



28 April, 1992

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Here is a letter I sent to Senator Specter last week. I am not naive enough to think for one second that he is going to agree to my invitation to a public hearing of serious questioning about the Warren Report. However, my intent is to put the proposal on the table and keep it there for all to see. I've sent copies to Mr. Lesar and Congressman Stokes. I sent one to a woman (Katherine Lee) in the editor's office of Newsweek. Her letter to me was one of the few responses I've received from a major publication. I plan to send copies to as many television program directors I can find. The same goes for newspaper reporters, editors, public figures, and anyone else who may be in the position to generate a strong demand for the truth if, and when, the time comes. If you have any suggestions, I would love to hear them.

Your books are thought-provoking and provide me with much material, as you can tell from some of my questions to the Senator. Thank you very much for them. I will be ordering more.

This is all for now. Take care and stay healthy.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Peter M. Swindells'.

Peter M. Swindells
148 Oakwood Drive
Stafford, Va. 22554

*P.S. Also enclosed is the letter from Ms Lee,
and my letter to Newsweek.*

Newsweek

444 MADISON AVENUE • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022 • (212) 350-2000

March 24, 1992

Mr. Peter Swindells
148 Oakwood Drive
Stafford, VA 22554

Dear Mr. Swindells:

Many readers wrote to tell us of their dissatisfaction with our cover story on Oliver Stone's movie "JFK" ("Twisted History," Movies, December 23). The majority charged that our report and cover caption ("The Twisted Truth of 'JFK': Why Oliver Stone's New Movie Can't Be Trusted") seemed unfairly biased against the movie and its director, Oliver Stone. Newsweek, however, sought only to stress that "JFK" is a docu-drama, not a documentary. We attempted to sort out the known facts from the yet-to-be-proven or highly unlikely theories posed by the film; we never discounted the possibility that the basic premise of the film--that President John F. Kennedy was killed by a conspiracy of assassins--could still prove valid. "Oliver Stone would have us believe that the truth is still elusive, that there are villains on the loose," we reported, adding, "it's not impossible." We also said that "anyone who's ever dipped into the contradictions of the assassination knows what a spellbinding, crazy-making story it is--and Stone does it justice."

Other readers charged that we "towed the government's official line" and supported the Warren Commission's lone-assassin finding. Our report, however, simply attempted to sort the tenable from the shaky on both sides of the controversy. We neither dismissed the conspiracy theories ("Exactly how crazy is this stuff? Not especially, compared with what we've already found out to be true") nor failed to mark Stone's artistic embellishments ("Only the alert viewer," we reported, "will be able to distinguish real documentary footage from reconstructed scenes, shot in black and white, that often represent Garrison's suppositions about what might have happened"). Though some readers perceived our deconstruction of the film to be patronizing, our only intent, we assure you, was to distinguish fact from fiction.

Newsweek's perspective, in short, was one of skeptical inquiry and critical interest: while we detailed the dubious elements of "JFK," we also stressed the film's significance as "a powerful, radical vision of America's drift toward covert government." Our cover story offered this summation: "don't trust anyone who claims the movie is hogwash. And don't trust Stone either." We hope you had a chance to see the letters we published in our January 13 Letters column, which expressed many of our readers' concerns. Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,



Katherine Lee
For the Editors

KL:bc

20 April, 1992

The Honorable Arlen Specter
The U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Specter:

I have been interested in the JFK Assassination for about 16 years. I strongly believe it is an unsolved murder and deserves to be examined thoroughly, beginning with an analysis of the Warren Report and all of the evidence the Commission had at it's disposal. I am, therefore, pleased to hear that you are urging the release of all files connected with the case.

Acting on my own, ^{not} ~~and~~ as part of a group or for another individual, I have developed some questions I would like to put to you, Mr. David Belin, Mr. Gerald Ford, Congressman Louis Stokes and anyone else who would be in a position to answer them.

Would you agree to appearing before a televised panel of questioners to answer the many questions that have remained unanswered over the last 28 years? It would be similar to the 'round-table' debates produced by PBS over the years. You would be joined by whomever you chose. The opposite side would be chosen by someone such as Jim Lesar, attorney and head of the Assassination Archives. One of the rules should be that no evidence from outside the Commission's (and FBI's) official publications would be used. One of the disturbing actions of the Warren Commission is that it disbanded the moment it handed over it's Report, leaving no individual or corporate entity to answer legitimate questions arising from demonstrable misstatements of fact in the Report.

Where in the 26 volumes of Hearings and Exhibits can I find evidence that the FBI and the Warren Commission ever seriously considered a murderer, or murderers, other than Oswald?

Marina Oswald was a valuable witness for the Commission. Why does the Report not refer to the hints made to her by the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service that if she wanted to remain in the United States she would do well to "cooperate"? (1H p79-80) Was she not subject to pressure, and did this not affect her credibility? Why did the Report suppress her admitted lying? Why did the Report not mention her considerable financial gain as a consequence of the assassination? Was she not a wealthy young woman after her testimony? Does this not put a cloud over her credibility?

Where in the 26 volumes can I find hard evidence that Oswald fired anything on Nov.22,1963? How could the Report declare the so-called murder weapon (the Mannlicher-Carcano), to the exclusion of all others, was in Oswald's possession(to the exclusion of anyone else)at the time of the assassination, when it cited no proof of any of these allegations?

Why did the Commission not include a subject index to make possible the tracing of relevant testimony and documents to any single item of evidence? Did it not occur to the Commissioners that it would be impossible for the average person to study the 26 volumes (some 20,000 pages and more than 10 million words) as they are presented by the authors?

next page

Why was the Commission (and the Secret Service and FBI) so secretive about the photographic evidence that was available in this case? For example, Commander James Humes (head autopsy physician) told you that autopsy photographs are routine and "invaluable in the field of forensic pathology" (2H p350), yet the Commission did not provide him with the photographs to help him prepare for his testimony. The 'solution' to the crime hinged upon reconstructions in which the number of shots and the location of the wounds and the angle of declination were vital. Yet you wouldn't show him the pictures. Instead, he had to depend upon second-hand scetches based on recollections. Why was that?

I read where Chief Justice Warren told the Commission staff that "truth was our only goal". If that is true, why is it that the credibility of the Warren Report is falling down like a house of cards? Why, after 16 years of study, does the Report look like it had a different goal: to convict Lee Harvey Oswald?

Finally, is it safe to say that, since you are interested in opening the files, you are also in favor of getting all of the answers to all of the legitimate questions to the American people once and for all? I hope so. If truth is really your goal, I think you will agree with me.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Swindells

Peter M. Swindells
148 Oakwood Drive
Stafford, Va. 22554

27 December, 1991

Letters Editor
Newsweek
444 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Sir/Madam:

Your movie critic has a difficult time distinguishing fact from fiction. He calls Oliver Stone's 'JFK' a "piece of propaganda" and "twisted history" yet treats the autopsy report as conclusive evidence against Oswald. This is another example of how the media has always had problems with the facts of this case.

Here are a few reasons why the autopsy is not reliable:

- 1/ The original draft was burned by Commander Humes (chief autopsy surgeon)
- 2/ Autopsy report was not dated.
- 3/ Precise measurements pinpointing the location of certain wounds in the head and the back were not made.
- 4/ Autopsy photographs were withheld from the public and the surgeons, causing Humes to have to make diagrams for the Warren Commission from memory....4 months later.
- 5/ Humes did not learn of a small hole in the front of the throat until the day after the autopsy when he talked to Dr. Perry from Parkland Hospital.
- 6/ The brain's interior was not inspected, nor was it sectioned for microscopic examination.

Any one^e of these items alone would be reason enough to doubt the legitimacy of the most important autopsy in this nation's history. Like the Warren Report from cover to cover, the autopsy report is unreliable, incomplete and inaccurate.

If Newsweek wants to believe the Warren Commission on faith and with little regard for the facts, that's too bad. The truth is making it's way to the surface whether Newsweek wants to help or not. I suggest your correspondents try reading all of the available evidence instead of acting as a mouthpiece for the Warren Commission and it's apologists.

Sincerely,



Peter M. Swindells
148 Oakwood Drive
Stafford, Va. 22554

202-775-5830 (Daytime)

Peter H. Swindells
148 Oakwood Drive
Stafford, VA 22554

Dear Mr. Swindells,

Thanks for your 4/28 and its enclosures.

Of course you won't hear from Specter. But you may, as I did, get on his list for campaign solicitations!

I see, however, that you put my books to use. Good!

It is also interesting that Newsweek found it necessary to prepare as detailed a response, probably a form letter.

Maybe some of the letters may make a difference in the future.

So, it is worthwhile writing and thanks for taking that time.

I think asking Specter more questions is a waste of time.

He knew what he was doing when he did it.

and got where he is because he did.

Thanks and best wishes,