Dear Mr. DiCarlantonio, 6/22/90

There does appear to be some contradiction between what some of the Dallas doctors said contemporaneously and later. I believe that the damage to the head was pretty much as the Commission said. I do not believe the back was blown out. All those doctors, however, did not say that the back was blown out.

Saying that th e damage was pretty much as the Commission said does not mean that what else the Commission said about the wounds is based on solid evidence. It isn't.

I do not think that any of the frames of the Zapruder film were touched up. Some were destroyed in the original.

You are nor misinformed when you say that none of the eyewitnesses said the back of the head was destroyed. "one did.

You refer to the Umbrella Man. There were, in fact, two. The other is clearly visible in the Zapruder film on the south side of Elm St. However, I believe that all that is alleged about The Umbrella Man is fiction.

Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg

June 17, 1990

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I'm nearly finished my first pass through POSTMORTEM (there's so much to absorb) and I'm looking forward to reading PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. I'm amazed at how much information you've uncovered on the Kennedy assassination. You demolish the Warren Report--and every subsequent attempt to support its untenable findings--so methodically, on every page.

One quick question (nothing to do with the umbrella man, I promise): Isn't there a discrepancy between frame 313 of the Zapruder film and the description of the President's head wound given by the Parkland doctors? Unless I'm mistaken, the doctors all said the wound was in the back of the head, involving the occipital region and exposing part of the cerebellum. Frame 313 clearly shows an explosion on the right side of the head, above the ear, but too far away to involve the occipital region.

One explanation is that the Zapruder film was doctored, which I understand has been suggested (whether by you first, I don't know). I don't recall you addressing this so far in POSTMORTEM, so I'd be curious to know your opinion. But weren't there also several close-eyewitness accounts--Zapruder and his secretary, the Newmans, and others along Elm Street--that support the side-of-the-head impact that you see in Frame 313? I just don't recall reading about any eyewitnesses who said anything about the back of the President's head exploding.

I'm probably just misinformed, but it remains a mystery to me as to how this can be. There doesn't seem to be a logical explanation for it.

Sincerely,

Martin DiCarlantonio

P.S. I'm curious to see what you have to say about the King assassination. Check enclosed for FRAME-UP