

Randy Robertson, M.D.
100 Maxwell crossing
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21701

March 23, 1994

Dear Harold:

I received your original letter before I got your note telling me that you had sent the first one with the address in the wrong spot. As far as a press conference goes there is another reason why I am hesitant to commit myself at this point. I am telling you this in strictest confidence as I have encountered difficulties in the past. Please do not tell anyone this but I have resubmitted a paper on my findings to the journal RADIOLOGY for peer review. This is the same editor who sent my peer reviews to the Conyer's committee before my testimony there in November of 1993. Roger wrote about this in his paper "The Emperor's New Clothes" which I believe he sent a copy to you. If you do not have it then I would be glad to send you a copy. I gather that the editor felt some pangs of conscience and he told an intermediary that if I resubmitted the paper with some disclaimers that there is a good possibility that it would get printed. I do not know if he will do it or not but I am willing to give him a chance. I should be finding out his decision by the end of April. I think that if I can get my theory put in the medical literature it should give it some credibility. There will be hordes of others who have already put their reputations at stake by concluding that JFK was shot only once in the head and have overlooked the many significant findings that I have brought forth and which I explained in my previous letter. Roger's paper was appropriately named because once you call their bluff and point out that there is evidence to support the autopsy doctors then their beliefs that the autopsy team somehow missed by four inches and that the head snap is due to some "reverse jet effect" quickly become unbelievable.

As you know I have had problems in the past with the peer review process so that the fewer people that know that this is going on the better. If by chance the editor does accept the paper for publication it will be most likely published in the November issue of the journal. While I doubt that any significant portion of the public will read RADIOLOGY, I do think that the occasion of the first publication in the peer reviewed medical literature of an analysis of the materials that leads to the conclusion of conspiracy might generate some interest by the press. All of this is, of course, dependent on the papers acceptance. As I said this should be at the end of April. If this does not pan out then I would welcome any opportunity to bring forth these findings. Dr. Lundberg of JAMA will have some explaining to do when it is realized that he rejected a paper for publication that proves the accuracy of the autopsy team in locating the wound of entrance in the back of the head. Dr. Lundberg seemed quite confident in their capabilities in the JAMA articles and even

said on Larry King Live that the bullet entered "near the hairline". I believe that it will be important to keep the pending publication of the article a secret because if it gets out I am sure that attempts will be made to scuttle its publication.

I do not know of anyone right now who would say that dust like particles only come from non-jacketed ammunition but I will look into it. There is a paper that is going to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Roentgen Ray Society which addresses the fragmentation pattern of bullets and their penetration. I have not spoken with the presenter yet but his abstract does say that frangible bullets have the shallowest penetration. This could be part of the answer as to why no fragments are seen in the left side of the head in addition to the fact that it was a tangential shot. What has been very frustrating in all this is a complete lack of support by Wecht. I do not believe there can be any clearer presentation of the material as it relates to the head shots than what I have put forth. He must realize that this is the answer unless he wants to believe in reverse jet effects which in the past he has criticized severely. At this point he seems content on sitting on the fence and allowing Aguilar and Mantik to continue on the dead end road of attempting to prove that the photos and x-rays are fake. The problem is not alteration but interpretation. People can decide not to change their minds but they can't change the facts.

Another thing I want to tell you about that should be kept in confidence but probably wouldn't matter is about the autopsy photos and x-rays. On the one photo which shows the large defect in the skull with a portion of the exit defect in the skull anteriorly, there is a very interesting finding. In the lower left hand corner of this photo there is subcutaneous fat exposed which must be in the area above the clavicle on the right which extends vertically almost to the back. The edges are very sharp and it could only be related to a surgical incision. There also is a disruption of the soft tissues in this exact same area on the postvisceration chest x-ray and I do not believe it is related to the incisions to remove the contents of the chest and abdominal cavities. No one has ever mentioned this since no one has really looked carefully at the materials and you would only look if you had any questions as to whether the neck was dissected. I truly believe that this was an incision looking for a bullet or the track of the bullet that entered the back. With the current restrictions on the autopsy materials I do not feel that this is going to go anywhere because you need the uncropped photos to show this area and the chest x-ray which corresponds to it has not been reproduced. Until a number of reasonable critics go in and see this defect and make comment about it or the autopsy doctors get under oath and are questioned specifically about this, I don't think this observation will be taken seriously. Perhaps the mortician's might remember sewing this area up. There are some veiled inferences that this area was opened up in some of the HSCA interviews. Of course this makes the autopsy team out to be liars once again but at this point we are able to know when they are telling the truth on some things and when they were lying. What a story will be told when they finally get around to exhuming JFK.

I did receive a copy of the Frazier memo on the limo inspection from Lesar. On the front page he says that the rugs were not torn out. The data on the first page is copied on the second and third pages with the exception that he dropped off the note about not having torn the rugs out. Maybe that's where some of the lead went. I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but the White House garage log sheet shows that

representatives from Dr. Burkley went over the limousine at about 9 p.m. the night of the assassination and brought some of the skull fragments back to the morgue. I always wonder whether they might have retrieved portions of bullets at that time as well. It is interesting that they didn't let the FBI agents see the limo until 1:30 a.m. the next morning. We may never know many of the true facts related to this investigation.

If I hear of anything I will let you know. As I mentioned earlier please keep the fact that I have sent my paper to RADIOLOGY in confidence as there are a number of people who would not want to see it reach print in a medical journal. I am hoping that some stroke of luck will occur that might shed some light on my findings. I think that when it is presented in the right way it is very comprehensible and provides a good common sense explanation of the head movements and the fact that he must have been struck by a second shot. The beauty of this is that the evidence that proves all this is in the safekeeping of the National Archives. No one can erase the trajectory lines penciled in. No one can alter the true images or take away the fracture of the occipital bone that sits where the autopsy team has placed a wound. The autopsy team is and has been committed to the lower entry wound and we can prove them correct on this point. Unfortunately for them when we do so we expose the deception they created the night of the autopsy.

Sincerely,


Randy