

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701::391/473-8186
1/6/88

Dr. Cyril H. Recht
Director, Institute of Forensic Sciences
Duquesne School of Law
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dear Dr. Recht,

Need I tell you how gratifying to a layman and a writer it is to find, on reading your contribution to Thompson's book, that an expert with your reputation is so totally in accord with what I first published on this subject? Or to learn that law and science are so much in accord with ordinary common sense.

However, there are hazards and pitfalls I think it possible you have not yet detected in pursuing this further. If I can communicate with you on the basis of confidence, there are unpublished things I have and others that I have established that bear on this.

My fifth book, which is really part five of a single large one, has been written for several months. I haven't published it simply because I fear the added debt. It is entitled POST MORTEM: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY AUTOPSY. I think you will find that what I have discovered moves this aspect of the study of the assassination and its investigation far forward. I have with it a considerable burden of relative data not directly part of the autopsy.

The problem I face and have faced is that where I have given other people what I have learned on the basis of confidence, trying to help them in their own researches, which I want very much to do, they also trust others who, it turns out, are unworthy of trust. So I find that I am not only denied the property right to my material but what I regret even more, it is misused by those who really do not understand it. With one now well-known document that I turned up in the Spring of 1986 I think you will understand this on reading POST MORTEM.

After I wrote POST MORTEM, some new material came to hand. I have written and will revise a postscript. Aside from this and the tightening of the rather large appendix, the book is done.

If you are ever in the Washington area (I am but a little more than an hour from it), or if I ever make a TV appearance in Pittsburgh (I've never been asked to), perhaps we can get together and talk about this.

Particularly if you are prepared to go farther and do things do I think this would be fruitful. I long ago laid the basis for certain activities that I think can and will be very productive. They are beyond my capacity, alone.

If you are now shocked at what you know about the autopsy, may I suggest that you will be more so when you know what I now know.

And may I add a few comments on your writing: Humes did not burn his autopsy notes. And well before the book was sent to the printer, he left the service. He returned to civilian life as soon as the CBS show was aired.

I would also like to add a caution on which I will expand if you will not discuss it with anyone else: do not, right now, publicly demand the production of the pictures and X-rays of the autopsy. By all means, continue to point out all the flaws in the autopsy, emphasize, if you want, as I have all along, the utter impropriety of their being suppressed. Demanding their production today may be a booby-trap we are building for ourselves. It is for this reason I have not demanded their production since the day they were returned. I have a considerable amount of original and unpublished material bearing on this. As I promised above, you can have access to all of it if you share it with no one.

Right now I wish it were possible for me to either publish the book immediately or, failing that, to Xerox copies of it. I have only an incomplete and unrevised copy of the rough (or I should say "rough rough") draft and one extra copy of the retyped rough draft. Unfortunately, I have had to publish only rough drafts, as I think you can understand from the volume of my work. I need this extra copy for my own work.

The manuscript is about 150 single-spaced, legal-size pages. This is not a short book. The appendix is perhaps 200 additional pages.

May I also suggest that separating the autopsy study from the really great volume of other evidence today presents other hazards: There is also a hazard in depending upon a good knowledge of the published material in the 26 volumes alone, for that is entirely inadequate for this purpose. Those with a good knowledge of the 26 volumes still do not know enough. I think it unlikely that even you realize the magnitude of the dishonesty involved in the investigation of the murder. I think it not unlikely that criminal acts are involved, whether or not there is ever any prosecution.

Much of this may seem cryptic, perhaps paranoid to you. Therefore, for your purposes and understanding alone and not for any dissemination, I tell you these following things:

There has been much plagiarism of my work. I have been silent about it only because I do not want to increase the already too-great tragedies that have followed that of the assassination. These are so flagrant they include the faithful reproduction of my typographical errors and in a case with which you are familiar but did not recognize it, the reproduction of a factual error that is quite logical but nonetheless an error of fact.

It is I who turned up the Sibert-O'Neill report, turning it over to a very fine, honest and intelligent young researcher on the basis of confidence. He either did not understand what this meant, forgot about it, or trusted others. In any event, it next appeared in the paperback edition of "Inquest", the original press run of which was by it and what relates (that I also discovered and was passed on the same way) increased four fold. It appeared also in Hopkin's book. Remarkably enough, neither author understood that it is destructive of the rest of his book. Neither, today, really understands what this report really says. You personally have seen the reproduction of an additional relevant document that was not understood by the author of that book.

Thompson's book is a work of singular unoriginality and inaccuracy. Your association with it is of a different character, but the essence of the book is wrong. I cannot conceive of Thompson not knowing it. No one can doubt that there was more than one assassin, probably not fewer than three. But his own reconstruction is entirely indefensible and is based upon deliberate error of which he

had to know. It is also an inventory of literary thieveries presented under the disguise of dispassionate, calm "scholarship". I spare you further detail and specification, for I have no desire to embarrass you. As you can see, I have been silent about this. However, if establishing the inaccuracy would be helpful to you in your understanding of what happened, I'm willing to do it for you. I have now read all of the book except the CBS commentary.

To now I have published four books. I enclose a list, for they may not all be available in your area. The third is almost nowhere on sale.

Several months ago I discussed my suggestion that we now not demand production of the pictures and X-rays as we have been with Congressman Kupperman. He, understanding what he now does, is in accord. I presume you will have noticed he has gone no further. I also took him to the Archives and showed him the Zapruder film in a way he had not seen it at LIFE. He saw what he could not at LIFE. The slides there are the same generation as the LIFE prints, and you can do with the slides what you cannot do with prints. You may want to do this sometime. Going backward is particularly valuable. Sylvia Meagher's suggestion about this at LIFE came from me. It is I who got the Archives to permit me to bring an 8mm projector in and view the copy of the copy rather than the copy of the copy of the copy in 16mm that they usually show. Showing the slides backward, to me, is very revealing. With them you can also switch from frame to frame, in motion.

Although Thompson says that in the published frames, none except 207-11 are missing, I suggest you decide for yourself whether any Frame 284 is printed. And if you examine slides at the Archives, some are still misnumbered. Almost a year after I established what is obvious, the misnumbering of 317, it was still so erroneously designated. And in considering whether or not the destruction of the missing frames in the original has significance, I suggest you wonder whether it is what they do not show that is important, not what they do show.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg