

Dear Robert,

12/9/88

I think I wrote and told you I'm getting along OK but still can't use the better eye for reading. So, please excuse the typos and the haste. I started on one of my periodic desk-cleanings and, what a mess!. I'll respond to you 12/5 while I read it and get to the great quantity of clips when I can. Many thanks for them.

I do not suspect anything with the mail here. Years ago I'd be sure there was no hanky-ponky here but by now some of those people have retired. Mail does sometime go astray. It then usually has postmarks showing where it went but not always

es, I'm glad to get things for archival purpose only, thanks. and the reviews of the shows are valuable, too. I'll trim the clippings while I file them after reading. I've put all of this in a separate box because I've no file room left in my office and have problems with stairs.

Bob Culter sends me his newsletter, thanks. You form your own impression. He is a really fine guy with whom I often disagree.

House assassins committee set itself to rebut the critics. Each hearing began with Balkey's narration of what so-and-so said. He skipped only one, me. So, I'm sure he thought the police tape analysis would be the biggest putdown. Only when it wasn't he grabbed it and thus escaped complete bankruptcy. What else can he claim to have done?

Cutler has his own nonsense about that utter nonsense, the umbrella man. In his literature, TUM.

Re Jesse Jackson: he would not respond when King was killed and his lie was to claim he had King's blood on his shirt. It was Abernathy who claimed to hear King talking....The FBI did test fire that rifle. Said not sufficient marks on bullet remnant. This is a lie because I'm sure there is no match.

Re Selby's documentary: Zapruder claims copyright and nobody would dare it fearing copyright suit. Chip's copy is not as good because it is a pirated copy, I think mine. The others paid Zapruder and got better copies from the original.

Agree with you on Anderson. I think no mob involvement.

I'm aware of what O'Connor says. He is just wrong. I think that the gross material is at least the left hemisphere of the brain. Some of the right was section, the left wasn't touched. I got that record under FOIA

The Dallas gang swears they see a uniform. I don't and don't think they can. "One of the Morrmann enhancement was done with my print. They actually call him "h ad-geman."... . Belin is at least disturbed. I debated with him once and two days later he came out for a new investigation. I think of him as a Judenrat and I think he is driver, by guilt feelings and compulsion to self-justify. ...Cronkite was only the voice on "ova. It was done by Robert Richter, who'd worked at CBS.... On Kennedy family permission, true. See contract in Post Mortem. When Nova referred to NAA test they meant for HSCA, where Guinn did it. I think NOVA got the pictures from Lifton and that he got them from the Navy photog, who kept prints....I don't think there was a left-temple wound, which McClelland did say there was... I can't answer your questions about these pix but I think they are not fakes.... Sure bullet entered front of neck but not sure what happened to it. Maybe it is what made the hole in his back....I did help the Anderson people although I disagreed with them and him. I left anyone have access... On clippings: if they are trimmed neatly, on some you can use magic tape others do staple....I've not heard the Ne man radio program. Some months ago a Chicago outfit that prepares radio for public stations interviewed me by phone....I don't expect any hitch in getting the Zapruder frames now. Letting lawyer handle. Sorry I didn't take more time for some of the questions, which could require a book, but I want to clean this up, let nothing more accumulate and someone is due here before long. Many thanks and best wishes, Harold

December 5, 1988

Dear Harold -

Got your letter of 11/7 and 10/24 (I have a question about the 10/24 letter, but I'll get to that in a second). First of all, I hope you are doing well and have recovered from the cataract surgery. My grandmother, who is now 92, had it several years ago and she can now read without her glasses if necessary. Now, on your letter of 10/24 in which you included the article Iran-Contra figure who was wanted for plane bombing (it was from the Indy Star 9/5/88). You obviously wanted me to get it the LA Weekly prior to the election. ~~██████████~~ The postmark on the letter was 10/25 and normally your letters take five days tops to get here. This particular letter with the article on Bush's friend, Felix Rodriguez, arrived on 11/15 -- after the election and after the letter you wrote dated 11/7 and postmarked 11/8. I don't want to seem paranoid and with the U.S. postal system as it is anything can happen. But I've never had mail problems and your letters always come in five days. Yet this one article was in a letter that took an abnormal period of time to arrive. Is it possible that your mail is still locked at by anybody? I know you had mentioned mail problems in WHITEWASH. I don't know the answer, it just struck me as a peculiar happening.

I've got a lot of articles here. Many deal with the assassination, others are just on the anniversary. I included everything regardless of the topic since I thought you'd want it for the permanent archive you are putting together. My mother gave me some things from

(2)

Cincinnati papers. In some cases when the article wasn't in great shape, I made a xerox and included both the copy and originals. I've included reviews of the various assassination specials (most of which just irritated me for their lack of substance or covering the same things that they always do -- not to mention their picking the most outlandish theories to knock down). Among the things included: a follow up story on the British documentary; Leo Sauvage's obituary; a ridiculous story from the GLOBE which claims Jack Ruby is still alive; an article from the New York Times which covers various assassination theories; a story in the LA Herald Examiner from Liz Smith's column on the Zapruder film suit that you were involved in; several articles on Marina Oswald today and a reprint of the Ladies Home Journal piece ^{which} ran in San Francisco; an article in the LA Times where Alan Dershowitz calls for a new investigation; a blast at Jack Anderson's special by LA Times reviewer Howard Rosenberg; a review of the NOVA special from the NY Times; other review of CBS's special and the Arts and Entertainment special; an LA Herald Examiner piece done by AP on the assassination; a truly stupid piece by Larry King comparing the similarities of Lincoln and JFK's assassination (he fails to note Lincoln's assassination was the result of a conspiracy; in fact he says otherwise and says the same of JFK -- shades of John Lattimer); and speaking of truly stupid, I've included David Belin's article that appeared in the NY Times Sunday magazine section - the article is adapted from his latest book Final Disclosure, which is a rehash of You are the Jury. Also included: a short article and picture of James Earl Ray who was on the Morton Downey Jr. show recently; a hatchet piece on JFK by Patrick Buchanan, a truly

(3)

reprehensible human being; another Globe story linking the Kennedys with Marilyn Monroe's death, a National Enquirer story on whether Oswald acted alone "Yes" written by Vincent Bugliosi and "No" by Cyril Wecht; a pro and con conspiracy editorial in USA Today and also on the same page USA Today decides there was no conspiracy; a reprint of the Variety that came out on Monday Nov. 25th; a pap-piece cover story from People on "Where We Were Nov. 22, 1963;" a ridiculous Time Magazine story that is by James Reston Jr. claiming Oswald was really after Connally, also a story on whether the Mob killed JFK; an article by Pete Hammill from New York magazine; I've also included a special section from the L.A. Weekly on Robert Kennedy's Killing by Andy Boehm and a look at the recently released documents that have been suppressed since the assassination; a piece on assassination conspiracy theories from Newsweek; an article from the LA Times magazine on David Lifton; and an article from the New York Times by David Margolick on the legal aspects of the suit you and Gerald Selby filed against Zapruder. At the end of the RFK piece in the LA Weekly it gives the address for a bi-monthly newsletter published by Robert Cutler. I sent for a sample copy, which he sent me. I copied it and enclosed it. It has a reference to you in regard to Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassination. It also talks about the acoustical evidence presented to the House Assassination Committee. Now, I've always regarded that "evidence" as irrelevant because conspiracy evidence abounds without it. He concludes it is not accurate. My question is, why did the House Committee even want to introduce evidence that concludes there was a fourth shot? They clearly wanted to prove Oswald guilty, so

(4)

why use the tape as evidence? Also Cutler says the man who appeared before the Committee who claimed to be the umbrella man perjured himself and showed a different umbrella. I've never given much credence to the idea of the man with umbrella being a "marker". Why have a man so cut in the open? This is one of those things that the government can easily knock down and I question why so-called assassiniologists waste time on this rather than issues that the government can't pick apart so easily. There's a lot of other articles, but those are the highlights. However, there was an interesting comment in the George Bush - Jesse Jackson meeting on the King assassination which I included. Bush and Jackson agreed ~~to~~ that James Earl Ray should not get a furlough and Bush stated that Ray's release would "send the wrong signal to America". I'm surprised that the outspoken Jackson didn't use the forum to state that he did not believe Ray was King's Killer. But you can't expect much from a man who lied about Dr. King speaking to him as he lay dying in his arms.

On the subject of King: I caught the Morton Downey Jr special with James Earl Ray. If you've never seen Downey before, you should know he is a right wing loud mouth a la Joe Pine, who has no regard for guests. That wasn't the case on this show. He actually criticized the FBI for covering up, although he defended them on other work they do. Mark Lane was also on. I didn't know he was Ray's attorney now. After Lane's involvement with Jim Jones I could care less what he has to say. But for the type of show Downey usually does it wasn't awful. Although he ended it in his typical blow hard style demanding that the FBI test the

(5)

the weapon and release suppressed material. Like no one has demanded this before. Suddenly, the FBI will do this because Morton Downey Jr wants it done.

I saw most of the JFK specials and have some comments and questions which I hope you can answer to give me some better understanding of things involved. I saw Reasonable Doubt and thought it was very well done. It was nice to see something that dealt with facts, not theories or hearsay. One thing I don't get is how Zapruder's son could have stopped you from showing the Zapruder film. That film was shown everywhere - on Geraldo, on The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald, on Jack Anderson and numerous other shows. The majority did not include a copyright, why did Reasonable Doubt have this problem? Also, the other versions of the film were much better quality. Why did this documentary have to use an inferior copy? I must say Reasonable Doubt went a long way in convincing people I know especially after they had seen other specials which didn't deal in the facts.

The Jack Anderson special was sickening. The re-enactments were tacky and after I saw the show I wondered how this man ever won a Pulitzer Prize. Most of the information he had already published in his column. Marina Oswald was on by satellite and she had no idea who she was talking to (she answered "Hello, whoever you are" after he introduced her). Whenever she said something he wasn't interested in, he just cut her off. I guess an argument can be made for the Mob not liking the Kennedy's but from your writing they don't seem to play any major

⑥

role in the assassination. In your opinion, did the mob play a role in the murder?

Geraldo Rivera did a two-part examination on the assassination. On Part one, Cyril Wecht did his single bullet theory routine - something he could do in his sleep by now. I saw Wecht on quite a few specials. He is convincing on his magic bullet material, but he often becomes flustered on other questions. He can never answer why the rest of ~~the~~ panel that looked at the autopsy materials disagreed with him. And while saying the head shot could have come from the Knoll, he always says the autopsy reveals that all shots only came from the rear. He could disprove that if the missing brain was sectioned. He never talks about the Parkland doctors describing the front neck wound ~~as~~ as being one of entrance. Then came Paul O'Connor who removed the President's body from the body bag and got it ready for autopsy. (O'Connor has a chapter in David Lifton's book) O'Connor stated that all of the brain was missing, therefore it could not have been fixed in solution. Yet, there was a metal box marked gross material in the Archive at one time (according to Wecht). What is the story on that? Was the brain fixed in solution or not? Do you know of a man named Jim Marrs? He was also a guest on Geraldo. During his segment, he showed Mary Moreman's polaroid taken at the time of the head shot. They focused in on the figure and the smoke behind the stockade fence. This figure is hard enough to see as is, but Marrs claims you can ~~see~~ see the man is wearing a uniform

⑦

that looks to have a badge on it, much like a police uniform. I couldn't see this and I have no idea what Marrs was getting out. If he was saying it was a Dallas cop, why wear a uniform? Maybe he was saying the assassin could easily blend in with other police after the murder. These are the kind of accusations that are not helpful. Your books are filled with documented evidence of a conspiracy. But TV wants sensational or visual "evidence". They're not going to show Commission documents for an hour. So they find people who claim the body was reconstructed or that the tramps were various people that they can't be and then shoot them down and say "well so much for a conspiracy". Jean Hill told her story of being detained by Federal agents and of her being told there were only 3 shots not 6 as she heard. She also said she took photos, but was not asked what happened to them. Leavelle, the policeman handcuffed to Oswald, was on and he said in his opinion Oswald was the lone assassin. Why his opinion should disprove anything is beyond me. Finally, David Belin was on. This man is truly disturbed. He ignored questions to say what he wanted. As usual, the Tippit is the Rosetta Stone to the assassination. He lied outright. He said, ~~the~~ critics always blame the government for finding that Oswald acted alone. Well, I don't work for the government (what was the Warren Commission and the Rockefeller Commission?). He continued by saying if had all the time the critics get on tv he could convince the public that Oswald acted alone. He said all of Connally's doctors agreed that one bullet passed through the Governor

and the President. I saw Connally's doctor say just the opposite on one interview. Then Belin said Connally never said the first shot missed him. Here Geraldo knew differently because he had done an interview of Connally for his other special Lee Harvey Oswald on Trial and Connally had said just the opposite. When Geraldo told him this Belin didn't answer. When Geraldo said how can bullet 399 be in this kind of condition all Belin could answer was I don't know, but we know the bullets came from Oswald's rifle. He said, ~~most~~ most people had not read the Warren Report, to which Geraldo said how can they it's 10 million words and it was published with no index, to which Belin did not reply. The man seems driven by some inner demon and I'd love to see a credible critic tear him apart. Did you ever share a forum with Belin? I missed the second part of the special (a friend is sending me a tape) but I knew the woman who says she was Jack Ruby's girl friend (I sent you this article) is on claiming Ruby and Oswald knew each other.

I also saw the so-called Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald. It was a ludicrous spectacle. How can a man who took his secrets to the grave defend himself? He can't. The single bullet theory was argued. This theory only exists because Oswald was killed. This would have never been part of a trial. The thing that stood out in this "trial" was Cyril Wecht's testimony. He went through his typical speech about the single bullet theory. Then the prosecutor asked him if the shot came from the rear that struck Kennedy and exited the neck, where did

④

the bullet go? Instead of saying the Dallas physician said the neck wound was one of entrance and the autopsy doctors never tried to find the bullet in the back or neck, he hemmed and hawed, finally saying to Buglioso (the prosecutor) where did the third bullet go? It's not my job to find that, it's the autopsy doctors. Now that may be true, but Wecht could have cited known evidence to say that it is possible the neck wound was one of entrance. It seems he is fine discussing the magic bullet, but anything he has not rehearsed he has trouble answering.

Perhaps the most ridiculous thing I saw was James Reston Jr. on Nightline discussing his theory that Oswald wanted to shoot Connally. He was asked, why shoot Connally when he's with the President, Connally would have been easier to get anytime in Texas, Oswald needn't go over Connally at that particular time. Reston had no real argument for this. I don't understand why TIME magazine gave this theory a cover story.

I assume you saw the NOVA special. It was of interest in some aspects. Of course, it was typical that Cronkite stated although the single bullet theory was improbable, it has not been disproved. Why is it that the single bullet theory is the rule to go by? Like it has to be disproved. The opposite is true. It should have to be proved possible and it cannot be. They say things like: If Connally was moved to the left he would have been in position to be hit by the Kennedy bullet. But he was not in that position. Photo analysis proves the Muchmore film shows a human figure on the Knoll.

(10)

So rather than ask who was this man or what was he doing, they say they cannot conclude he was holding a rifle. They jumped on the acoustic evidence, which is irrelevant. There is other evidence that proves a conspiracy existed. They explored various theories, like the Mob, but always with Oswald as the gunman. They totally ignored anti-Castro Cubans. Of all the critics, they went after Lifton, whose charges are impossible. Several questions do arise about the NOVA special. One thing, they said they had to get the Kennedy family's permission to have the Dallas doctors look at autopsy photos and X-rays. Is that true? NOVA's report also said they conducted neutron analysis on bullet 399 and said it was identical to fragments found in Connally and Kennedy. Is that true? Also the Dallas doctors said the wounds were the same in the autopsy photos as at Parkland. How can that be? And, can we trust their memories after 25 years. And finally, they said the Kennedy's had to give permission to let anybody see the autopsy material, yet NOVA showed 4 photos of the dead President. Now, my father is a doctor and I've seen photos of gruesome murders. These photos were not gruesome, but it was disturbing to suddenly see this man lying dead. There was no warning they would be shown. How did NOVA get permission to show these photos? Even you with all your knowledge of the case were denied permission, yet on a PBS documentary 4 black and white autopsy photos of President were shown.

I looked closely at these pictures by stopping the tape. The first photo was of the President's back (I believe it was similar to the one drawn by Ida Dix for the House Committee). The second was

(10)

of the left profile of the President. Two doctors recalled a gunshot wound at the left temple. This could not be seen in the photo. Of course, the photo was black and white and not of good contrast, but as I say it was not noticeable. If there was such a wound, where did the shot come from and when would it have occurred on the Zapruder film? Or was the description a mistake? The next photo was of Kennedy taken from the top of the head, None of his features are seen, just his nose sticking up and part of the body. He is lying flat in the photo. The top of the head is clearly damaged and it looks as if the brain protrudes.* This does not look like any description of wounds I've heard of before. I might add, in the photo of the back, the back of head can be seen (the Dox drawing). The entrance wound is seen as is a small flap at the base of the neck hairline. On the right side of the head, a flap of skin is hanging, but it certainly doesn't resemble the damage in frame 355 of Zapruder. Perhaps the wound was cleaned up before the photo. But I reread several portions of Mrs. Kennedy's testimony where she described the massive head destruction. Other witnesses seem to confirm her statements. Without sounding like David Lifton, have these photos been tampered with? Was the head reconstructed for autopsy photos? Maybe this is what the surgery of the head area in the Siebert-O'Neill report was about. It seems impossible that these photos are accurate. The final wound shown was the tracheotomy wound. I have seen the Dox sketch of this before. I believe part of the wound is still there. It is not totally obliterated by the tracheotomy

(* I'm talking about the top of the head to the rear - the crown of the head - it looks shredded and I am guessing the shredded area shows the brain torn up as well)

(12)

incisions. I could not detect the ring of bruising from the photo shown, but again it's black and white and not a real close-up. What the NOVA photo showed that the Dox drawing did not was the upper torso as well as the President's face (the top of the head could not be seen in the photo)*.

*the photo only shows up to the President's forehead, Aside from the tracheotomy incision, there were no signs of any damage, you can't see the left side of the head or right, and from the photo, it's hard to believe the President had any major damage to the head.

This was the most disturbing, seeing the young President lying lifeless, eyes staring blankly.

Then, it really sinks in -- a man has been murdered, a man with a full life ahead of him, a family, children and there he is dead. Did these photos come from Lifton? If they didn't get permission to show them, why would NOVA air them?

I have one other question regarding the neck wound. Most of the doctors in Dallas stated it was an entrance wound. You seem to know as much, if not more than most experts about the autopsy. Where did that bullet go? There is no exit wound on the back of the President in the photo I've seen. I know the neck wound was not dissected and various X-rays are missing. Is it your belief the bullet remained in the body?

I saw some other special reports on the CBS Evening News, CBS Morning News, the Today Show and Good Morning America. They were of little interest and basically gave an overview of JFK's life, politics and that day in Dallas. I haven't seen the Arts and Entertainment 6 hr special although my mother taped it for me (I don't get cable where I am). I am curious to see the NBC coverage and how it was reported.

With my work, I haven't yet finished Oswald in New Orleans, but I'm half

(13)

way through. It's riveting in that so much was covered up. In light of all the articles and TV specials, I find it terribly frustrating that the lies continue. Now, we have a President who is a real friend of the CIA and my fear is the agency will be free to do as it pleases.

The assassination was truly a turning point. Things changed in America. We lost our innocence. Violence became commonplace. Unpopular policies were continued. It's hard to be optimistic about government anymore. JFK's murder made LBJ, Nixon, Ford and Reagan possible. I believe Carter was an aberration. He only got in because of Ford's pardon of Nixon. There is little chance of a reinvestigation and at this point a solution will never be discovered. The public doesn't believe the Warren Report, yet they don't see the need for another investigation. And I can see why. Whenever the government investigates itself, the cover up only continues.

By the way, I noticed you received a credit on the Anderson special. I've tried to be careful in putting the articles together. I had to fold some, but rather than staple, I've used paperclips. I tried to put them in chronological order, although some may be out of order. I know I'm no investigator, but hope what little I can do is of some help. I assume with the 25th anniversary over, we've seen the bulk of articles, but I'll keep a look out. And I'll certainly stay in touch.

Hope you are well and I hope your wife is okay. Have happy holidays and I wish you the best. All is well with me, although work is getting hectic as the last time from the strike catches up to us.

I know this is a long letter and I've

(14)

asked a lot of questions. I also know you don't have all the time in the world to spend answering my letters, but I hope you will try to answer some of my questions.

Finally, after feeling like I've relived all of this again because of the TV shows, etc. I just want you to know how much I respect and admire what you've done. I especially respect your integrity and the fact that you've consciously chosen not to exploit the subject matter. When is Zapruder going to let you see the missing frames and sprocket hole sections of the film? I'd be curious to know what you find.

Best wishes,

Robert

P.S. I also heard you on a radio program hosted by Edwin Newman run on the CBS affiliate here called "The Kennedy Assassination: 25 Years Later".