

Received NA-N

NOV 27 1974

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

11/23/74

DATE RECEIVED IN NN 11/29/74

DATE REPLY DUE 12/6

REGISTER NUMBER 75-78

Dr. James B. Rheads, Archivist
The National Archives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Rheads,

SIGNED TO

In the November issue of Medical Times Dr. John K. Lattimer, the urologist you alchemized into a "pathologist" or "other expert," claims that you let him make tests on the clothing of the late President Kennedy.

His exact words on page 41 are, "This has been tested on President Kennedy's original [sic] shirt by one of us." The footnote citation identifies the urologist you converted into a pathologist as this "one of us." (page 55)

I write to ask that you rescind this claim, which I have no reason to doubt, with your representations to me and what I regard as of mere significance, your representations to Judge Gesell in C.A. 2569-70 as well as those made on your behalf by others.

Now why do I not doubt your personally-selected expert? -because of all the new expertise he establishes for himself in this single article:

- On "rubber or horsehair" (p. 42);
- On motion and the new physics as cited-

- Travelling at some 2,000 feet per second a bullet did "assume an almost sideways position" (p.44); after which it was
- "now travelling partially backwards" (p. 44)
- "travelling sideways, as well as somewhat backwards" (p. 44)
- "travelling almost entirely backwards" (p. 45)(his emphasis)
- "going backwards" (p. 45).

I do hope you can agree that when one man with one fell article can do this much damage to Webster and Newton simultaneously and at the same time enjoys the exceptional confidence you imparted in him, his word can't be doubted.

So, because of your representations of fact to Judge Gesell I am asking how come you let Dr. Lattimer "make tests on the clothing of the late President Kennedy."

In previous correspondence you have sought to justify delays in response that violate the regulations you are supposed to observe by claiming that it is because you anticipate I will file lawsuits. In this case, the lawsuit was filed and came to an end four years ago.

Far be it from me to suggest that lawyers should not be consulted about representations made under oath to a federal judge. I don't. But I do believe that when this is a suit you can't anticipate I'll file and they also have no reason to suspect I will, the compliance with your regulations might easily be speeded up by a month or so.

Particularly in the light of the most recent expression of the Congress and the vehemence with which it was expressed.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg