

Mr. Lewis Kinard  
P.O. Box 1047  
Varnville, S.C. 29944

10/4/91

Dear Mr. Kinard,

Those are not Top Secret file folders in the picture you refer to. They are the pages on which the court reporter's bills were posted. As I told you earlier with regard to the Altgens picture, I'm not in a position to get and take apart and repack what I used in printing the books. However if I find any of those pages still in the files I'll enclose some. No charge. (I believe some are in Whitewash IV.)

There is nothing I can now do about the Altgens picture, as I told you. I do think there just be some misunderstanding on their part. All they charged me was \$15 and that included the right to publish. Of course things have gone up, but there is a lower rate for research and not for publication.

One of the real problems we have faced in trying to learn more has been the influencing of recollections particularly after so many years. Some who did have knowledge have been so questioned as to respond as the questioner wanted, not by telling the plain and simple truth. Some have done this deliberately, most innocently, but in all instances the result is the same - misinformation and disinformation. This misleads the people and it is cover and protection for those in government who failed us. I want to do neither nor be part of either.

Did you look "tares" up before writing me to get an understanding of what Humes was saying? If you did your letter does not reflect it. It is an archaic word and one of its meanings is consistent with caused by an explosion.

If I did not urge it on you before, I now really urge that you learn to ask yourself whether something in which you are interested is reasonable and do a good job of cross-examining whatever it is. If it then passes that test, then ask yourself whether it is possible. What you are talking about, the fabrication of Lifton in particular, is neither reasonable nor possible. However, you are not in a position to have done the research that would tell you this. But if you know enough about the autopsy to consider asking questions of someone who was there you ought know enough about it. While what you write indicates that you do not, I proceed as though you do. In general the notion is that the body and the film were toyed with, the corpse having been kidnapped, the latter a total fabrication without basis and an impossibility for which I do not take time.

The alleged purpose of this alleged kidnapping/toying was to make it appear that LHO was a lone assassin, that there had been no conspiracy.

Now those making this claim also claim that the existing film is forged or altered. Of course they have to or they have nothing. So forgetting all the many other questions that one really informed should have, ask yourself why in the world anyone would go to all

that risk and trouble only to create what entirely disproves the official story? This is precisely what the film said to be official actually does. Or did you not know that? On this I hope you can see my point, you are not really qualified to ask any questions and if you do you run the risk of planting false notions that originate with those who enriched themselves by their exploitations of fabrications in their minds.

As I remember it, earlier I said just to get this person recalling and talking and not to try to direct the recollections. I also asked that one question only be asked, did anyone in the amphitheatre ask if there had been any surgery on the head while the body was in Dallas. Perhaps the person you have in mind recalls, perhaps not, but this does not risk planting any notions because it is in the Sibert-O'Neill report. I'm disappointed that you have trouble with something this simple, was that question asked of anyone who had been in the Parkland emergency room. I'm disappointed also that you refer me to testimony on this. You complicate things unnecessarily. If you can or cannot get that questions asked, fine either way but I'm not going to give you any explanation that you can use to argue a point with this person you are going to interview.

If you think about this you wasted a lot of your time and work in first arguing a point of view (that has no real basis) and telling me where to look for the answers, etc., when all I suggested is that the simple question above be asked of someone who you say was in the autopsy room. In this I was not asking for your opinion, was I? Or your referring me to the printed record. All such is irrelevant. The only relevance is, did this person hear such a question asked? Or perhaps also answered.

I take this as a fair demonstration of your approach and of your knowledge. I cannot tell you what to do or what not to do. I do think that you do not really know enough to interrogate on the subject and also that you can't help arguing a preconception or a point of view. This is no way to ascertain fact and I'm not interested in anything else.

I do not say any of this to offend you and I have no such purpose. I think that what I say about what you wrote ~~is~~ is correct, is what you reflect, and I'd like to think that you do not want to stir the already muddied waters and spread more mud around.

Most of what most people have a chance to read is these unproven and usually untenable theories. They are impressed and their minds are influenced. If you don't have to be factual anything can be made exciting and stimulating and if you are just making it up then it is easier still. Your head is full of that junk, as this letter reflects. You think you know what you do not know and what is not so. I do not say this because I want to interview your witness. That is entirely impossible for me. I do say it in an effort to ~~make~~ do no more than get this person to remembering while you tape the recollection. Stay away from what you think is fact. It may not be. Don't point to any answer. Get all you can of actual, uninfluenced recollections. I don't think this will be possible for you but I hope you will heed this caution.

Sincerely,

