

Randolph H. Robertson M.D.
100 Maxwell Crossing
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027

February 17, 1994

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Fredericksberg, Maryland

Dear Harold:

I just received your letter about the material that Roger Feinman sent you and I wanted to write you and try to answer your questions.

1. As far as CE 388 goes I believe that both Humes and Boswell directed a (1) Navy medical illustrator by the name of Harold Rydberg to draw the picture which was submitted as CE 388. Supposedly they did not have the benefit of the photos or x-rays when they were doing this but I have very strong doubts. I have included a copy of the lateral skull x-ray which has (2) (3) trajectory lines for the first bullet drawn on it. These match the trajectory lines on CE 388. Dr. John Ebersole admitted to the HSCA Forensic Pathology Panel that he drew these lines on the x-rays at the request of Dr. Burkley's office a month or so after the assassination. He also told them that at that time he was told that these might be of some benefit to an **artist**. I think the fact that they match exactly the trajectory lines on CE 388 is too much of a coincidence. Either directly or indirectly these lines were used to create CE 388. It is also of note that while Rydberg denies that he was present at the autopsy he was included on the list of people who were given orders not to discuss their activities on the weekend of November 22, 1963 (4) and I have included a copy of this for you. There are some eyewitnesses to the autopsy who say that a medical illustrator was present at the autopsy. I have also included my interpretation of the markings Boswell made at the autopsy table and by a remarkable coincidence these show the trajectory of (5) (6) the first bullet through the head at 32 degrees the same as CE 388 and the trajectory lines on the lateral skull x-ray. As a final note on this I will predict a question that is often asked and this is how could a bullet fired from above and behind traverse the skull on a 32 degree upward angle. The

answer to this is that CE 388 is drawn from a straight lateral perspective just as the lateral skull x-ray was and this does not taken into account the tilting of the President's head to the left. I have included some simple trajectory angles made from Zapruder frame 312 to illustrate this point. The trajectory that goes through the EOP (16 degrees) traces back much closer to the TSBD 6th floor than does the HSCA's trajectory (24 degrees) which is so steep that it could not have been fired from any building in Dealey Plaza. (At the end of this letter I have included a computer trajectory analysis done by a WC supporter who inadvertantly did an honest trajectory analaysis on the head wounds which fits my conclusions of a bullet entering lower than where the Clark Panel said.)

2. As far as the metal fragments go there are roughly 30- 40 small fragments. Of note are the two 7X2 and 3X1 mm fragments which were recovered from the front of the skull and introduced into the evidentiary chain. Of more importance is the large 6.5 mm in diameter fragment in the back of the head, the largest metal fragment present in the skull, which was not recovered but which was seen at the rear of the skull the night of the autopsy because it was mentioned in Sibert and O'Neill's report. This 6.5 mm fragment and many of the other much smaller fragments in the rear of the skull were deposited by the second bullet fired from the Grassy Knoll. Why was it that the largest piece of lead, which was and still is clearly visible on the skull x-rays, was not recovered that night ? If this really was at the point of entry wouldn't they have mentioned this important fact in their autopsy report. I believe that someone must have intervened to take this large lead fragment out of the evidentiary chain early that evening .

3. You can see from the x-rays that the lead fragments do not line up with the trajectory from slightly above the EOP to the exit point in the front of the skull. The autopsy doctors lied about this in their autopsy report. This trajectory is shown by the pencil lines that Dr. Ebersole drew on these x-rays and which were used for CE 388. It has often been pointed out by critics that while CE 399 inflicted large amounts of damage and broke bones without deforming that the same type of bullet turned to mush when it struck the skull. It didn't. This really is the key to understanding the head wounds. While the Clark Panel used the higher metallic fragments, especially the 6.5 mm lead fragment which had gone unmentioned and unretrieved by the autopsy team, to arrive at the conclusion that this was the trajectory for a single bullet which struck the skull several inches higher than the autopsy team placed an entry for a bullet ,they, the Clark Panel,

did not assess the skull x-rays for any bullets that might not have fragmented upon entering. They **did not** look where the autopsy team told them a bullet entered namely **slightly** above the EOP. **Exactly** at this point is the fracture I have identified which exhibits Puppe's rule and therefore must have been made first thus validating the autopsy doctor's location of a hole of entry low in the back of the head. They contemporaneously drew this location on the autopsy face sheet in a position consistent with **slightly** above the EOP and not at the cowlick where the Clark Panel would have us believe a bullet entered. For the HSCA the autopsy team independently marked on a skull the level of entry. All this firsthand documentary evidence of a wound low in the back of the head seems amazingly consistent with itself. The reason why is that the autopsy team did not mislocate the wound of entry. They ignored the x-ray evidence of the metallic fragments which were inconsistent with this trajectory. The Clark Panel easily saw that the metal fragments did not line up to the described entrance documented in the autopsy report so they made the ridiculous assumption that the autopsy team had erred by the incredible distance of four inches and didn't bother to look for the subtle evidence of a nonfragmenting bullet entering from behind at the exact location the autopsy team had told them a bullet entered. Basically the skull was struck first from behind down low by a bullet which did not fragment on entering and which exited the front of the skull (this trajectory is shown by the pencil lines on the skull x-ray). A second bullet struck from the right front , fragmenting extensively on impact unlike a jacketed bullet, and deposited most of the metal fragments we see on the lateral skull x-ray. Now you can understand why the autopsy team never mentioned the largest piece of lead on the x-rays because to do so would have destroyed the official version of the President's head **wound** because they couldn't say that there was a piece of lead in the back of the head which could not have been deposited by the path of their single bullet. As a sidenote it is interesting to see how the Clark Panel's radiologist handled this material. In the 1967 Review the pencil lines were described as **angle lines**. I would ask what type of pencil lines would you expect to be drawn on the lateral skull x-ray of a homicide victim with one being on the horizontal and the other corresponding to the described entry and exit points for a bullet. I believe most people would say that these would be trajectory lines. Instead when Dr. Russel Morgan gets this clue thrown in his face he decides to completely ignore the significance of these pencil lines. Instead he describes them as " Also on film #2, a pair

(10)

(11)

of **converging** pencil lines had been drawn on the film. Neither of these artifacts interfered with the interpretation of the films.” The Clark Panel simply found evidence for a gunshot wound to the head as evidenced by the metal fragments and proclaimed that the autopsy team missed by four inches. They did not bother to or ignored the evidence which supported the autopsy team’s contention of a bullet have entered somewhere else because to do so would have meant that the President was shot twice in the head just as you surmised many years ago. Roy Kellerman told the Warren Commission that the bullet entered the back of the head 2 inches below the large defect at the vertex. This description of an entry hole removed some distance from the margin of the large defect is at odds with the conclusions of the Clark Panel who never had the chance to see the body. The fracture that I have identified is located exactly 2 inches from the margin of the large area of bone loss in the back of the head just where Roy Kellerman described it and if you look at CE 388 you will see that there is a considerable amount of intervening bone between the large defect and the hole of entry just as the x-rays show and just as Kellerman described it. These observations were overlooked by the Clark Panel. Furthermore they overlooked the fact that Dr. Finck arrived after the brain , and by necessity, the skull cap had been removed and yet he still saw a portion of the entrance crater in the intact skull. This can only mean that the the piece of skull bearing the Clark Panel’s conjectured entrance wound would have already been removed to get the brain out.

3. As to the direction of the second shot I have no doubt that it arose from the right front of the motorcade and was responsible for the backwards snap of the President’s head. When dealing with only the x-rays however I can not state definitively the direction of the second shot but can only say that a second bullet struck the back of the skull several centimeters above where another bullet entered. The proximity of these two impact points precludes their having been made by the same bullet. What is ironic about all this is that if the autopsy doctors had not so tenaciously maintained the lower entry point I would not have considered that the lower transverse fracture could be the evidence for the location of the entrance of a nonfragmenting bullet.

4. I can not say why we do not see blood on the back of the President’s collar at frame 346 of the Zapruder film except to say that I believe that the Zapruder film is authentic and that it is not visible. I believe that the autopsy

photos are authentic as well and that they show the entry hole right above the EOP as the autopsy team and 8 other eyewitnesses have placed it. There is a large flap of loose but still attached scalp that can hide a portion of the large defect at the top rear of the skull and this might have prevented blood from getting on the collar. The fact that this large flap of scalp in the back of the head is intact makes me believe that a **single** large piece of bone was removed from the skull underlying this. It is **extremely** significant that this large piece of bone (10.5 X 6.4 cm) was brought to the autopsy room later that night where it was determined to compromise a portion of an **exit** wound. This of course was an exit wound in the **back** of the head. It has struck me as very odd that Drs. Humes and Finck told the Warren Commission that they could not precisely locate the position of this large piece of bone in the large defect at the top of the skull and that they initially could not find a defect in the intact bone made by an exiting bullet. They were later able to identify half of this supposedly nonexistent exit defect in the front of the skull in the postmortem autopsy photographs in their 1967 review for the Department of Justice. It would seem to me that if you had half an exit hole in the intact skull and another separate piece which supposedly contained the other half of that exit hole that it would have been easy for them to locate it's precise position in the skull. What is also amazing in the 1967 Review is the fact that 4 years after Humes and Finck's WC testimony and only one week after Boswell told Josiah Thompson that the late arriving fragment fit in the **back** of the head, they can **now** all precisely locate the large late arriving fragment as having come from the previously nonexistent exit defect in the front of the skull. This piece of skull is too large to fit adjacent to the exit wound in front. The fact that **several** fragments of bone arose from the front of the skull in this area at frame 313 would virtually eliminate the possibility that one large piece of skull was ejected from this area. The reason why they perjured themselves before the Warren Commission on these points is that the large fragment of bone fit in the **rear of the skull** and compromised a second exit defect that was not related to the other defect which is clearly seen on the postmortem photographs. I believe that the Zapruder film and Nix film demonstrate quite conclusively where this large piece of bone originated. Certainly those fragments of bone we see rocketed from the front of the skull on frame 313 of the Zapruder film did not fall back into the back seat of the limosine. If you read carefully Dr. Boswell's interview by Josiah Thompson in Six Seconds in Dallas you will see that he told Thompson that the large

fragment of bone did fit into the top rear of the skull and there are several other eyewitnesses the HSCA talked to who corroborate this. Humes and Finck perjured themselves before the Warren Commission on this point rather than tell the truth.

In the final analysis President Kennedy was shot twice in the head in very close succession just as you surmised almost 30 years ago. The eyewitnesses said there were two closely spaced shots at this time. The Zapruder film shows a double head motion which can not be explained by a single shot from behind. This film as well as the Nix film shows a large piece of bone being ejected from the rear of the skull and the governments own eyewitnesses as well as the x-rays attest to the fact that this bone was part of an exit in the rear of the skull. The autopsy photos, as interpreted by the individuals who have had the best view , as well as cotemporaneous notes show that a bullet entered the scalp just slightly above the EOP. The autopsy x-rays, when correctly interpreted, provide evidence that the autopsy team did not err by four inches in locating the entry but that they did ignore a large piece of lead and associated radiating fractures in the rear of the skull which was evidence for a second bullet having struck the skull. The first bullet entered the rear of the skull 3 cm above the EOP, did not fragment on entering, and exited the front of the skull blasting pieces of bone from the front of the skull far from the limosine and caused the initial forward movement of the President's head. The trajectory of this first bullet through the head has been drawn on the lateral skull x-ray by Dr. John Ebersole, the radiologist present the night of the autopsy, and this same correct first trajectory was recorded by Dr. Boswell on the autopsy face sheet and was later used in the creation of CE 388. A second fragmenting bullet, fired in very close succession from the right front of the motorcade, struck higher on the President's head, removing a large piece of skull and depositing a 6.5 mm lead fragment in the back of the skull. It is this second shot from the right front of the motorcade fired by a still unnamed assassin which caused the dramatic backwards snap of the head.

I hope this explains some of the questions you raised. I believe my explanation corresponds best to the events and evidence surrounding the head wounds to the late President. Unlike most critics I have few, if any, problems with the authenticity of the autopsy materials or the photographic

evidence. It is the government's interpretation of this body of evidence with which I differ. I take it as a great honor that you would show an interest in my findings. It has taken a long time but I believe that the medical proof of conspiracy in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is at hand.

Sincerely,



Randy Robertson, M.D.

P.S. I have included a radiographic explanation of the 6X4X3 cm bone fragment seen on Boswell's autopsy diagrams. The 3 cm base of the triangle is a portion of the fracture made by the entering bullet slightly above the EOP. I believe this speaks highly for the authenticity of the radiographs. I have also included a picture of a skull marked at the entrance site by the autopsy principles for the HSCA which corresponds quite well with the radiographic entrance.