C

3/20/93

Dear Jose Cornejo,

When John Barbour asked to interview me it was specifically not to be used with the several hours of his earlier interviews with Garrison and it was with the specific understand that I would not be used with anyone espousing any theories or imaginary solutions.

He gave me his word and he broke it. In every imaginable way. He did not give me a dub of the interview, did not send me what he produced, etc. So, unprincipled as he is and greedy to get money for his utterly worthless crap from Garrison he edited and produced what you tell me about. I've not seen it and don't want to. I do not suport what Garrison made up, dreamed up, cribbed up from the work of others. It is false.

There was no two-inch entrance scar on Connally's back.

Sincerely,

Harold

Harold Weisberg

March 8, 1993

Joe Cornejo
11200 W Cleveland Apt.#E11
West Allis, WI 53227

Dear Harold,

Thank you for your quick reply and for setting me straight with the books that I have been reading. (Sorry that this letter took so long to get to you, but I have not been able to gather up enough money to purchase all of your books until now.) I am terribly sorry to here about your health, and I wish you quick return to wellness. I am sorry to be taking your time to write to you again, but one question has been eating at my guts since I recieved your letter. In a video I recieved for Christmas intitled "The Jim Garrison Tapes", you make several appearances, which gives the impression that you support him. While I know otherwise thanks to your letter, I can't see why you chose to be in the video if you disagree with Garrison so much. (Moore also mentioned your feelings toward Jimbo in his "Definitive book on the Kennedy Assassination", but I was and am hesitant to believe anything he says) Please don't misinterpret this letter as I have Garrison's "investigation", I am in no way trying to insult you but merely seeking an explanation.

In your letter you reccommended Sylvia Meagher's book to me. This was the first book I recieved on the assassination but I forgot to list it in my first letter to you. My uncle purchased it for me along with Moore's book. When I read it I was very new to the case and the only information I had was from Oliver Stone's entertaining but extremely inaccurate movie. Although it does contain some things that have been proven false, Meagher's book seems far ahead of its time, and goes over many things that people like Mark Lane missed. (Although I own copies of "Rush to Judgment" and "Plausible Denial", I haven't read them. I really don't know what to think of Mark Lane, because although he presents himself better than people like Garrison, he does seem to make some outlandish charges. What is your opinion of him and his book(s)?) As for the video "Reasonable Doubt", I rented and recorded it a few weeks before writing to you.

Enclosed is the order form and check for $110. If this is not enough for all seven books, just write and I'll send more. In the meantime, I've had an "out of print search" done on Howard Roffman's book, as well as some by Peter Dale Scott, who wrote the introduction to "Accessories After the Fact". Since your letter, I've also finished "Conspiracy", which I mentioned I was reading in my first letter, "High Treason 2", "Cover Up", and "Reasonable Doubt". (No, I don't believe Robert Easterling in case your wondering) Shaw's and Hurt's books were good, but gave me little new information. On the other hand, I liked Harrison Livingstone's book very much, and found it to be a lot less far fetched than what I've read from his first book with Robert Groden. (I have absolutely zero respect for Mr. Groden. Even though his enhanced Z-film has proven useful to most researchers, his publication of the autopsy pictures in "The Globe" is one of the most disrespectful, repulsive acts I have ever heard of and his refusal to let other researchers work with his photos makes

the act that much more inexcusable. While in Dealey Plaza on the 29th anniversary of the assassination, someone from the "Assassination Information Center" was parading the autopsy photos around like the Crown Jewels. Granted, the photos are relevant to the case, but I wonder how that "researcher" would feel if it was his father in the pictures. If you have Groden's address, I would appreciate it so I can write him a little letter. On that same tone, I would also like Jim Moore's address if you have it.)

Well, this letter is already longer than I intended it to be, (sorry!), so let me try to wrap it up. Again, I hope your health improves and sorry this order took so long.

Sincerely,

Joe A. Cornejo

P.S.- One more question. In "Conspiracy of One", Moore says that the scar on Connally is" a two inch long sideways entrance scar in his back". He gets this from Dr. Michael Baden. Is there any truth to this statement? Because if it is true, than it gives serious credibility to the single bullet theory. Although there may be bullets that tumble in the air, I find it implausible that an assassin would know a) that his shot would hit Connally, not Kennedy, and b) that there would be a need for a single bullet theory, thus the need for this ammunition. Perhaps the scar is merely the cut from the surgeon's scalpel, which seems more likely given that it is two inches long, which, if I remember right, is much longer than CE399. However, I am no expert on this case and am merely speculating. Please fill me in on this situation.