

Auckland, 14/01/95

Dear Harold

Another letter from me! Two days ago I had a visit from an Auckland lawyer, John Shaw, who had asked me if we could meet to give suggestions on how I could design my course. (Don Craig gave John my name and phone number.) John Shaw flew down to Christchurch in 1993 to attend the course Don Craig ran at the University of Canterbury, and he has kept up a correspondence with Don since the course.

I will give you more background to my meeting with John Shaw in my next letter. In the meantime I need a little (!) help from you on a couple of issues that John Shaw raised that I was not well informed on.

-The Texas Theatre- What exactly were the circumstances that led to such a **heavy** police presence in the wake of the phone call from Brewer? It does seem an incredible level of response given the nature of the information supplied by Brewer, somebody acting suspiciously and entering a theatre without paying. And what of the presence of Assistant DA Alexander, is this significant? Was there any evidence that Oswald may not have been the person seen furtively entering the theatre? I am familiar with the details of the arrest, as given in your books, but I know nothing much beyond this basic factual information. Is there any additional significance, in such as the level of police response (heavy) and the appearance of Alexander at the Texas Theatre?

-The police radio log- was there an eight minute period just after the assassination when one channel was blocked by a policeman's microphone left switched on for sending (broadcast)? *Significance??*

-Was the original of the Zapruder film in the custody of the CIA for a time shortly after the assassination, specifically in the hands of the CIA's own photographic laboratory? If this was so, would it compromise the validity of what the Zapruder films shows?

These questions came up in John Shaw's interest in the respectability or otherwise of the evidence. In these three instances, my knowledge of the first was limited to what I have read in your books, and I had no knowledge at all of the second two topics. Obviously they must have featured though in some of the books John Shaw has read.

You may think from this short mention that John Shaw subscribes to some speculation and theory, in fact the opposite is true. He is very sceptical of the conclusions reached in nearly all the books he has read.

Well, this is only a very short letter, but I felt I needed to write it now because these three questions are drifting around on the top of my mind.

Bye for now. I look forward to hearing from you soon. My own efforts at writing are still bogged down at the level of drafting an overall outline. I am putting a few bits and pieces of text together but not in a way that it hangs together. I realise now I may not get down to really putting it all together until next month when I meet with some teachers from the Auckland History Teachers' Association.

*Love and best wishes to you and Lillian,*

*Paul*

Auckland, 23/01/95

Dear Harold

I am struggling on, more slowly than I would like, but still getting a few bits and pieces together. It is a rather awesome task this, the most important thing I have written I think. Maybe I am being overly careful, but I am still learning myself and now that I am to teach it I am learning it again but in more depth. What I write has to be just right, I mean both accurate and effective (or meaningful).

You will not be surprised to read now I have a couple of quick questions to put to you. I think the answers may be in your books (most likely POST MORTEM) but I cannot find them easily tonight.

① Was there evidence to indicate Humes knew the tracheotomy incision covered another bullet wound on or during the night of the autopsy? (There were several persons present at the autopsy who had been in Dallas, and at Parkland, surely somebody must have known enough to say something to Humes?)

② Did Humes ever say he had destroyed papers (?) because they were stained with Kennedy's bodily fluids? I KNOW (thanks to you) that he certainly did not say any such thing in testimony before the Commission. But what of his testimony before the House Select Committee? Or in any other medium where he could be quoted confidently? The Auckland corporate lawyer who wants to take my course, John Shaw, quizzed me on this point last week. I could only say I knew nothing of where this reported comment by Humes could have come from, but the record showed he handed over all of his notes along with his autopsy report and that he later testified to their existence when he was taken through his testimony before the Commission by Arlen Specter.

This is as you can see a very rushed and quick letter. I suppose you think it is about time I wrote you a short and succinct to the point letter!

Bye for now. I look forward to hearing from you again soon.

my love and best wishes

Paul

ps. What I wonder did Humes tell Perry about the autopsy results when he phoned him in Dallas on Saturday morning. He must have said something?