

Dear Roger,

10/2/92

Once again your MCI letter took four days. Costs you to be inefficient!

I've read your 9/28 and won't argue.

There are many things that went wrong but they have no other real meaning.

They just went wrong.


What you seem to be aiming at makes no sense to me.

Do your things.

But be careful and don't get carried away.

and be prepared for getting nowhere.

Best,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Harold".

September 28, 1992

Harold Weisberg
Route 12
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Harold:

I'm replying this way to avoid pen-and-ink on the high holiday (a shoddy rationalization). Happy and especially healthy New Year to you and Lil. It's good that people with mutual respect should occasionally disagree, although I take your cautionary words in their proper spirit. No one can accuse me, after 26+ years of studying this problem, of flying off the handle with some zany conspiracy theory. (I am not suggesting body alteration after the autopsy.) I think even Wrone and McKnight would agree that, at some point, a student of this case has to weigh the conflicting evidence and make judgments as to what is credible and what is not. Also, whether the evidence can be fit into a pattern without straining it beyond its limits. As you know, I could have obtained a set of autopsy photos years ago but did not out of principle: I think we have to use lawful means and be above reproach in battling more powerful adversaries.

So, I am looking at the so-called "Fox photos" reprinted in both Shaw's second edition and Livingstone's last. I see an unmistakable bullet wound in the scalp where the autopsy pathologists placed it, and I will not budge on this point. It is corroborated by the Fox print of the interior skull. When viewed in landscape orientation, the scalp is reflected over the face and Kennedy's right eye is visible in the center-bottom of the image. The bloodstained upper lobe of his right ear is glimpsed on the left-hand margin in between two flaps of scalp. We are looking A-P and the entry wound is apparently illuminated (backlit) by a flashlight. It is exactly where it is supposed to be. If the prints Groden lifted from the HSCA show otherwise, then they may be doctored, and we may have two different sets of photos coming into the public arena from different routes. The x-rays were never properly authenticated. Lowell Levine used dental x-rays obtained from Burkley's White House records, not from the original physicians themselves (from whom Burkley had sought them), and there was no sworn proof that they were genuine. Since it is ridiculous to propose that umpteen forensic pathologists and radiologists who have examined the Archives collection since 1968 have conspired or been paid off to lie, it follows that either I am mistaken (or crazy) or they have been looking at a different set of photographs. Or, as you seem to suggest, there were two separate entry wounds in the head and the autopsists missed one. Roger Feinman is still missing the other.

As regards Kellerman, I originally was influenced by Whitewash, Inquest, Six Seconds and Accessories to regard him as something of a hero for telling Specter what he didn't want to hear. Having reviewed Specter's administrative on his interview with Sibert & O'Neill, and having also reviewed documents from the FBI files, I have reinterpreted the situation. Kellerman and Greer do not dispute

what S & O saw, but take issue with virtually each and every statement that S & O report from their conversations. They were primed for this by Specter. Kellerman and Greer knew that their reaction to the shooting had been sluggish, and they had a self-interest as well as the Secret Service's reputational interest to protect. I credit Sibert and O'Neill. I now interpret Kellerman's testimony about Finck's discovery of the back wound late in the autopsy as an attempt to refute the incident S & O reported in their investigative insert, not some heroic attempt to tell the truth about the back wound. There was a conspiracy involved in this autopsy, and it's not so obvious as to leap out at us from the printed page in the public record. If it were, we would have been done with this subject a long time ago. It has to be pieced together. It is difficult and painstaking work

Thanks for your comments. I'll let you know if I hear anything more from AFIP.

Best regards,

Roger

Roger Bruce Feinman
Attorney at Law
237 Park Avenue
21st Floor
New York NY 10017

Harold Weisberg
Route 12
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

*This letter was electronically transmitted and distributed by **MCI Mail***

*Call 800-444-6245 for information about sending **MCI Mail***

SPH14

00037949559227302331J700001*