

RANDOLPH H. ROBERTSON MD  
SOUTHERN HILLS MEDICAL CENTER  
DEPARTMENT OF RADIOLOGY  
391 WALLACE ROAD  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37211  
OFFICE 615-781-4650  
FAX 615-377-8100

Harold Weisberg  
Route 12  
Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Maryland 21701

February 21, 1994

Dear Harold:

I have become very intereseted in the Department of Justice and its handling of the autopsy materials and the reviews that it set up. I have read Post Mortem and refer to it often. From this I know you have more than a passing interest with the Clark Panel Report. I thought you might find the memo written by Alan Moritz M.D. of some interest. If this is a true memo, and I have nothing to indicate to me it isn't, then what Russel Fisher M.D. told you in his letter to you on page 596 about the editorial process was not completely the truth. Than again neither was their final report.

I have already checked the archives of Case Western Reserve University to see if Moritz might have left some early drafts around and all that they found was a press clipping referring to his participation in the panel. What I would give to see a rough draft of that report.

Another area that I think is crucial to finding out what the DOJ was up to is the 1967 review. Two things strike me as being remarkable. After having Dr. Ebersole help in the inventory they decided for some reason to not have him participate in the 1967 review and they gave the most cursory treatment of the x-rays in this review. The reason for that is obvious because it is the x-rays which destroy the original autopsy conclusion of only one gunshot wound to the head. The second remarkable thing about their 1967 review is the statement that the entrance hole appeared to be slightly higher than its described location as seen in the autopsy photographs. The report of course was drafted by the DOJ and presented to the doctors for their signature six days after the review. After seeing the doctors HSCA testimony it is clear that they would not have described the apperance of the entrance wound as it was described in the 1967 review. Who then in the DOJ thought that the entrance was higher and who was the physician who told them that it appeared higher. We are dealing with a very short time interval between the time the materials were "transferred" to the Archives and the time the 1967 review was performed.

If you have any comments or other input I would appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Randy



March 22, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Bromley and Drs. Carnes, Fisher, Morgan

FROM: Alan R. Moritz

The enclosed is an edited copy of The Panel report for your consideration. To the best of my knowledge, the changes that I have made in the original draft as assembled by Dr. Fisher are literary only, and do not in any way alter our agreed-to opinions as to what we saw or conclusions derived from our observations.

You will recall that just before leaving Washington on the afternoon of February 27, each of us gave to Dr. Fisher a draft of our section of the report with the understanding that he would put these together in the form of a unified report.

He did exactly what he agreed to do. It is inevitable, however, that this would produce a document that suffered from a certain amount of unnecessary repetition and undesirable variation in style and word usage.

I believe that none of us would wish to be the signatory of a document in the National Archives that was blemished in this manner.

I am aware that many of the changes that I have made probably reflect my personal taste, and are not necessarily better than the original.

*Alan R. Moritz*  
Alan R. Moritz

*Mr Clark*

Messrs. Sanders, Vinson and Rogovin

November 25, 1966

Ramsey Clark  
Acting Attorney General

Warren Commission-- Re-evaluation of Evidence

We should carefully examine all the criticisms, hypotheses and suggestions contained in the existing body of literature concerning the President's assassination and the work of the Warren Commission. The purpose is to inventory the contentions so we can evaluate their dimensions and validity.

I would like the task described above to be undertaken by a small group of lawyers within the Department on an unpublicized basis and suggest that the group be headed, if he is available, by Mr. Harland F. Leathers, Chief of the General Litigation Section of the Civil Division. In addition, I should like Mr. Rogovin and Mr. Vinson to designate a member of his staff, preferably in the Appellate Section, to work with Mr. Leathers. I would appreciate meeting with you and your designees on Monday, November 28, at 5:00 P. M. to discuss this matter further.

*11/25/66 - cca to Fred Vinson, Mitchell Rogovin & Berenice Sanders by messenger*