

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Duluth Campus

Department of Philosophy

College of Liberal Arts

10 University Drive
Duluth, Minnesota 55812-2496

218-726-8548
Fax: 218-726-6386
E-mail: phil@d.umn.edu

Office: (218) 726-7269
Home: (218) 724-2706
Fax: (218) 726-7119
jfetzer@d.umn.edu

20 April 2001

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

A copy of your letter of 19 March 2001 to Gary Aguilar has now reached me, and I am glad to have the opportunity to respond. I am a great admirer of your work and only wish that we--and the rest of the world--understood the case as well as you do.

In the enclosed copies of our books, I have earmarked the parts that may be most illuminating in response to your specific inquiries about what we have found and what we take to be its significance. I would especially note that Appendix A of MURDER IN DEALLEY PLAZA provides a summary of the findings presented in ASSASSINATION SCIENCE.

Our objective has been to take rumor and speculation out of the case and attempt to place it upon an objective and scientific foundation. We have gone back to the most basic evidence in this case, including the autopsy X-rays, the autopsy photographs, the autopsy report, the Zapruder film, and the (early) eyewitness reports, for example, and sought to reconstruct the case from the bottom up, especially by sorting out the authentic from the inauthentic evidence.

A striking example of our discoveries is that the autopsy X-rays have been fabricated in at least two different ways, namely: by imposing a "patch" over a massive blow-out to the back of the head (in the case of the right lateral cranial X-ray) and by adding a 6.5 mm metallic object (to the anterior/posterior X-ray) in an evident effort to implicate a 6.5 mm weapon in the assassination.

Complementing these discoveries has been the conclusion of Bob Livingston, M.D., a world authority on the human brain, that the brain shown in the diagrams and photographs at the National Archives cannot be the brain of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the more recent discovery by Douglas Horne of the ARRB that two brain examinations were conducted following the autopsy, one with JFK's brain, the other with a substitute.

Harold Weisberg

20 April 2001

Many of our findings will come as no surprise to you, since, in many instances, you have anticipated them. For example, that Jack was hit at least four times (once in the back from behind, once in the throat from in front, and twice in the head, once from behind and once from in front) from multiple locations (where Connally was hit by separate shots, probably two and possible three) appears to be quite consistent with your own analysis of this case.


While suspicions have endured about the possible alteration of the X-rays, for example, hypotheses or conjectures require confirmation in order to be acceptable scientifically. David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph.D., has studied the X-rays, the clothing, the copies of the film, and such in the National Archives repeatedly over the years since 1992, and he has produced a level of proof that the X-rays have been fabricated, for example, never before attained. Our conclusions are not so different from those that others might have drawn in the past, therefore, but the strength of the evidence we have been able to produce should be considered to be considerably greater than has been possible in the past.

In order to conceal one or more shots from the right/front, of course, it was necessary to patch the massive defect to the back of his skull. And since there was no longer a massive opening for brain matter to be blown out, it was necessary to reconstitute the brain. And all the rest is no doubt at least equally obvious to you. So please do not suppose that we believe that we were the first to entertain many of the most important aspects of the case, where you were (typically) far ahead of us. Our role has been the far more modest one of conducting observations, measurements, and experiments intended to lend scientific weight to those hypotheses and conjectures.

I certainly hope that this letter offers some indication of how we regard our work. If, after reviewing the work itself, including the sections I have earmarked, you would like to discuss these matters further, I would regard it a privilege. We all admire you for showing us the way.

With my very best wishes,

Yours truly,


James H. Fetzer
McKnight Professor

enclosures

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Duluth Campus

Department of Philosophy

College of Liberal Arts

10 University Drive
Duluth, Minnesota 55812-2496

JHF

Mr. Harold Weisberg