

Mark Crouch
426 Single Ave.,
Collins Park,
New Castle, DL 19720

10/23/91

Dear Mark,

Thanks for your undated, mailed Monday. If you change your mind I have a few copies of other books that are damaged a bit and you are welcome to any you'd like.

I'm into so much, have so much correspondence, and with a failing memory (of the recent past, not the distant) I have no recollection of what I wrote you. However, I encourage you to address a question Harry has not been able to: why would anyone fake photographic evidence to disprove what the alleged faking is supposed to validate? Until you can do this, I see no purpose served in doctoring any of the film. As you will see in Post Mortem, it entirely destroys the official "solution."

This is merely one of the real problems in theorizing who conspired. For example, where you say all the conspiracies were one, however many are conceived.

On Lifton: I think his problem is not memory.

On who did the covering up, first you have to establish that there was a conspiracy to cover up and then you have to identify quite a few people because a very large number were part of it. That it was not spontaneous, not the way the system usually works, will not be easy for an informed person to do. Some of it began before it was possible for orders to do it where possible.

I think it can be argued that the FBI and the Commission were major, if not the major, components of the coverup. Do you think either had anything to do with the assassination, the killing? I do not and I know of no substantial reason even to suspect either. What does this do to considering all elements part of one conspiracy.

The problem people like you face is that almost all you know is what was written by those with a conspiracy ax to grind. For example, Lifton, Schein, Davis. Where what they say is not false it ~~also~~ is misleading because of what they omit and how they angle. This influences the thinking and understanding of even some well-informed readers.

The one thing that is certain is that the official evidence itself leaves it beyond question, there was a conspiracy to kill. Offhand, and I'm a bit tired and sleepy, I can't think of anything that now can responsibly be added. There is nothing wrong with addressing possibilities in thinking but I think it is very wrong to present thoughts as established fact.

Consider that you may have a horsecart problem. I think you do. First you have to establish who conspired to kill. Until you do that you have no basis for any next steps. And as of now I know of no basis for establishing this. It certainly was not necessary for them to be part of the covering up. Nor does the fact that there was covering up have to mean that it was to protect the killers or because they were part of the same cabal.

Best wishes,

Mark

October 19, 1991

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, Md 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I was very pleased to get your letter today. Let me start by saying I am returning the check, please keep it. Many of the books in my research library were purchased in much worse condition and at prices far above the original cover price. As my finances permit I would like to acquire all of the volumes you have written.

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate the time you spent on the letter. I also understand that you are not able to engage in lengthy communications of this type. What I would like to do as time permits and at your convenience of course, is to seek your answers to some of the numerous questions I am wrestling with. I have read, with haste, Post Mortem, which I borrowed from Groden. I would like a few weeks to carefully study it now that I have my own copy. It would be redundant for me to consume your time with questions which can be easily answered by simply reading your book. If at anytime you wish to speak with me about these matters do not hesitate to call me collect. I sincerely believe your insight will be worth far more than the cost of the call.

In addressing the items in my previous letter allow me to explain my confusion.

I am and have been for over 20 years a broadcast journalist. I have tackled some pretty tough stories, but this case makes me a mouse out to wrestle King Kong. I admit that with all humility. I also admit that I am still quite malleable despite 11 years of working on the case.

I can see your "reporters instinct" in your writings. I can also see how your commitment to documentation and substantiation has greatly influenced Harry. Many others in this so called "community" have chastised me for working with Harry but he is more of an honest reporter than many of them could hope to ever be.

PAGE 2

On the issue of 1, 2 or 3 demensional conspiracies let me simply say I confess that I have many years of work still to do before I arrive at a conviction based on fact. Aside from those personal experiences with Lifton, the comments in my letter are all theory at this point in time. I will ponder the points you've made and seek substantiations as opposed to beliefs based on suspicion. As for Lifton your comments are wholly valid, I simply try to reframe from being overly critical on a personal basis. I sincerely believe he has a serious memory dysfunction, or perhaps he is simply a naked plagiarist.

When I was a young boy living in the hills outside of Lynchburg I spent many a day down by a large stream fishing, swimming and hunting. Just up the stream from our home was an old but still operational grist mill. The stream ran squarely across our property.

I crossed that stream many times during my boyhood. There were several places I knew to be the best locations if one wished to emerge dry on the other side. There were many possible locations when the weather was dry because the numerous boulders in the creek would be dry and provide good footing. If the miller opened the water wheel gate at the dam, some of those "dry" rocks would vanish. Likewise a heavy shower up in the mountians would also eliminate sound footholds. On three occasions during my childhood I remember being evacuated up the "back road" which did not require crossing the creek because it had become a raging rapid due to flooding.

I have always seen my role as a journalist as analogous to crossing that creek in that one must find a sequence of dry rocks(facts) in order to reach the other side (the truth) safely. The path is seldom a straight line and usually requires one to zig zag.

I say all this as a preface toward anwsering your questions concerning my changing beliefs concerning the integrity of the autopsy photos. I had always looked upon them as "dry rocks" which would help provide a crossing. No singlar item has pushed me towards the conclusion of alteration but I cannot ignore the mounting weight of circumstantial evidence.

PAGE 3

That evidence is:

- (1) The numerous eyewitness repudiations concerning the back of the head as it appears in the photos compared to their recollections.
- (2) The photo/X-ray conflict.
- (3) The unexplainable contrast anomaly between the black and whites and colors.
- (4) The fact that the photographic material was handled in a bizarre manner:
 - (A) Delay in processing
 - (B) No prints made when first processed
 - (C) The burn party
 - (D) Whom did Fox make B & W prints for?
 - (E) Why enlarge the back of the head shot.

Please realize I do not use the terms evidence and fact interchangeably. Nothing above is a fact except for the issue of differences between the black and whites and colors and between the photo's as a whole and the x-rays. The rest is evidence which supports a theory of photo alteration, I know of no fact which would definitely prove photo alteration.

Evidence supports theory while facts prove the truth. I could therefore say that in light of the fact that there is no clear proof of alteration I must therefore conclude the pictures..as they are..constitute uncorrupted truth. I have adopted a stance that the photos are altered in order to explore the argument in hopes of finding fact...if there is any to be found.

As for the Mafia and the CIA, I offer those concessions merely to get beyond the issue of who actually did the killing and more into the argument of who did the cover-up. Don't misunderstand me, I'm not saying they're separate conspiracies the facts are obvious that they are not. What I am trying to sort through is the separate and similar motivations of various actors in the conspiracy.

PAGE 4

I have had first hand dealing with the CIA surrounding a very bizarre incident in 1980 when a Department Of Energy helicopter crashed in the Chesapeake Bay near the Soviet Retreat in Queen Annes County. I will be glad to discuss that with you at some future time. I do not claim to have a broad knowledge of The Agency aside from certian cladestine operations which have been run for years out of Andrews Air Force Base and here at Summit Delaware.

You are 100% correct that there exists not one singular solid irrefutable FACT that either body or the photo's were altered..it is merely conclusions..occasionally supported by circumstantial evidence...held together with suspicions.

The more I've tracked through Lifton's research the more I've discovered the truth about what you have said.

I appreciate your candor and I look forward to your insight as time permits. Somewhere in this stream there has to be some dry rocks to stand on.

Best Wishes,


Mark Crouch