

Dear Howard,

7/29/72

Awakened before daylight this a.m., too wide awake to go back to sleep. I'd planned to intersperse overdue mowing with other work today after taking Lil grocery shopping, but I soon realized I am too weary. I then planned to take a nap on return. But getting your 7/26 reply and Cyril's 7/20 changes that. I'll write what I think I should in haste and then try to nap. Recent events, not this flap, have, I think, caused an emotional rather than an essentially physical weariness.

Your letter does surprise me. I haste to add, it also pleases me not so much because you have come around to what is essentially my view and done that independently (unless, perhaps, partly in reactions to the excess pressures Sylvia and others have visited on you and their inability to confront anything) as much as by the way you have put it all together in your own way. From the one hasty reading while Lil was in the store I recall nothing you said with which I am not in accord. However, from that hasty reading I am left with impressions that your are less constructive than you could have been, have left yourself in the position where the rabids may deliberately misrepresent your positions and motives and particularly will suggest that I subverted you, and have not made as adequate a record in some areas as you might. Therefore, I suggest another letter to him amplifying and clarifying yours. You can decide for yourself whether or not you want to do this, whether or not you want to tell him that these are my ideas based on a reading of the exchange, and the other views I'll probably include. I will be making no distribution within the critical community but I place no restrictions on you. I would like a set of your exchange, if you have no objection, for friends of my years who I think would want to read them.

You realize I'll not have time to organize this, and I don't know if you will be in accord. Again I emphasize the decision is and must be yours and whatever way it is I accept.

You do not detect what I think he is really up to in that other materials jazz. He is really up to using what I developed, and if he is there is nothing I can do about it. I don't want or like it, but I also have other reasons for feeling he should not even think of it. My feelings about all this cheap thievery are unchanged but I think, if one on my position can think with detachment with such an involvement, the more important reasons are his inability to use them in context, something I think he will be blind to, and my desire to be able to counter any possible adverse consequences.

I think he and the others have filtered my views where they know them, to eliminate that which they find uncongenial. You know that I have always felt that if the government had purposes to serve by having one of anti-Lattimer views see this stuff it can be arranged and would be. Nichols will see this stuff, for example, if not Chapman. I think you should spell this out to him and add that to your knowledge I was asked to submit the name of an expert to examine this material in my behalf before he got an answer from Marshall and that I refused. Two solicitations, too, not one. You have seen them.

If it is by no means certain that the press and others will react as I and now you anticipate, we feel the possible gain is not worth the risk and that Cyril alone among the applicants enjoys the statute he has which can magnify the damage but his not seeing the stuff would not eliminate the hazard. However, his being a reserve for countering any

dirty-work is no longer possible. I will come back to others aspects of these things but I want to get to specifics while they are in my mind.

It is not enough to make an inventory, or to compare an existing inventory, like the panel's, which he has because I gave it to him. I think he should make a careful, described inventory of his own and then compare. I think it is, as you say, that he should restrict himself to the materials covered by the contract because the other stuff can be done anytime, whether it is in my view ethical or unethical, and he can't in two full days do what he should do with the film alone.

He should prepare a list in advance of what a full and complete autopsy record should include and be able to say where this is deficient. If he prepares his list in advance from his own professional experience and training, he will also have a check list of what to look and ask for and in each case he will have an adequate record of what is not there or what was not done. There is, for example, hazard in asking for the tests in the supplementary report and finding that a slide he can't vouch for shows scorching, which is typical of entrance wounds, but there is no hazard in saying that there is no slide in what he was shown to show that the required similar tissue testing was done for the anterior neck wound, all of the original body tissue being present at the time of the autopsy, it having

but cut through only by Perry's scalpel. He knows about the absence of X-rays or testing of the left hemisphere and its urgency in any competent autopsy.

What X-rays and pictures that should have been taken are not there? The area in which he can add to what we know is not by stealing what I have done and pretending it is his, a fairly clear intent to me and I have no objection to your telling him I feel this way and feel I can, should I ever have the desire, make a fair case of it) but by sticking to his discipline, staying entirely out of pretended solution to the crime or motive or responsibilities outside the autopsy, or Oswald's guilt or innocence. The one way he can diminish the possibilities of counterproductivity is by sticking to his profession and doing with the autopsy what Sylvia and I in our original books did with the "report. He should focus on the autopsy to the exclusion of everything else, there and afterward.

If it is not a complete autopsy, what should have been done that wasn't. Here the advance list I suggest could be invaluable, because he need only check it and then, where he thinks it necessary, make further notes. For this I'd recommend a tape recorder rather than the time for writing.

Chain of possession on the film-is it there in a written record? If so, that record is very important. He has no way of evaluating it so he should duplicate it, and if he can't with xeroxes he can on tape. I can later tell if this is an honest record.

Damage to the X-ray. Is it explained? Does it obliterate anything that was originally captured on the exposed film or is it in the margin and does it destroy nothing?

Aside: I had thought of writing him but felt I'd better preserve my detachment in the event it is necessary to counter, if there is adverse reaction.

There are three contradictory versions of two batches of film, that of the contract, that of the panel (which read everything and made no ref. to the comment of the contract), and Lattimer's. This kind of thing is quintessential, but his lack of knowledge may mask it from him. It is much more important than duplicating and cribbing my work, which you can tell him is all already on paper and has been for a long time. You might remind him he has read the earlier parts of PM, for you have seen his letter on it, and that I did tell him what was immediately necessary for his understanding when I got the other stuff. You will recall that you got me the skeleton chart I still have by the phone, and as soon as I got it I phoned him and discussed this with him on his word he would preserve my confidence, so he knew it long before anyone sent him copies in all cases, in my view, obtained improperly and unethically. He knows that this is in the Archives, in fact, only because others breached that confidence.

Now it is not possible for there to be film that the panel could read and describe and film that was exposed to light by an agent. He should make full notes on the note or record about this light-exposure for later comparison with the panel and Lattimer reports. And he should note with each picture every mark or identification that appears on each, leaving nothing out because any mark can have a significance he may not know. You know, for example, that I have material on this not in the Archives. You also can tell him this but not its content. It is in the part of PM I didn't send him. What I am really saying in this and other things is that he is going to have to search his soul, if much too late, to see if he is after glory on the cheap or there for the serious purposes he pretends to himself probably and to others certainly are his exclusive interest. On this lay it directly on the line for the future, as explicitly as you can, because what is really needed is thing kind of thing that he can do and I can't and that I have not done. He serves no honest or honorable purpose in duplicating or stealing what I have already done and he knows I have, but he can serve legitimate purposes by doing what needs to be. Every detail, not matter how beyond seeming significance or his comprehension, is important or at least potentially so. This is the one chance to get it because Nichols is an egomaniacal nut. And the creature of preconceptions, as are all of those with whom Cyril can consult. I assume this includes Bud and Smith, both of whom are extremely rabid and no less ignorant. Smith started preparing for this long, long ago and in every discussion I have had with him still lacks elemental understand. Example: he was during the late winter still looking for explosive bullets but hadn't yet studied enough to know if their use was indicated by the scene or permitted by the known evidence.

Aside: when under Sylvia's pressure he belatedly wrote me, I told him that I did not consider that my association with it made right out of wrong. But I did not turn him down on consultation, said that would be controlled by conditions at the time he might see the stuff, and until then could not make a final decision. I am not now disposed to change, but this kind of thing as ~~discuss~~ contrasted with a cram course in the assassination I'd undoubtedly have done, once I knew what his intent and purposes are. If he is, as I suspect, going to do what I think he intends, in my view steal my work which he knows about only because he and others violated my confidence--and as you know this extends to Gary's source of duplication of it, I'd not be party to any of it.

You might tell him that I had exhausted my administrative remedies on much of this stuff and in one form on all of it and abandoned what to your knowledge is an enormous work because of its possible counterproductivity. To a degree you go into an area of this in your excellent exposition of the political ramifications and potentials. He should be able to see receipts and records on which he should not comment without those in a position to know their meaning and potential. You should understand that Bud is by far the most severely anti-Kennedy of all, and I presume Bob is similar.

He should be prepared to give some acceptable explanation of his Long John remarks on who did the killings if asked by the press, and he should anticipate that, whether or not he is, some will be briefed on it in sufficient detail and I have already tested enough correspondents to know that this will turn all the press off if it is pulled. He may actually believe that drok, but if he does is merely reflects his ignorance and irresponsibility. So, handling this may be touchy. My own view is that this also requires that he stick to the stuff covered by the contract so he can say nothing else is relevant, that he has, as a professional forensic pathologist (forensic), studied only what is allegedly covered by the contract, and that in the context of the two protocols and the panel report, and that is all he will talk about. If he does this and rattles off the enormous inventory of flaws, faults, stupidities, culpabilities, omissions and plain misrepresentations and lies he may have a chance of keeping this in proper perspective and preserving his own reputation, which the determined press can more easily ruin than I think he may be willing to conceive. I have canvassed competent reporter friends on this and they 100% confirm this opinion. I believe I informed you of this at the time. He should understand that he can be ruined, that it thereafter can be used against him every time he takes the stand, and he should especially not lose sight of Fisher's open animosity toward him and Fisker's enormous stake in what Cyril now does. I have never believed in returning evil for evil, for it accomplishes nothing. But not to save Cyril, in which I now can't pretend to have an interest, but to save us and all the work we have done, if he agrees to restrict himself 2100% as I have outlined, I'd probably work with him on this. And my news and public-relations experience could augment considerably my knowledge of the fact. Without this specific commitment and that in writing I'd not consider it. In fact, I can conceive of having to go after him vigorously if this does backfire, because that also will be necessary for our survival and the prevention of what may be preventable in the further burying of truth in the full not the fictional sense of the unthinking. And there are some reporters I could and would background so they could ask the right questions and try to keep this clean and from ruining him. I have several in mind. I have spoken to at least one already.

Also, if he follows what I consider the honorable rather than the self-soaking course and does commit himself to doing the really exhaustive job that should be done on this stuff and can't be done adequately in two full days, I might go to his press conference as a writer. Conversely, if he does, I might be even more interested in doing that. And he should understand the full import of the latter. He should also understand that if this backfires, as you know, I have already laid a foundation of others having a possible interest in my having a press conference of my own, and you know enough of what I have written to know what I can do, and would be tempted to, whether or not I did, and what that can do to him. He may be blind to this but you are not. Don't give him details because if this does kick back, the best I can hope for is puny enough and I'm not throwing anything away in advance. My prime consideration is reducing what harm can't be eliminated. And if he chooses to take this as a threat, I wouldn't argue the point. Meaning I wouldn't, not counsel to you.

The chains of possession records should be listed, dated and all signatures should be recorded. Of the things he may not know along this line that may later be important may be the names of David Acheson and Evelyn Lincoln, to name a few. Also Kelley, etc. and

any records of or receipts for the showing of anything to anybody. If he sees not, he should make a note to ask and be able to note the answer, if any. Here also dates are important, as you know, but DON'T tell him why.

At the beginning of this graph I had a long call from my mother. It wrenched my mind from this and what I'd written but I've no time to reread. It is now almost noon and I'll have to make a special trip into town to mail this so you can get it promptly as possible.

I will want to file these things under Cyril and under you, so I'll probably include a carbon, which will be easier to read, and you can return whichever you want for my Cyril file. If you have extra copies of what you sent, I'd like copies for that file, too.

These records on possession should be extended to the clothing. Don't tell him the importances. He'll know only one. I don't want to give this way needlessly and more, I don't want to blow anything or get him into anything not of his own knowledge. Because of his lust for glory, he'll do anything that might build him up or give him a headline, but neither is a legitimate reason for seeing this stuff. I wish he could forget his ambition and stick to his last. One impertance he should know, but don't even say that. Just tell him to be certain to make complete records of this sort and ask for them aside from the examination he makes.

He asks for caution. Here be blunt without being impolite. He needs them. The first should be that he cast himself in the role of a scientist, not a partisan. This again requires that he forget my work and do his own, but he won't. He should eschew any and all backgrounding for many reason, the most obvious one is that there is nobody who will who is in a position to. He ought not have his head full of glory stuff but should have it clear and unfettered for what he sees, not what she wants to see because of something he has been told which may well be wrong. He should make long and detailed notes instead of departing from this stuff for sensational work already done. He can't know the significance of everything he sees, but if he records everything he sees, ultimately significance denied him may be ascertained. So he should record every triviality he doesn't understand, but does see with his own eyes, not SM's or BF's or Bob's. And I think you should be painfully blunt about his forgetting everything he heard from Lifton and about his having no further contact. What Sylvia can't tell him about Lifton's lack of scruple Gary can and Gary is a scientist who can tell Cyril that Lifton is a madman. He should also understand what he has gotten into when he is counselling with the literally mad. Caution enough? You don't address it.

In his 2 he makes no mention of notes, only of "digesting". His capability of digesting is more limited than he can visualize or may be willing to. And if it is to "digested" with the likes of Bud and Bob and even Sylvia, it may give him and all of us a bellyache. It is my view that first you eat before you digest, and he should spend all his time eating, which means here studying and what he never mentions, making full and elaborately-detailed records. The comes the digestion, and I don't think he'll have access to the good enzymes. Or at this point should. I have the same counsel for him I had for you, he MUST be independent. If he takes one nutty notion from the butts on this subject he'll be counselling with, he can balst himself forever, and with him all of us and what can be done on the subject. Asking questions based on what he saw is another thing, but of whom? He has made it impossible for those who can do this to have an honorable association with him in this project. Christ, Bud hasn't read the basic literature yet. He prefers fables of his own invention. But he has found time for all the farout literary rubbish there is. Jerry is of immeasurable ignorance. Smith is biased and captive of crazy preconceptions all of which are in context irrelevant and lacks sufficient understanding of what he read. Sylvia is solidly grounded in the past and will have better recall than she pretends with me, but it remains the past and is not remotely close to current. He has hoist himself on a petard of his own creation and he'd best understand it and adjust to it. He should spent the night after his first day's examination going over what he has seen alone, not with those who would at best confuse him and befuddle his understanding of what he has see, and spending what time he has in recording impression, questions, etc., and in making notes of things to do the next day, not based on advice but his own knowledge of his own field. He should also know that he doesn't have to leave at any special time, although they may insist upon it. However, it may be better for him not to overload himself and to try too much in one day. If he is really serious, two days are inadequate. I can spend that much time on the clothes or the film and not be finished, and I've a better notion of the evidence they

can and should hold than his majesty.

Your graph 2, p 1 opens fine. I don't think it necessary for you to expand on the last part, but for the record, two years ago I made him a proposal to which he has yet to respond and if you see first you might, now that you know what I had in mind, remind him that he might, had he been unselfish, have accomplished more and then and without any of the present possible adverse consequences. There was more involved than my planned legal actions.

I disagree with the opening of your fourth graph. Since he is going to see this stuff anyway, then he can and should use that time for what constructive purposes might be served, indicated at least in part above. you can't make such a judgement without knowing his motivation and purposes. If they are as selfish as I think, you are precisely correct and really understate. But if he will sublimate his ego and ambition to become famous on the cheap and on the backs of other, by what amounts to deliberate dishonesty, he can serve constructive purposes. And only in this way, as a scientist on a scientific not literary, publicity or partisan purposes.

For the record, your p. 2, penult full graph, this includes him. You know I invited him here, repeatedly, and he said he hoped to do that. Instead he went off on his own kinds of glory-roading and ego-tripping, the last of which I've heard is a debate with Lusius Birch in Memphis on Oswald's innocence, for all the world as though he knew what he was talking about.

Your penult is very good. Add supplementary autopsy report and his professional estimate of the work reflected in it, esp. the omissions and inadequacies.

P. 3, first full graph: you misread. literary theft is the purpose here and so in his own egocentric mind he'll have no obligation to SM, JP or GRS. But even if this is his intent, what kind of crazy notion is it to waste time he can spend on the withheld doing no better than duplicating what he, not we, have access to? I'd lay it on him on this, and I'd not be afraid to ask him his motivation when he is in clover to reach into the haystack. This reminds me, he should ask for the unidentified object, which is in the panel report and covered by the contract because it is in the covered pictures, and if it is not shown him ask if any effort has been made to obtain and what the result. Ditto for the frag you noted when I missed it at the back of the head.

And this reminds me. He should be carefully to correlate pictures and cassettes on those from what I think was the Speed Graphic. This is the kind of detailed work that is indispensable, is essential for medico-legal and scientific purpose but he fears will not give him the fame he wants.

p. 3, second full graph: more, he should look for enlargements of small areas in the pix and ask, since it was sworn to as having been done, where the full-body X-rays are. He could crib this from my work and he has read it anyway, so don't be afraid to tell him. Finck asked that they be taken and swore they were, as did Hughes. They don't exist. He should be able to say whether or not there is an area of the body that could have held any kind of missile of ~~the kind~~ which there are no pictures and/or no X-rays. He should record the notations on each envelope and the contents and whether or not they match. And any changes in identifications. If there are changes, he should ask for xeroxes of envelopes and note if refused. He should ask to be able to get them the next day when he returns. This is separate from any alleged exclusionary right and it would be just as good if he is refused. We need to be able to attack, not defend.

Without ~~remembering~~ remembering your last full graph 3 you see I've said the same in more detail.

The incomplete bottom graph: I think you should note that this was not your original view, than he and others not me changed your thinking. This is one of the many areas where others may seek to transfer possible later guilt feelings to you.

The conclusion of this graph p. 4, remember that I actually solicited this from him and the others. He has to this day yet to make meaningful response.

Your final graph might have included ethical considerations with those you list.

As you can see, I have not stopped thinking about this, even if I haven't made an effort to influence your thinking by forcing mine upon you. Although none of us can always do it ~~to~~ to the degree we'd like and many of us exaggerate the natural, an inability to be detached, I have tried to think in terms of the reality, he is going to see this stuff. Therefore, the essence is to do two things: make it as worthwhile as possible in terms of the possible adding to the overall knowledge, if only in the making of a good record,

and in doing what is possible to reduce to the minimum the possibilities of hurt to the truth, to him and to the rest of us. If he whores around on this, I will do what I can to see he earns the proper reward. If he does a pure-science thing, I would do what I could to help him make a dependable record and to protect himself from the personal harm to him that is possible. If he whores around and can hurt us, as I wrote a book only one person has ever seen to protect us in a possible contingency, so I would be willing to do what I could to see him get his full and what I would regard as his proper reward. His say, I know, amount to nothing. But I give you my willingness.

Quite aside from questions of sincerity, on which I enjoy no monopoly and which I know those with whom I disagree believe they have, I take a very simplistic view of all of this. While Cyril was busy getting richer than he need be and doing no real work, while Sylvia was accumulating her pelf, I think she said tax free and considerably by normal standards, while Bud was enjoying his inheritance (a fortunate thing for him), while Maggie was luxuriating in the warmth of a Hutton & Co partnership, while all those who have done nothing for years or worse, have made only trouble and problems, Bill and I have wrecked our lives, mortgaged and ruined our futures, to work full time and long overtime on this. I am not going to sit back now and let some wretched sheep personal ambition make a waste and futility of all of that, least of all if it involves by no matter how much an indirection or how carefully contrived a pseudop justification, the taking of what I did with no help of any kind while all of these were busy getting rich, enjoying life or doing whatever they did instead of doing what I did.

As I would help a worthwhile thing, I would do what I could to counter anything else. People do not understand me on this, referring fictions with which they can console themselves. Just yesterday I agreed to GIVE to Jim what I went out and got on my own and have refused to use in my own interest, for Bud's glorification in the Ray case. Now when I set out to get this particular stuff, because Bud is Ray's lawyer (my book was out) and he does have considerable wealth, and I asked him about paying the nominal costs. He said he'd go to \$50.00. Hell, that didn't cover the travel expenses. So I went further into debt, didn't take his \$50.00 and I did go out and do this on my own. He wants it for the habeas corpus and I'm not only giving it to him but I'm having the copies made for him because he and Jim went to see Ray today (forgetting that the deal when I arranged that was that I would see with him whenever he saw Ray). And let me say, so you will have no false impression, that what I did is the obvious that all the big brains, imprisoned as they are by preconceptions, just couldn't conceive of doing. Any paper would fire a cub report if, on his first day of work, he didn't think of this, that is how obvious it is.

More interruptions, so I've got to quite. There is more I could say but can't now.

Sincerely,