

Dr. Randy Robertson
100 Maxwell Crossing
Brentwood, TN 37027

5/27/95

Dear Randy,

I let your letter of the 20th and your enclosed papers of May 1 and 2 wait until I could sit and read them through without interruption, as I did yesterday afternoon. I then decided that more than what you say about Olivier would best be kept in confidence so I've written on the envelope, in the remote chance someone comes here with an interest in that area, "temporarily confidential." It is what can be distorted by those with such an interest and it should not be, particularly because it is so worthwhile. I've highlighted parts in the event we have time to talk about it because I do not now have the time to go into those things in detail and in writing. I did ~~name~~ ^{make} a few notes of what to call to your attention in this.

One is that it is a mistake to refer to critics as you do as all in agreement, to all having the view or the records you attribute to them as unanimous.

Early in the reading I got the impression, which may be wrong, that you refer to two shots from the back while saying that in reaction to them the head moved both forward and back. Later you do refer to a shot from the front.

I think the use of the word "rear" is too indefinite and can be criticized in referring to the location of a wound. I suggest that as a doctor you find some more specific place location or give the word more limited meaning. Others are making very pointed use of that word and "back" to advance their contrary arguments.

That James and Boswell had any autopsy film to show Olivier can lead to further FOIA inquiry if you'd care to. From the records the Secret Service had possession of all of it. They therefore should have a record of any time it was not in their possession. You can ask for that under FOIA.

I am not and do not pretend to be a ballistics expert. I had to do considerable reading on it, including when I was James Earl Ray's investigator. In that case soft ammo was used. It exploded on impact. It is designed to do that. But the stub, the part that is the back of it, the part that fits into the shell, was intact when it was recovered just under the skin down a bit ^{down} on his back. Impact was in the jaw. The explosion was mostly through the neck, but the jaw was included. It thus ~~se~~ seems most likely to me that the 6.5 fragment at the back of the head was the stub of a front-entering soft bullet.

^{NOT NECESSARILY 6.5 caliber.}
It is not impossible for hardened ammo to fragment. It is impossible for it to fragment into dust-like particles. Off the top of the head I think you would do better to refer to "hardened military ammunition and to what is generally referred to as "soft" ammo. "Hardened, full-jacketed" might be better, in addition to "military". If you have a gun shop near you why not stop off and get some catalogues, like Remington's, and look at what it has on Core-Lokt, the ammo used on King? More than one catalogue might be

helpful. And in any further mentions I suggest you use the words of the autopsists, "dust-like" particles, because it means much more than "fragment."

While you limit yourself in this work to the skull, I suggest you can use as notes addressing fidelity to fact or honesty or dependability the notes I have in Post Mortem under the autopsists' and the DJ panel's reports in facsimile. Each reflects that there was fragmentation in the chest cavity yet each says that its study confirms the official report. They lie and they lie knowingly because any fragmentation in the chest area ruins the case for any magic bullet. Bob Artwohl tried to work his way around this by attributing the fragmentation to the passage rather than any ^{bone} impact of the bullet.

Part of the incredible explanation for p. or X-rays was the decision that portable equipment was adequate because all they were looking for was a bullet.

You are also in effect, and quite correctly, accusing Arlen Specter of suborning perjury. You find ^{it} an unarticulated case of this in NEVER AGAIN!

I suggest that you modify your statement that "The best evidence can not be found in the words of those who would lie and deceive us" because, among other things, ^U Humes did ^U swear in contradiction to himself and in some of those attestations all the prosecutors agreed ^U also under oath. Perhaps "is not limited to" might be better.

In your 5/2 you do not reflect awareness of the fact that the limo. was washed at ^U Arkland.

Ebersole did not type the receipt. That ^U was done by a corpsman.

Where you refer to the Harper fragment ^U being exploded 25 feet I think it would be helpful to your case if you can get an expert opinion on whether ^U that is possible with ammo like that 6.5 MC. I believe it is impossible.

Am I ^U correct in thinking that I remember that Constable Seymour Weitzman also found and turned in a piece of skull? From some distance from the limo.?

I think this is ^U fine work, which is why I told you that if you are at the press conference to feel free to go into it. I've also told Lesar that. I do not seek ^U personal attention. My purpose in the press conference to which I cannot go is merely to let ^U it be known that the book is available plus the hope that in a competitive situation there might be more possibility of ^U stones being used.

Thanks and good luck,

Heard