

Dear Dal,

1/18/95

Yours of the 10th, with that of the eighth, here yesterday. Beautiful place where you had those few days, even if with no fish you could use.

I know nothing of what Newman got in that 210 file. He keeps it all close, a not uncommon attitude. His book is due in two months on it. He is working on one on Cuba, from what others have told me. Anna Marie ^{Rubins} ~~Kanis~~-Walko has moved to the southwest. Her husband is a career military man. When she gets settled and her files all arranged she is to send me much, including what she gave Newman of her examination of that 201 file and she tells me he has been telling others is his own work. She sent me that box of CIA records you refer to. It is a CIA Mexico summary of its communications both ways with its HQ. I doubt if at this time it is worth the trouble and cost to you. Its real importance is that they were a bunch of idiots believing what had no credibility at all and pushing for World War III through the rabid Cold War Ambassador Tom Mann, who was promoted by LBJ despite that record.

While I presume Newman used other newly-disclosed CIA records, all he mentioned to me is that 201 file.

I'll do the best I can with your questions.

On Oswald's request for Abt, there are several possibilities. perplexing because Oswald was so anti-Communist and Abt had the reputation of being one. He did as a lawyer defend some of them. I worked with him for three years at the Senate and saw no sign of his being a Communist. Oswald could have asked for him because he had read that Abt did have unpopular ~~sinister~~ clients or perhaps as a provocation. The police never told him that Abt had refused as soon as he heard of Oswald's request.

I know of no checking out of the FBI police radio broadcast transcriptions and there is no official explanation of the deficiencies of those provided by the local police and sheriff. I am inclined to believe that if there is anything missing in the FBI version it is not sinister.

If the Secret Service report in WWII that you refer to is on Klein's, I do not know of its publication elsewhere but Lane cribbed it for his second book.

I've often wondered about that Kelley-Oswald conversation. LHO may have perceived a difference from the questions asked. I think Oswald was as little worried as he seemed to be because he did not expect to be killed and knew he could prove he had done no shooting.

Brennan's word can't be taken on ~~any~~ anything. He may have been photographed talking to a policeman in plain clothes. *On a reporter,*

No idea what happened to the bullet that smashed Connally's wrist. But remember, the limo was washed at Portland.

Do not now recall re Zapruder and Frame 255. Could have been delayed reaction to what he saw earlier or recognition of what it all meant.

On the man in the doorway in Altgens, the description of the shirt Lovelady wore that day, note at end of Photo WW index, by his wife, not a usual pattern, is on a man in that doorway a short time after the assassination and the man looks like Lovelady, Overexposed section of a John Martin standard 8mm reel. So I do think it was not Lovelady and was Oswald. Who had to have been down there somewhere from other evidence and who could not have been on the sixth floor and gotten to the second before Truly and Baker.

Barrett was wrong on that 24 fps and my photo shop confirmed him. Until I got a duplicate of the Z camera, when I knew they were wrong. Down the ^abasement. I think it was about 48 fps. Slide control so it could go from normal to either rapid or slow by a simple nervous reaction.

I do not know the date that aerial photo was taken. It was after the assassination and before the end of 1966, when I was given that print.

I know nothing further on the trimming of the background material and the paving of Elm St. that I used then.

The Doorman photo received by the FBI is the one showing the limo at the time of the assassination and some of ~~the~~ the Grassy Knoll background. That one is not missing. Gary Mack has been using it and two commercial prints of it, one mine, in efforts at enhancement. She gave a ^{different} print to a cop who was her boyfriend. He was in it.

I do not know why Curry had the phone off the hook but it could have been so he and his wife could get some rest. If the police had really wanted to tell him about the call as he knew in general it would do if it thought that necessary would have been to send someone to his home.

I've forgotten the precise Z frame represented by that Altgens picture but if it is not 255 it is close, like 253. I know the location of the road stripes was different and that I was wrong, there was an invisible earlier stripe that the Altgens picture does not show.

I suppose that LHO was asked what he did after leaving his rooming house but I have no clear recollection of that now.

On the use of the Z film for noncommercial, scholarly purposes I did establish copyright law on that in CA 65-1996, with regard to other pictures. The copyright does not make it possible not to make them available for scholarship. The issue there was pictures of the King assassination to which ~~MLP~~ bought the rights. The FBI denied me prints as copyrighted. After the appeal it gave me those prints. The ^NJim Lesar sued the Zapruder estate for Chip Selby and me, he for the right to use the film in a documentary that was his master's thesis and I for copies of the individual frames. Zapruder agreed to my having copies and then Groden, who had promised to copy them for me, backed out and I could not afford the Archives's charges. The law is that they cannot be published by others without the owner's assent but that the own cannot deny access for study of

2
John
the, so there is no barrier at all to your getting a print without payment of the outrageous commercial fees- as long as you do not publish them, use them for scholarship only. If you TV people want to ask "ear, his address is 918F St., NW, #509, Washington, DC 20004. There thus would be no reason you could not show any print in a classroom but you could be sued if you showed it on TV. I think that perhaps Donna "hisholm may be aware of this, that it may be a pretty universally recognized principle. It is the law here and I think that would be the controlling law. I reprinted some from the 26 and also used them on TV without any complaint and Zapruder lost the suit against Thompson for using sketches made from the original frames. I've given Hood all the prints I had, I think four, but I doubt they are in a position to duplicate them.

But there is ABSOLUTELY no prohibition on the use for scholarship. The prohibition applies to commercial uses only. Otherwise copyright~~xx~~ could be used to suppress our history, as the courts here did recognize when we argued that.

As you'll see from the enclosed page of the C & G catalogue NEVER AGAIN IS is not due in April. I've been assured it will have a professional index and pictures. Delay in copy reading but I should have that to go over in a week or so. The "ast Hurrah has been getting many calls, letters and even visits about it. I think they'll have copies before I do if you want it fast. I'm willing to send you one when I get it but getting it from them, with Case Open as in point, may be 2-4 weeks faster. Let me know so I'll know what to do

I heard from Craig and responded, thanks.

We return your good wishes, with hope, and thanks,

Harold