

3/18/69

Dear John,

Delay in responding to your letter of 3/8 is due to the second fever I've had in 30 years. It has lasted a week, has me weak and unsteady, with an enormous accumulation of mail. This is the first effort to answer any. I hope I can get some done today. It is before six on a Sunday morning and I'm just sick of being abed. I was supposed to stay there through tomorrow.

C  
O  
P  
Y

I cannot now let you use the Burkley material for a number of reasons, the two most comprehensible being I am trying to sell it myself to raise the funds with which to publish and the second of which is I am still pursuing certain angles of it. Third, I have not yet written that part of the work myself. If it did not represent one of the few assets I have, I might feel otherwise. I have now written and published very limited editions of two of the three works I projected on the autopsy. The first is what you read long ago, POST MORTEM: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY AUTOPSY. The third is what I found in the Clark papers and passed on to others because the use was imperative where needed in the trials. I call it POST MORTEM III: SECRETS OF THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY. The second will contain the Burkley stuff and much more that I already have, from deeply suppressed material. If you are in the neighborhood again, I'll be glad to let you know the content for your own understanding.

When I was last in New Orleans, I gave three of the people I could trust, those with whom you dealt, copies of this material with the understanding they could use whatever they felt they needed and on their promise to use nothing else. They were honorable, as I knew they would be.

I understand, not from the office, that you remained there. We are in your debt for it, for what came out on the autopsy is, I think, the major, perhaps only significant development of the trial. I am judging from what I read in all the available papers, including the Q and A in the N.O. papers and what members of the press who are not unfriendly and who are my friends told me.

When you have time and I have an extra copy, if you'd like I'll send you a copy of PMIII which you'll be able to copy if you want. It is incomplete, for I plan to add a chapter on the conclusion of the legal end, some correspondence I initiated during it, etc., and I do plan to add to the incomplete appendix. These things I will do when and as I can, for until there is some prospect of mass publication, I have accomplished my immediate purposes. I am, slowly, collecting the added documentation.

I am glad you are about to join me in charges of perjury and its subornation. I long ago leveled these against the autopsy doctors and Specter, repeat them in much more pointed form in PMIII, with the direct challenge that they sue me and the prediction they will not for they will not dare giving me the chance to prove the charge in open court.

I suggest you not give up on Dallas. I do not know if or when I will be back there, but I did interview Perry and, if and when you desire, I'll write you a memo on what he told me that you will be able to use. Please delay this until the last minute if you take me up on this, for aside from the sickness, I am working on three limited editions, all still requiring work and all very current. And you have an idea of the other angles I have been engaged on. Perry told me that when

he measured out what Washington told him he found the near non-fatal wound was two inches down on the back. Also relating to this is something no one else has used that I did that perhaps you might want to. I have good clear copies and will provide them if you'd like. Compare the fourth paragraphs of the holograph and typed autopsies. I did this in the first book and it was almost entirely ignored. After ~~Hines~~ turned the draft in, after he and the others had gone over it and made the changes, there remained the statement attributed to Perry that the President had been shot from the front. This was changed by somebody without making a mark of any kind on the holograph. I made a word by word comparison of the two versions back in late 1964. I probably can find it if that would interest you.

I am trying to track Kinney down, without success. However, I am building a record of sorts in correspondence, with a variety of agencies, and it looks as though the unanswered letters will themselves tell enough of the story.

C  
O  
P  
Y  
Even this is too tiring. I've got to stop, for I'm sweating again. Let me add these things. The context in which I might, in the future, use your excellent drawing is not only the one in which you present it but by actual comparison with the alleged angle. This work was first called to my attention by a retired engineer in Arizona in late 1966. The alleged angle was a minimum of 45 degrees had the shot been when the govt says and whence. That, of course, is but another proof of the deliberate dishonesty of all those involved. Foreman said I could use his skeletal pictures, and I may want to use one or two. I have had a local radiologist who has become interested since the weekend of the Clark report looking for some X-rays we can use for the plotting of the contradictory versions of the injuries. And, with all, I'll emphasize what I discovered to my utter amazement late the night we first got the panel report, there are fragments in the thoracic area, and it requires no expert to know what that means; though I immediately checked with Wecht on it and he confirmed it.

John, there are also some angles I am working on that I prefer not to put in a letter. This involves people. I have been in contact with some "on the other side". It is foolish to expect major help from them, but it is not foolish to try for it. I have made some progress. You'd probably be surprised to know who has spoken to me, who has been helpful. Please try and read between the lines. This also encourages me to encourage you not to give up on some of the people in Dallas because of your testimony. Many of them have been misjudged as a consequence of too many of us engaging in loose talk and propaganda. If I could get there again with you, I am confident some of them would speak and that we could get to see some who you think will not see you. There is no single one I wanted to see who I did not and only three declined my request to tape them. For two of these I had someone with me. But, if you give up on your own means of getting what records you want from Parkland, let me ask one of my contacts there to try. I do not know that he will or that he can succeed, but I think it worth the trial. He has gotten other data for me. Just do not give up. Try and get these yourself. If you cannot, tell me what you want and let me try.

I hope this is comprehensible. Best regards, and thanks,



## UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER

RAINBOW BOULEVARD AT 39TH STREET  
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66103 • AREA CODE 913 • ADams 6-5252

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND ONCOLOGY

March 8, 1969

Harold Weisberg, Esq.,  
Route 8  
Frederick, Maryland, 21701

Dear Harold:

Many thanks for your letter of March 6. Yes, I shall be delighted for you to use the cross section diagram of the neck with the path of the bullet at  $28^{\circ}$  in the appendix of your "Post Mortem" book. You do understand, of course, that this is the minimum lateral angle the bullet can emerge from the midline at the front without striking bone (vertebra), in fact the angle can be greater. Enclosed is a 5 x 7 glossy of this diagram, if you use it just mention the copyright and my permission.

Now, I should like to ask if you would be willing for me to use your autopsy diagram with Admiral Burkley's written approval on it. I am dickering with a magazine about a short article because considerable time will elapse before I get a manuscript ready for a book. If the magazine should agree I would like to use this document and cite your kind permission. Hope to be able to write you about this further within a week or two.

If you should agree to this it might be best to send me by registered or insured mail your best copy of the document and I would have our photography department make two negatives. I would return one of the negatives, the document, and some glossie prints by next post. I would keep the whole thing in utmost secrecy until publication as you know it would be to my advantage to do so.

Because of my testimony in New Orleans it is now unlikley that I shall get to my sought after records in Parkland Hospital. However I do have, already, enough to substantiate my perjury and subrogation of perjury.

Shall look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely

  
John Nichols