

ML - flyer

10/2/69

Dear Mr. Aoypt,

Your letter has been forwarded from our old address.

I have printed not three but four books, list enclosed. One deals with what was suppressed and misrepresented about the New Orleans end, with Oswald and his associates there and some of the Cubans who figured in it, etc. If you are making a deep study of the entire case, I believe you will require them. The second book is the first to report what is suppressed in the Archives, and with that carries forward some of the revelations of WHITENASH, which was the first book on the Report. The third deals with the suppression and misrepresentation of the photographic evidence. It has about 150 pages of reproduction of suppressed documents on this and related subjects.

To answer your first question, as the second book proves, the first shot had been fired by Frame 202. I do not quite agree with the formulation of your question. The error of the Report is not to make the first shot as late as possible but to make it at a time when it could be alleged it was possible for Oswald to have fired it. Before Frame 210 that was not possible, according to their inaccurate, contrived reconstruction.

My feeling is that, had there been a trial, the paraffin test would have been accepted as competent proof Oswald had not fired a rifle. It is proof of just this.

My knowledge of the autopsy has advanced much since WHITENASH, though everything in it is accurate. I have written but have not been able to print two of three planned books on it. The autopsy doctors, aside from their competence or incompetence, were not free to conduct a proper and complete autopsy and they did not. They perjured themselves before the Commission. I charge this in the new, unprinted books. And I prove it. If your question relates to who made the handwritten changes in the draft of the autopsy, except for one, they were made by Dr. James on the late morning and early afternoon of 11/24/63. Except for one that was made without any change in the Holograph. If the question asks who ordered changes, I cannot give you a name. If you mean why were the changes made, my belief is to point more to Oswald as the lone assassin.

Because you are a young man going to much trouble to write a good thesis, and because you are a young citizen apparently deeply concerned about the integrity of his society as well as what happened to his President, I speak to you as frankly as I otherwise would not. Of the book you cite, I encourage you to ignore all but two as sources, Sylvie Meagher's (which is a magnificent job) and WHITENASH. The other are much more erroneous than you would be able to understand.

Without knowing the length of your thesis I cannot make many suggestions. You do not give its planned title. But if you have not yet selected the subject, I suggest you might consider the Report as a measure of the integrity of government.

Sincerely,  
Harold Weisberg

Mark Houpt  
307 S. Delaware St.  
Mt. Gilead, Ohio 43338  
9/26/69

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown,  
Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I'm a High School Sophmore who, in March of this year, started my own investigation into the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

During this period I have read; Accessories After the Fact, Six Seconds In Dallas, Inquest, The Oswald Affair, Who Killed Kennedy?, A Citizen's Decent, The Second Oswald, New York Times Edition of the Warren Report, The Death of a President, and I've just finished your very revealing volume, Whitewash: The Report of the Warren Report.

I have chosen the assassination of President Kennedy (and the subsequent events involving Oswald) for my American History thesis. I've decided to by pass the Warren Report and draw my own conclusion from the evidence presented in books such as Sylvia Meagher's, Joshia Thompson's, Edward Jay Epstien's, and your's.

I do have some questions to ask you about the events in Dallas.

1. Sylvia Meagher backs up your veiw of a shot as early as frame 207, do you feel that the Warren Report just said this to make Kennedy's nonfatal shot as late as possible?

2. What is your feeling towards the paraffin tests?

3. Do you feel it was the autopsy doctors or the members of the Warren Commision staff, who "edited" the autopsy report?

4. What are the main subjects are involved in your other two books?

I'm definetly open for suggestions as to how to write my thesis.

Thank you for your time and answers.

Yours truely,

*Mark Houpt*  
Mark Houpt