

George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

7/12/97

Dear George,

Anyone writing as ill-informed a letter as yours of the 8th would not want any response. However, if you write me that kind of stuff, you should expect a response.

With all the lies I faced in all that FOIA litigation it may well be that I was lied to about the shirt and tie. I did not ask to examine them. I asked for what the Archives regulations then provided for, photographs as a substitute for actual viewing. However, regardless of what you think of your knowledge and of your powers of observation, you were suckered.

There is no bullethole in the front of the shirt and this is the FBI's own evidence. I did not make up what I told you. There are not the required spectrographic traces on either the shirt front or the tie. In addition, what you saw was definitely caused by a scalpel as part of the normal emergency-room urgency. If you had looked at the tie you'd have seen the two scalpel cuts against the knot from the left as worn. I enclose a picture of it from NEVER AGAIN! from the official evidence. The Archives photog, who was about to retire, told me the FBI employed all its not inconsiderable skills to make the picture ^{that} unclear. There is a slight enlargement and enhancement on the right-hand page. The cuts could not be more obvious and that there is no hole through the tie also is. New Lardner magic, a bullet that goes through a tie knot, the requirement of the official mythology, and leaves no hole?

I enclose what is much clearer if you ever screw yourself up enough to get in contact with reality, the pictures used in the book. The FBI was careful not to give the Commission a good picture of the tie it could use in evidence, with witnesses, but it covered its own ass in its report, CD1, in its exhibit 60. It took the knot apart, which could have destroyed its value as evidence with the knot being the evidence, and phoned up what to a hasty glance looks like the knot. That picture is clear, as is the pattern of the tie. It suggests a hole but in the FBI's legend it is careful to refer to what it is, a nick. That nick was made by the FBI itself. That is where it took the specimen for spectrographic analysis. Which proved no bullet or part of bullet had struck the tie, whatever you may want to think or believe.

There is no other evidence on this as on so much else you prefer not to believe. Only conjecture essential to the preconception of Oswald's lone guilt.

You are really talking about the so-called single-bullet theory. Each and every doctor questioned by the Commission, including all three autopsy pro-

sectors, testified to the opposite. All stated they did not believe it. As is recanted in the first book on the subject if you ever read what you do not want to believe for your own political reasons.

Asides from those being slits, not holes in the front of the short collar, the FBI Lab picture it did ~~Not~~ give the Commission reflects that the slit on the left ~~is~~ worn, or toward the scalpel in the hands of the nurse, either Henchcliffe or Bowron, I've forgotten which, is much longer than on the other side of the collar. And what with the neatly-dressed President's tie in place, his shirt as it should have been. Isn't that still another kind of magic, a bullet that strikes two pieces of cloth that are flat against each other and make a slit in one about twice as long as the other? With so much in the neckband ^{on the side} and none in the neckband on the other side. Please note that the FBI lined the button and the buttonhole up.

~~Neither~~ Neither slit has the characteristic of any bullet hole.

You are childish in arguing against all the official evidence, of which I do not here go into all, that "Dr. Carrico could have been wrong." For doing what is always done in all emergency rooms under those conditions? Without being even asked about it by Specter or any of the others? Without any other doctor who was there being asked by the Commission if that had been possible? Or any of the nurses being asked? Or any member ^{examined} being asked, including Dilles, who did return to it.

That Carrico's testimony is consistent with all the evidence you prefer not to believe makes no difference to you. You want to have faith in the coup d'etat we had and adjust all to that.

Now the Commission had to move the bullet hole in the back up to even be able to dare pretend the single-bullet theory was possible. But the fact is, and the actual official evidence—again the only real evidence—is that it was, as the suppressed death certificate states, down on the back, at the level of the third thoracic vertebra.

The Navy required that a body chart be filled out at the autopsy. It was done on the proper form with JFK and then that, like so much else, was hidden once the Commission got it. A reporter with your experience should be asking why this was hidden rather than used as evidence but you do not ask that. The official body chart, which was "verified" by the President's own physician, who was there, actually was the only doctor in both hospitals, coincides with the death certificate and the autopsy pictures on where that bullet hole was. And all of this, each and every piece of it, makes impossible an exit through the shirt and tie—which do not have the evidence of exit or entry in any event.

I took the time for~~x~~ the DJ ² pnel report and the report of the autopsy doctors that do reflect fragmentation of the bullet that supposedly did not fragment so you would be informed, so you could understand better the reason for the change Ford made. So you could understand what seemed to be relevant.

If you can back up your allegation that there is FBI evidence other than I cited, I invite that.

You make a fool of yourself if you say you can look at a short that has two slits in it and recognize them as bullet holes.

The FBI was very careful to state repeatedly under oath that those slits had no spectrographic traces of bullet metal whereas the hole on the back did.

We deposed Frazier in CA 85-226. I gave Jim the FBI's picture I published of that shirt collar to ask Frazier about. What Frazier actually testified, and you can get the transcript in Jim's office, is that he had the same question we had as soon as he saw the shirt and ordered an examination by the lab hair-and-fiber expert, I think Cunningham. That report was to have been provided in that litigation but it never was.

You have at least one^{perhaps} ~~perhaps~~ two problems. One is the policy of the Post and the other is what you want to believe and what you believe is all that is real to you no matter how unreal, in this case totally impossible, it is.

Aside from your belief, which can be political in origin because it has no relationship no matter how remote ^{from} with fact^s, established official fact, which is what I have always restricted myself to, how much more childish can you ^{be to} argue that to argue that because you think it serves your argument the doctor departed from standard procedure in that dire emergency. He had the nurses cut the tie, and as he demonstrated to me, it is always done at the knot and with two cuts, one up and one down, because time is so precious. Meanwhile, the doctor inserts the stethoscope to seek a heart beat.

It is standard procedure except when you argue like a child and do not like not being agreed with ^{by} your childishness.

That is so entirely inappropriate in a man with your experience!

I don't ^{damn} give a damn if you respond or not but I do give you a challenge: give me some evidence, not some ^{damn} argner hope or dream, that anything I say above is not correct.

Shame on you! When I took that time in the present state of my health only for insults!

Handwritten signature

In this country, whatever the intent of any assassin or assassins, the effect is that of a coup d'etat. In this country, once upon a time at least, the papers would have regarded that as news and would have investigated. Would have protested when there was a ~~secret~~ chamber proceeding with what, had Oswald not been killed, would all have had to be in public. And no paper had even a question, leave alone a protest about that.

If any reporter did, I am not aware of it.

No paper made any kind of project of looking into that assassination, and no reporter has made any real effort.

I've done what under our system reporters and papers should have done and ^{they} have not done. With no subsidy and with the papers never once reviewing any of my books. Including the very first on the assassination. Once up on a time, when we had a few real newspapers, there surely would have been some interest in the first-and only- book on a topic like that.

And despite the controversial nature of it, despite the nastiness like yours, in all these years not a single one of those of whom I have written so critically has written or phoned to complain that I wrote about him unfairly or inaccurately.

When all the cowardly newspapers were kissing FBI ass I was chugging it with perjury, and not with lawyer's pleadings but putting myself under oath so I could be charged if I lied. That, of course, is so everyday not a paper believed that was worth mentioning. Nor was the FBI's reply news. It said, and the judge accepted it as a defense, that I could make such charges ad infinitum which is a quote, because I knew more about the assassination and surrounding events than anyone working for the FBI.

With all the yellowbelly newspapers boycotting fact on the subject I've been spending years making a record for our history, what reporters and scholars are supposed to do. And I do leave a record of which you are ignorant, a voluminous record that reporters like you should at the least have contributed to. And didn't.

Knowing the paper attitude and that of almost all reporters I nonetheless took all the time they wanted and I have yet to have a complaint about a single bum steer. Including from you. And all the time I take for others is time I can't use for my own work.

If you want to believe ^{that} you hear shrimps whistling from the backs of purple cows as they jump over a green-cheese moon, believe it. But that you believe it does not make it real, or true. Nor can it make what is not true about the assassination true because you want it to be true rather than what is. Sometimes I can barely cross the room yet I took that time for you only for insults. For Shame!

SGC

July 8, 1997

Dear Harold:

Thanks for your note, but I must say I found parts of it condescending and insulting. As sometimes happens, you jumped to conclusions without knowing what you were talking about. You claimed that whoever let me handle the shirt was in knowing violation of some contract. You are wrong. I made a written request of the appropriate officials and it was granted. You claim that the purpose was to sucker me. Wrong again.

You told me over the phone that I should consider the evidence. The shirt is evidence, a piece of evidence you have never seen, but you evinced no interest in what I saw. You simply started shouting that I didn't know what I was talking about. I didn't deal with my examination of the shirt in the story because it didn't belong there, not because I was afraid of being embarrassed by reporting what I saw. The hole in the shirt was not made by a surgeon's knife. It may be that it cannot be proven that it was a bullet hole. So what? That doesn't prove that it wasn't. Dr. Carrico could have been wrong. You could be wrong. You say you go by the evidence, but you don't. You accept the evidence that comports with your views, and you respond to evidence, testimonial and otherwise, that you don't like with sneers, shouts and ad hominem attacks. You cite FBI expert testimony when it suits your purpose. You denounce it when it doesn't. It sometimes seems to me that you have come to regard the Kennedy assassination as your personal sandbox. No one can get into it without your approval. You pretend to be objective about it. You are not.

Enclosed are copies of the Rankin release.

Sincerely,



P. S. I neither expect nor want a response.