11/7/69

Dear Cyril,

In one sense, I have throughout my life been untrue to the tradition from which I spring. I have never believed in an eye for an eye. However, after reading Finck's New Orleans testimony, which I completed for the second time this morning, with it completing 24 pages of single-spaced notes on it, I feel differently about him. He comes from those pages as the Nazi-scientist type, arrogant, contemptuous of truth as he is of his responsibilities, almost as though he were part of the successful conspiracy and, in his own way, is gloating.

As of now, when we get in court, I would like only one friendly witness, besides myself. You. I have spoken of this to Bud and I think he is in agreement. In due time, when things are more firm, I'll spell it out. I would much rather use the unfriendlies, daring as this is to lawyers, and inconclast. If I could do the questioning myself, I'd be entirely without question about it. The detailed knowledge it requires is beyond the capability of any lawyer, for none, incuding Bud, has been able to take or ever will be able to find the time required to learn the essential fact.

What we will sue for is not yet firm. We are still trying to get some of it, and a promised letter from the Department of Justice is about 10 weeks past its first promise and at least two after its second - unless it arrived in Bud's absence. He'll be gone until the end of next week. Meanwhile, we develop more and more, in the tender areas.

I I do not anticipate duplicting Lohn's suit at all. There are some things I anticipate we will forgo because he is after them, even though I was first. We also have a different approach, a different doctrine.

One of the grounds on which they have refused me certain materials is non-existence. I propose to prove this a false defense and my proof is both overwhelming and entirely unassailable. I wish you had time to come here, as I've been inviting you for so long, so I could show you some of it. I have more than is in POST MORTEM III on the autopsy pictures and X-rays and I am hopeful the law will be our way on it. I have not discussed this aspect with Bud. We've really had little time. He hasn't even finished going over my enormous Archives correspondence files.

If we can get this case into court, I think there are grounds for some optimism. It will make their positions intolerable for some people, and that can be good. And what a record we can make!

The local radiologist who first explained the floating character of the scapula to me, promised to get an actual-size human skull and post the panel readings and the autopsy jesting on it. He hasn't done it. I would like that very much. If you can help here, I'd very much appreciate it, to use as evidence and in a book. I could get an artist to do it, but a medical man would be so much better.

When I talk about using the unfriendlies as witnesses, I hope your imagine is unreined. One in particular I think you would like to see on the stand, the one who has been spreading nasty comments about you. One of our problems here will be paying their slight expenses, for I am still close to $40,000 in debt and still have no income...Thanks for your note and I will give your regards to Bud when I see him.

Sincerely,

CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., LL.B.
1417 FRICK BUILDING
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15219

281-9090

FORENSIC PATHOLOGY
LEGAL MEDICINE

4 November 1969

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harold:

Just a note to acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your letter and accompanying materials of 30 October 1969. I agree with your remarks concerning Finck; in fact, I compliment you on such keen perception.

I wish you success in your pending legal action. We certainly need some kind of a breakthrough before matters become more obscured by time.

Please keep in touch and let me know of any significant new developments.

Please convey my best regards to Bud.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

Cyril H. Wecht, M.D., J.D.

CHW/njs

10/30/69

Dear Cyril,

In various ways, as time and circumstances permit, I am preparing to get what we didn't get in theproceeding in Judge Halleck's court. Much of this is unknown to you because you were never able to come here and see what I have accumulated. However, soon I hope to resume writing POST MORTEM II, where I will include it, and then you will see.

Of the perjury I charge in PM III I now have even more overwhelming proof. I have new, specific and documentary proof of Finck, in two jurisdictions, Louisiana and DC.

I have begun ti study his N.O. testimony, having read it hastily. I find interesting things in it. As with the Washington WC testimony, I have difficulty believing the evidence on and testimony about the head wound can in any way be attributed to the behavior of a full-jacketed, military bullet; From what I have been able to learn, it just is not reasonable to believe that such a bullet could have wound up in so many minute fragments.

Enclosed are pages 33-9 of Finck's N.O. testimony (direct). He goes into this here. I ask that you tell me what you can on this (and any other comment you would care to offer on other aspects) and, if you have it available, xerox copies of what the standard sources say of this so that I may, if it seems desireable, include them in photocopy in the book.

I just cannot imagine a man pretending forensic-medical competence and sufficiently informed to be chief of the Army's wound-ballistics branch, saying what happened in the head could have been from a military bullet.

Finck is quite a character, a real authoritarian, European type, unless I misread his character while reading his testimony. He is so contemptuous of the mere mortals with whom he is so unpleasantly forced to associate that he feels compelled to tolerate their ignorance and spell out for them such simple words as "out". However, I have come to respect him as a real snake. He is a man of incredible evasiveness, which flags my interest and excites my curiosity. To avoid he talks of other things, which please me, for they are things about which I welcome his words. In the course of examining what he volunteered and where he suddenly pretended not to understand the question, I have a case where he pretty clearly says what was unknown, that to his knowledge the staff of the Commission did examine the pictures or X-rays. He unbagged other cats, never realizing what he was doing.

I think Bud has come around to my belief, that we use as some of our witnesses when we get into court on the suit he is filing for me (not duplicating John Nichols') the unfriendlies. I would dearly love, myself, to be able to examine the trio of doctors. And others. It is tedious to build a record, but we now have enough to out them in jail, which I regard as an impossible but desireable thing.

Thanks and best regards,

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg