

12/18/74

Mr. William J. Curran
Frances Glesner Lee Professor of
Legal Medicine
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Mr. Curran,

A letter like yours to the New York Times (12/15/74) and the ideas you state so lucidly are both long overdue. Thank you very much!

The actuality is even worse than you say in citing the JFK case: "...the medical examination of President Kennedy's body and the investigation at the scene of President Kennedy assassination, raises serious questions about the level of expertise and sophistication in our judicial and medical communities concerning the field of legal medicine."

Let me shock you or seem presumptuous because I am neither a doctor nor a lawyer let me first assure you that I have other expertise and have spent on that one case more time than would be required to earn several PhDs. I am what is called an investigative reporter, have been a Senate investigator and was an intelligence analyst in O.S.S. in World War II. I am the investigator for the James Earl Ray defense and it is on my work expertly used by a lawyer whose first real case this is that is responsible for a federal judge now considering whether to grant Ray a trial. Not a "new" trial because he had none. Our precedent of discovery in habeas corpus, already exercised to the extent corrupt officials could not frustrate, has been unanimously affirmed by the 6th circuit and the Supreme Court has asked for a filing by January 6 in its consideration of whether to grant the State of Tennessee's request for cert.

Although the murder was that of a President there never was, by anyone, what could be called an "investigation at the scene" of the crime. As one illustration of this incredible truth, it was a secret until I brought it to light that a piece of JFK's skull was found the next day by a student. It was known to be missing and was never looked for. And as I also brought to light in the first of my series of books, evidence alleged to exist in the building wasn't even looked for until 10 months later. The FBI and the Dallas police never did it on their own. Even these illustrations fall far, far short of the incredible truth. I mean by this beyond any question, not just reasonable questions. Worse, there is no reasonable question about either perjury or its subornation. Counsel who was responsible for this in the medico-legal area later became District Attorney of Philadelphia. When he was silent after I charged this in my second book and there dared him to sue me, I went to his city, phoned the newspapers to tell them I would be making this same charge in a public speech, did it, and he remained and remains without protest. My purpose, of course, was to dramatize exactly what you say. It can still be done and in another sensational case, too.

I ask that what follows be kept confidential. I think the reasons will be obvious.

My first book, which builds up ^{the} medico-legal evidence, devotes more attention to it than any other responsible work if not all others combined. Much of the second book is devoted to carrying this forward. My longest book, one I can't get printed and can't afford to bring out as a private printing, is entirely on it and what as I wrote it over a period of years appeared to me to be necessary for comprehension. I have obtained essential medico-legal evidence the Warren Commission did not have and I have asked its witnesses question it did not ask of them. However, my work is so definitive it does not

depend on eye-witnesses. The Commission and the federal investigative agencies abused the medical witnesses & those it called - and the closest eye-witnesses it never called.

The faults of the JFK autopsy are such that while it can be fairly said of Drs. Humes and Boswell that they lacked "expertise and sophistication" these failings are really immaterial. If Dr. Finck was not an authentic forensic pathologist although "qualified" he is without innocence. As a matter of fact countless people inside the government knew that the protocol and the testimony about it were fakes and as with everything I have told you or will tell you, I have the documentary proof in my possession and if you can ever come here you can see all of it.

At the risk of seeming crazy, I tell you that there is no single wound either victim sustained that is accurately and honestly described. With JFK two are not even where they are said to have been and if there were only three, then the third is not as described. None of the tangible evidence that survives - and some was destroyed after the Commission saw it - is unaltered or even as described. If you doubt me on this seemingly hysterical series of incredibilities, in confidence I will send you official certification of the destruction of this evidence. I got it as a consequence of one of the four suits I have filed under the Freedom of Information Law, 5 U.S.C. 552. Your law library should identify me on these, especially Weinberg v. Department of Justice, on the supposed spectrographic analysis, which went to the Supreme Court and you will find was a factor in the amending of the law and the over-riding of Ford's veto. (Congressional Record, May 30, 1974) Subsequent to the over-riding of the veto I have started through my administrative "processes" again, this time including the neutron-activation testing of which I have both proof and partial results and have for some years, despite what you may have read in the medical press.

I assure this will seem farout to you. You will find, if you take the time to satisfy yourself, that it is far short of unreality. And I think that this work and what I have done in the King case can lend themselves to the achieving of the essential objectives of your letter. However, among its requirements will be professional courage.

The medical examiner in the King case, based on questions I wrote out in advance for Jim Casar (202/484-6023) perjured himself in his testimony in the evidentiary hearing that began in Memphis October 22. A transcript is not yet available. I believe newspaper accounts are. He was Lingers' notes, and I obtained his autopsy by C.A. 718-70, federal district court for the District of Columbia. In time the transcript will be available. His utterly inadequate autopsy report proves his testimony was false about the material. His testimony alone proves his protocol was at least inadequate. I was not in the court room when he testified because I had taken our criminalist to examine the remnant of bullet (always official described as a bullet) and another bit of evidentiary falsity. His testimony on these points was not cross examined and there was no rebuttal witness. Particularly not the FBI expert who had sworn falsely earlier.

Were there to be a move to discredit all these men who are accredited and who did what I have summarized, I think the necessary proceedings would do more to establish the need for what you desire than anything else. And were there to be such an effort, I would require protection on the completed but unprinted book, Rust Morten, but no more.

The secret evidence is opposite the official accounts. You can get a bit of the flavor of the newest book in which Casar and I collaborated from the enclosed flyer. That transcript also includes disproof of the so-called medical evidence.

I am prepared to show you what I believe is more than enough of this secret proof.

Sincerely,

Harold Weinberg