

This test is spurious for a number of reasons.

There is a simple determination that can be made: was it at all possible? It was not.

It ignores all the evidence about fragments and one fragment in the body, the evidence about the one in the thigh, and assumes all were recaptured, whereas it would seem many might not have been.

It ignores the spectrography, which can answer questions.

It cites one critic as speaking for all.

Ignores "mutilation", substituting "deformed". Not same. Esp 530

525 Calls himself "uninvolved", which is refuting.

All three artificial questions he contrives are false, as, inevitably, the answers also are.

526-photos can and do show flattening. He just didn't take them. Neither did the Commission. Did his vice mark bullet he used?

He was allowed to handle evidence denied others.

Core dug out-concave (means he handled) and he describes markings on it. He fails to answer how the core could be dug out and the enclosure remain unmarked, entirely,

Is mechanical slicing at all comparable to the damage to a bullet by human bone. That bullet going 2,000 fps. Frazier on this.

4/13/69

Dear John,

Prior to completion of the analysis of the government's papers in your suit, there is one point I should raise.

They refuse you access to the bullet on the ground that letting anyone handle it would endanger irreplaceable evidence, etc., and that it is also "precluded".

I have handled it.

I know of one case where it was handled and "scientific" tests were made with it or the fragments or both.

If this interests your lawyer and you and/or he would like, I will carry it further for you.

Sincerely,

4/13/69

Dear Gary,

Were I to describe my letter to Lattimer, it would not be in his words, "lengthy and enthusiastic".

He is one of the fairies-and-needles "scientists". If you have not gone into his work, which was well-publicized at the time he delivered his paper, I recommend against it as a total waste of time, save for academic interest. However, should you want it, I have it. I will, I am certain, devote some attention to it at the right time and place.

He cites himself as authority for the statement that this bullet did not strike bone, etc., in JAMA 198:327-333, 1966. If I do not get a copy from him, can you from your library (if you do not already have it)?

His technique was to take a bullet, squeeze it in a powerful vice, extrude some of the core, and slice that into more than 40 pieces, from which he concludes the single-bullet theory was a high probability.

His is close to the right discipline: urology. About as close as it can be without being the actual shit.

Sincerely,

4/12/69

Dear Dr. Lattimer,

Your letter of April 2, with the enclosed reprint from "International Surgery", was delayed. It reached me yesterday. I read the article tonight.

What you have done is fascinating, and it does fascinate me.

In it you cite your own writing in the JAMA, 198. Do you still have a copy of that? I'd like to read it, too.

When I can, when I return to my own writing on the medical aspects of the case, I will want to reread this with great care. I will, probably then want to quote from your work.

However, should you desire comment before then, I will find the time. I offer this because you indicate a continuing interest and the intent of further publication.

Throughout you refer to "critics" in the plural, but you quote only one, Ray Marcus, who did a monograph. This narrow aspect has been dealt with in a number of books, of which my WHITENASH was the first. I believe that of the "critics" I have gone into it at greatest length and in greatest depth. Two chapters of this book deal with the ballistics and the medical evidence. Part 2 of WHITENASH II deals with the medical-autopsy evidence and the bullet. In addition, I project a total of three books under the title POST MORTEM on the autopsy and what relates to it, including this bullet.

I enclose a list of my available works.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg