1/21/71

Dear Cyril,

Many thankks for the copies of the shirt-front picture. Because their exposure is different than mine, they are helpful....I'm deep in a response to a quit belated government motion to dismiss. Bud read a copy night before last and told me yesterday it depressed him (to think of the work response requires). He said that had such a peper been served where he was the attorney, he'd recommend to his client that he abandon the litigation. I, of course, will not and will use a kind of intellectual judo with it to the end, I think, that what we seek may be advanced. Six of the 10 days permitted for response passed before I got and could read it! I've asked for 30 days. The fed atty tried to trap me into assuming I had them automatically!...The judge is liberal and hung up on Warren, which makes some problems, but has been willing to clobber the FBI in court.

With Collom's report you avoid mention of your own opinion. For my own understanding, I have a few questions. What is, as used here, a "slow moving bullet"? The conjectured 1800-2000 fps? Please ask him what his professional opinion would be with these added conditions true, as they are:

a) spectrographic ana;ysis discloses no metallic traces here on the shirt or anywhere on the tie;

b) there is no hole anywhere in the tiet , there is a slight nick, so slight it does no more than expose the tie lining, on the extreme left-hand (as worn) edge of the knot (the FBI picture was faked to giv the opposite impression, if you recall it), and there is no damage elsewhere, especially not at any point that could said to be over where these holes would overlap (and I have pictures showing the tie was straight, not in disarray).

I believe these holes were caused by a scalpel, which also nicked the tie. Then the tie was cut off (which is clear from the pictures I have). I have no doubt that the anterior neck wound was above the collar.

But aside from my belief, restricting ourselfes to just this single picture and the added fact above, is it possible for a ciminalist to reach a positive conclusion as to whether the hole was or could have been caused by a bullet from any direction?

I have more than relates that I can't go into but will show you whenever you are here. This evidence makes impossible a front exit there and is definitive on the location of the rear wound.

Collom's comment on the blood clot is one of the reasons that, with this, I also want the copies the Archives refuses me. My recollection is that much looks different in it and ther is a definite suggestion of fraying. Could Collom offer any opinion about whethe the fraying that is visible in t is shot is characteristic of a bullet's path? For your information, not to form his opinion, the hole in the back is entirely different. I have a good shot of that, which the Commission did not, ever. Just popped into my mind, if I never told you, the staff and the autopsy doctors were shown the X-rays before the doctors testified. I have odds and ends like this from an unimpeachable source. I make and want no use, for I want the source and I want to put everything together first. Andm there was no damage to the X-rays then, indicating examination after that and before panel examination. Something had to burn, remember. By the way, if I win this and they do have to take pictures for me, which will entail my presence when they are taken, would you like to be there? Collom? Would pictures of the undersides help?

Again, many thanks to you and please convey them to Collom. Gotta get back to pretending I'm a lawyer. On the fact and the law I should win this one, with what I already have and with the possibilities presented by a very dishonest federal motion.

Sincerely,

7F