

Done - as requested - in name of a friend - RR

Robert Bletcher
358 Craig
University of Pennsylvania
Phila., Pa. 19104
February 3, 1972

Dr. John Lattimer
Department of Urology
College of Physicians and Surgeons
of Columbia University
620 West 168 St.
New York 10032

Dear Dr. Lattimer:

I am very impressed that you were selected to have been the first person to make an independent examination of the Kennedy autopsy materials. The New York Times report of your examination has stirred much discussion on campus here, and I have found myself not adequately prepared to cope with those doubters who suspect the conclusions of the Warren Report. I have begun some research on the matter and have discovered that you have made in the past extensive ballistic studies which seem to focus essentially on two aspects of the case. I would greatly appreciate it if you could perhaps amplify a bit your work in these two areas since I would like to be better briefed in anticipation of writing an article for a campus publication.

I am somewhat confused about the angle trajectories related to the single-bullet conclusion. The Warren Commission seems to have postulated that the bullet which went through the President's neck did so at a less steep angle than the shot through the Governor's chest. It would seem, then, that when the shot through the neck entered Connally's chest, it was deflected onto a steeper angle. Now, however, you have revealed that the bullet through the President's neck travelled on a steeper angle than the Warren Commission thought. Are we now to assume that when this bullet entered Conally's chest it was not deflected? If you took a measurement of the angle through the neck shown on the photographs, I'd like to know what that angle was and whether it matched the angle through the chest.

Also, relating to the measurements of the Warren Commission is this. The Commission located the rear neck wound by measuring it to be 14 cm. below the right mastoid process. You have said the pictures show this wound to be higher than postulated by the Commission. Did you take similar measurements to locate it, and if so, what were they?

One of my doubting friends has argued that you referred to the ring of bruise around the rear entrance hole indicating no question but that this was an entrance wound, and while apparently having seen the exit hole in front, you made no reference to

whether or not it also showed a bruise. Did the exit wound show such a bruise? I would be interested in knowing if a bullet can make a bruise in exiting.

Although I realize newspapers do not use all the information they get, I have so far seen no reference to anything you have said about the cause of death, the horrible head wound. I would like to know, based on your examination of the autopsy films, if these films are in accord with what the autopsy doctors testified to about the head wounds, i.e., are they in the same locations and of the same sizes and character as described? Also, to quell the doubts of those around me, could you tell me if anything you saw eliminated the possibility of more than one shot to the head?

In the course of my research, I came across an article by you in an old New York State Journal of Medicine entitled "Similarities in the Fatal Shootings of John Wilkes Booth and Lee Harvey Oswald." Please allow me to say that I admire your ability to put this tragic assassination and its aftermath so plagued with doubting Thomases in a credible political context. Although the above mentioned article is well documented, there is no source given for one statement, and I'd appreciate it if you could provide the source since it will be of great help for the article I have in mind to write. At page 1793 of the Journal containing the article, you say that "many sophisticated observers" believe that Booth and Oswald, as "active enemy sympathizers" in "an era of large-scale undercover operations, psychological persuasions, philosophic rivalry, and intelligence activity" may well have been silenced "as part of a larger design." I'd like to know just who put forth such an intriguing theory, and where I could find it, so that I may use direct quotes in my article.

I am particularly disturbed with those doubters who insist with nasty insinuations that you must have had some "in" with the Kennedy family representative or the government. Even though I think this is logically irrelevant, some skeptics will not listen to any logical argument, so I am asking you to provide me with a more direct refutation of this speculation.

In closing, I would like to know if you plan any kind of report or writing on your recent examination and, if so, when and where should I look for it.

Again, I would greatly appreciate it if you could provide answers to these questions in an effort to help me set the record straight and, hopefully once and for all, put an end to the nagging, if unfounded, doubts.

Sincerely,

Robert Bletcher