

Dear Mr. Wheatley,

12/8/94

I'm glad you like Case Open.

I take this time to respond to your letter, realizing that you may not like what I say, because like many you have been misled by the books that while they pretend to be factual are not. Most of those whose books are available are not legitimate subject-matter experts. They make theories up and then twist and distort whatever they can find to make their theories appear to be real.

If you were familiar with my books, which come mostly from the official evidence, you would know that the history of the Zapruder film makes what you suspect impossible.

It was not processed by the NPIC. And, in fact, the NPIC's interpretation of it, which I have in my fourth book, destroyed the Commission's interpretation of when shots were fired.

It was processed that day by Eastman Kodak in Dallas. It was officially admitted that three extra copies were made. I've recently been informed that newly-disclosed records say there were six. While I have no confirmation of bootleg copies I've been told in Dallas that bootleg copies were made while the film was in the darkroom.

The original was flown to Chicago that night, for use in the coming issue of LIFE. One copy was flown that night to the Secret Service in Washington. Zapruder held onto one for several days. In Chicago a black and white print was made for use in the magazine. At that time, according to LIFE, after I exposed the fact that four frames were missing in the original it was damaged and patched by a technician.

It was not possible to toy with the film in Dallas and it was likewise not possible to recover all the copies so that all the supposed alterations could be identical. If they were not, that would have meant detection and the greatest of scandals.

Aside from these few missing frames I know of no reason to believe that the film was doctored as Groden, Livingstone and others claim. They are not aware of the official evidence, either. Livingstone claims it was toyed with because without that all his work is worthless. It does show the back of the head intact, no sign of blood on it after the fatal shot and none on his shirt collar.

To the best of my knowledge this is true also of the autopsy film. The truth is that except to those with bucks to make or fame to earn the autopsy film destroys the official story. As you would see in my Post Mortem. And even Bowron's chart, under Livingstone's strong pressure, does not show the back of the head blown out. There were some honest mistakes in judgement by those who saw the right side blow out well to the back and there was also heavy misrepresentation of what some of those medical people said.

As you would see in my first book, Zapruder himself disagreed with the official interpretation of his film. Please excuse the rush. I really did not have time for this at my age and in the state of my health with the work I am still trying to do. Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg Harold Weisberg

Sun, Dec 4, 1994

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702



Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Congratulations on your book *Case Open*.

Enclosed is a letter I have written to Robert Groden. I wrote a similar one to a Mr. Livingston but I have a feeling they won't write back since "their books" are based on the sanctity of the Z film.

Perhaps you too are too busy to help me on this matter.

All I wish is an opinion on my theory about the Z film. See "letter to Groden" Encl 1.

Do you believe the Z film (unbeknownst, perhaps, to Z) that it was a setup to be altered at the critical frames; or perhaps just was altered at the critical frames, a good post script to the public execution of our President.

If you're busy, just write "yes" or "no" on this letter and mail it back to me in the SASE provided

I too met JFK when I was 14 (was present) but unlike Clinton wish to get the truth out.

Sincerely,

Jay J. Wheatley
POB 3493
Silverdale, WA 98383

(206) 692-7692

ps:

(Couldn't Ricky Don White's father been the "body" of the Oswald in those fake pictures of "Oswald" holding the rifle and newspaper cut at the chin line?)

Thu, Nov 10, 1994 (31 years is long enough)

Mr. Robert J. Groden
c/o Penguin Books USA, Inc.
375 Hudson St.
New York, NY 10014

Dear Mr. Groden

Thank you so very much for keeping the culprits nearly at bay with your incessant pounding to get to the truth behind the John F. Kennedy assassination.

I have always had this question and now have it doubly since I've purchase your book *The killing of a President*.

Q. If all of the Parkland Hospital doctors and all of the eyewitness describe that the back of JFK's head was blown out and that brain matter spewed rearward and leftward, why doesn't the Zapruder film show this?

First let me say I believe you, the Parkland doctors and the near-by eyewitness to the fatal head shot. I just believe that the Zapruder film is tainted evidence--from day one when it was developed at the NPIC. Odd, that others got their film ripped right out of their cameras and this one "goes to Washington" to get developed. Didn't Z have a brother in the CIA?

I believe Zapruder was set up by the CIA to be there, at that spot for the sole purpose of having the only (or perhaps, one of a damn too few) films of the on goings. The CIA knew they'd tamper with that film and squirrel it away for many years and then when (Garrison) pried it out of the system, everyone would be lost in the macroscopic and not worry about the microscopic. Though I know you do. I just mean generally.

To me the problem with the fatal head shot on the Z film doesn't show blood going backward, and that fleshy blob on the front of JFK's face looks painted on (Thank God, they didn't have computer to retouch that film). There appears to be a painted-on dark-brown blob of paint right where the exit hole WAS. The hair in the back of JFK's head is fairly discernible one frame before--then blammo--the detail in the hair at the back of the head goes to pieces (no pun). As good as 8mm can be, Jackie's clarity remains constant throughout these frames--but John's does not.

Can it be that the greatest piece of photographic evidence we have is fake (faked, tainted, at least, altered where we need to see clearly the most)?

Will you send me a "yes," "no," or "maybe" on this one?

Someday, there is going to be a new science that can work on a part of the assassination evidence that the crimnal bastards who planned and covered this up didn't have the fore thought of tampering with--count on it.

JJ Wheatley POB 3493, Silverdale, WA 98383

see Encl 1