I have taken these to our photographer and asked him to make duplicates by making a negative and then another set of prints which will be quite good. Will forward these when ready.

Enclosed is copy of letter to Paul about Xeroxing.

The new "Autopsy Manual" is a public document and you should be able to get it gratis or have a physician get it for you. I do not want to irritate the AFIP (Armed Forces Institute of Pathology) because I am applying for a consultant staff position. Believe it or not the Bethesda Navy Hospital Has invited me for a lecture in January 1970 to be on closed circuit television!! My last letter from the adjutant to Surgeon General of the Navy was a complete non-sequitur. I just simply cannot locate the regulations setting forth details for preservation of X-ray film, photographs, and human tissues obtained at biopsy or autopsy.

I go to Topeka August 20 for a half day with my lawyers. Just the instant they get a first draft of my brief ready I will forward it to you and Bud for your opinions.

Sincerely,

JN



Nichols to Weisberg August 19, 1969 page -2-

August 19, 1969

Paul Hoch, Ph. D.  
2537 Regent Street  
Apartment 202  
Berkeley, California 94704

Dear Paul:

Frazier's testimony from New Orleans is on hand and Finck's testimony is with my Topeka Lawyers while transcription of my own testimony has not yet been completed. I Have sent a thermofax copy of Frazier's testimony to Harold but he thinks Xerox copies should be distributed.

Here, we overcharge ourself 20¢ per sheet for Xeroxing and 16¢ goes into a "slush fund" over which I have no control and benefit very little. Harold mentioned you can do this for 3¢ per sheet. # If you should want to take it on I could send you Frazier's testimony by insured mail if you could return my copy (Xerox from New Orleans) within a day or so bu uninsured mail. You could then make copies for those interested.

Could send you Finck's testimony when my lawyers part with it temporary and could send My own testimony when it arrives. Each of these run some 125 pages or so.

Presume Harold will write you on this.

Sincerely,



John Nichols

cc: Harold Weisberg