

12/23/69

Dear Howard,

I've read your memo on the pictures Dick sent you (very good) and that on Finck's N.O. testimony, which is both good and bad.

Not much time to write. You found one thing I do not recall having noted, the photographing of the bruises (Item 6). However, you so burn for Oser you waste yourself and your position is in any event one of divorcement from reality. There are many inadequacies in his examination, but was your purpose to analyze this or Finck's testimony? Indulging yourself (and it is indulgence, for we have too many enemies we cannot avoid to raise our own straw-man enemies) diverted you from other things I think you'd have seen and didn't.

You are correct on my being confused between the two schemes(head). I discovered this in making my notes. I presume I formed the wrong impression when I saw but a few selected pages, but it may have been just error on my part.

You do not understand what I've said on his seeing the anterior neck wound. Perhaps, after reading the draft of what I suggest you write Fisher you understand part, that the wound the Parkland doctors described no longer existed for him or anyone else to see, therefore he did not lie, did not perjure himself (by the way, a corrected misstatement eliminates perjury, I believe). Next, there is the question, was tissue removed? If it was, as it should have been, and if this was done before he arrived, again he could not have seen it but the camera, taking pictures before his arrival, could have captured what there was to be seen. His words are very technical, and in part you detect this.

The Air Force Brigadier was so distraught (see Manchester, who undoubtedly exaggerates) he left the country. He loved the President. He has the deepest doubts (entirely confidential) but will not express them (I know someone who heard him express them at the time).

I'm trying to recall. That he talked to Burkley could have been assumed. Burkley was there for the autopsy. He got to the hospital immediately after the corpse and remained with it. On presumably, you forgot Humes on this.

In summary, your observations are sharp and very good, but your indulgence diminishes your concentration and that of the reader, dulled you to the essence, Finck's words,

This is filed here under Finck's N.O. test, the memo on the shell pix under Frazier.

One more comment on Oser: you have no idea how close we were to not getting even this much. But this little is more significant, I think, than you seem willing to concede. ...Try to remember, first things first. Oser is neither first nor second.

Best regards and thanks,