

Wp's article Under Salcedo; Aw - P + Keep - Paul

2/3/68

Dear Dad,

Although you know and have known my opinion of Vince for some time, I never dreamed he was capable of this treachery, to have had me listen in on his end of his conversation with Garrison and then so rapidly, do what he could to effect the absolute opposite.

When you get this you will know I have mailed the letter to him and to you I've for Jim. Other copies are going to Sylvia, Hoch and Schoener only. The others (save those with whom Hoch will talk) are unworthy of serious consideration.

When we meet again, remind me to tell you of a good development that, fortunately, has no connection with New Orleans.

I want to go farther with what I tried to persuade you this morning. This is a crisis point for all of us. This will set back any effort to get access to what has been suppressed more than anything the government can do. I therefore feel it is urgent that we take certain immediate steps.

Whether you go any farther or not, I again ask you to at least announce that you are filing a suit for me under the freedom of information act and possibly others. If you feel that you cannot, or if you later feel that you should not go further, I will have had time to try and get another lawyer. It is possible this inexcusable thing may make that easier. But this announcement coming on the heels of Garrison's abdication will keep all of us a little further from his brush. I have exhausted my administrative remedies, more than once, and satisfy that prerequisite. I also have a very broad area I can cover, of which the pictures and X-rays are but one. The others are without justification, have no distinction contract to support them or give the government the possibility of invading. It will be very bad for all of us if we stop here, leaving the record Garrison has made. It will also make things more difficult, encourage the government to do more of the same.

If you will recall how much I wanted us to hold a press conference on the filing of the brief and consider what we might have accomplished with a little attention that was then possible, you can perhaps better understand my urgent desire that we hold one now. This new Garrison thing will focus attention on any press conference keyed to it. With what I can then disclose, we do have a chance of coming out of this rather well and getting a few telling points across. If we do not do this we join Garrison, become part of what he has done. Had I the capability of doing this alone, I would. It presents a number of possible if not probable developments. One, with the judge as interested as he seems to be, with a little attention in the media, should he be so disposed, he might harken back to what I did get in the record, that he had been lied to, deceived and imposed upon, that the papers filed do not say what he was supposed to say. I believe that, given the understatement of how understated this was, how he had been really had, he just might get interested and do what I have always understood a judge has the power of doing under those circumstances. At least we put him in a position to.

The criticism has often been made, sometimes with truth, that the critics are tails on Garrison's kite. This is an opportunity to show our independence without in any way undercutting him. I think it is especially important for you because you have or had him on your board of directors. Now, with you his lawyer, this happens and you stand for it, you will never, otherwise, convince anyone it is not true. If he should lose or desert or conduct himself badly, you will by that be ruined. It is also the chance, then, to make it possible for your organization to have the pos-

sibility of getting started. More, however, while we have nothing to lose by a press conference that gets no attention, look how much we have to gain - and who much your committee in particular does. For you to hope to get going, you have to persuade people that you will be doing things. There is little likelihood of your coming up with what I already have and have given you free. A little attention to that and you have a reputation. Although it is my work, you understand that it will ensure to you. I think if you understand, as I know you do, that this is the one thing that cannot do me any personal good, that can only take the edge off my writing and book(s), you understand my seriousness.

In such a press conference, save for questions that are asked, we restrict ourselves to a few narrow and comprehensible highlights. This and the new area the changed overtones put us in, make it possible for other things to flow. For example, right now, this very minute, we have a formula that eliminates all the political liability to the new administration by making it a Clark rather than a Warren or Commission matter. With five of the seven members Republicans, Nixon is not about to clobber the Commission, now or later. If the wolves have to be fed, they can right now be fed the expendables. In fact, there is now, for probably the only time, the chance that the new administration and particularly the new Attorney General, not to be hurt and able to get what they might regard as a benefit.

In a different area, in the political area, we are now where we were in court when I was got that call. Please do not have us in a couple of days or weeks look back with regret. We can now apply intellectual judo and turn all that heat that will be applied against us back where it came. We will not seem to be able to expect a duplication.

On a selfish basis, with you trying to start a law practice, this should be helpful rather than hurtful for you. It is more comprehensible than anything we can look forward to trying to present, is so signified and significant in content that no client you would accept would be antagonized, and others who might not know about you and be considering Washington counsel might just be impressed, favorably.

At this press conference we say, simply, that unlike the statement by the Attorney General, in fact, even his panel, that they "support" the Warren and autopsy reports, their work, limited and entirely inadequate as it was, destroys both. We cite as proof the suppressed knowledge that there was metal in the area of the thorax and the perjury, that there was none; the wrong location of the President's wound, of which we say it cannot on any ground be excused and is fatal to the Warren Report and its solution - and that knowing this the panel and the AG were first silent and then misinformed the people (in the last significant act of the outgoing AG); that there is still suppressed what cannot be, no question of good taste being involved (my request for the name of transfer, made 1/20 and since never responded to despite repeated requests; we allege, I think but do not insist, that the panel was convened for other than the stated reason, and that, with cutes from Clark and panel, they did not perform their purpose and made no pretense of so doing; that the accounts of the pictures and X-rays do not stack up - at the very least some are missing and more, we can now account for more than they say they took. The shell game with the pictures should get attention.... In addition to everything else, this gives us a chance to reach the remaining Kennedy people, possibly to turn some on. It is certainly the only chance we can expect to get a message to Teddy - and I want to.... Gotta get back to other work. Please see it my way and try. I assure you you will regret it soon if you do not.

Sincerely,

PS b 1ef and Xerox came today

Harold Weisberg

C
O
P
Y

1/29/69

Dear Bud,

Pursuant to our yesterday's conversation, I hand you herewith the following:

My original copy of the copy of the autopsy sent the Commission by ~~Ezzkasz~~ James Rowley under date of 12/20/63. This particular version appears in a number of files. Here it bears two identifications, CD 77 and JFK-1. I lend you this, my original, because it is the clearest copy I have. I got it from the JFK-1 file. The second copy of the covering memo is from a different copy. It occurred to me the judge may want a full copy of the finished autopsy and that you may want a clearer, easier-to-read copy during arguments, so I lend you this in the event you want to make copies from a known and clear source. Please take good care of it. It is the fourth paragraph on the page numbered 2 that is to be compared with the fourth paragraph of the holograph. Until I can get service on my machine I must keep copying to the minimum. It is about to poop out, has run out of adjusting scope.

Copies I have made from the original of the listed parts of the CD 371 file, in this case also duplicated in JFK-1 and copied from it because it also is more legible. I will have this entire file with me in the event you want to make a full copy. Perhaps the judge would like one as a souvenir? I have made copies of only these pages (also included in Exhibit 398 but much larger this way)- a page of Humes' notes, in this case to show the size of the front-neck wound as he got it by phone from Dr. Malcolm Perry a.m. 11/23/63, first call, according to what Perry told me December 12, 1968; the second page of the holograph autopsy, where the bottom paragraph is to be bracketed with the fourth of CD77 to show that where Perry said the President had been shot from the front and turned his holograph in this way, magically it got changed to "much smaller", to eliminate the statement the President had been shot from the front; Humes' two 11/24/63 certifications, one that he turned in his notes and holograph at 5 p.m., which proves his Clark-report statement false, that he retained no papers, and that what he had had been in his possession all the time; just noticed this version omits certification that he burned those notes he described in his testimony as the first draft of the autopsy. It is in the back of WHITENASH, in Exhibit 397, and I'll try and find time to dig up another copy before I come in; Admiral Galloway's receipt-memo to Admiral Burkley, 11/25/63, conveying last copy autopsy, which is against regulations, and "work papers"; Bouck's receipt to Burkley, 11/26/63, including "notes" (the marginal marks here are on the original and indicate staff awareness of the significance; the Boswell body chart; the Finck head scheme. You do not have to return these.

Paul Hoch disagrees with my interpretation of the documents and testimony. I believe it means that Humes did turn in his actual notes without which he could not have written his report. The Archives has never been able to find a copy. I have this in correspondence should you need it. However, whichever of us is correct, I think the only course is to assume his testimony means what it says, that we assume the government has the notes and raise the question in court. Let them say, in court, that they burned even the original notes, without which there can be no authentication of the autopsy. Now that ~~we have~~ we have analyzed the X-rays, Garrison's needs are satisfied and it would seem safe to attack the integrity of the rest of it.

Wecht is undoubtedly familiar with the charts, but perhaps, in this full-sized version of Finck's, he can detect more.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg