

Dear Peter

8/16/93

As I wrote Saturday the local photo lab forgot to make a b & w photo of the electrostatic copy of the picture of the curbstone the FBI in Dallas had when it knew that there had been a impact on a curbstone in Dealey Plaza the time of the assassination. It was ^{also} on the police radio broadcasts and the FBI transcribed them for the Commission.

I then also told you that on the chance of making out an ever stronger case of the FBI deliberately making terrible, bad pictures to hide or obscure evidence I was going to have a print made of an FBI photo of the President's ~~last~~ ~~the~~ tie. It is of the supposed color print of this that I made the xerox you have of the full tie. It cannot avoid showing that the tie was cut off, of course. The lab told me this morning that the color is no good so I'm having a black and white made of it. *All enclosed marked "A"*

Because I did not make the arrangements in advance, as I did for last Friday, the work could not be done while I waited. I'll get it either tomorrow or the next day.

I can't write captions until I know how much space there will be.

Thinking of this while driving to and from the lab this morning and remembering what I did not use in the text that can be exciting I wondered if it would be appropriate for ^{the text of for} a note of notes because in some respects it is rather unusual. I told the FBI's photographic expert off as few FBI agents are ever told off. He had pulled a very dirty trick when we deposed him and then added additional insult with a fraudulent claim for fees as an "expert witness," which he was not. That phony claim was made by three of the lab agents ~~we~~ ~~deposed~~, as part of their effort to throw the questioning off and as just plain dirtiness. That kind of thing also made them loved more by the FBI.

After I filed that FOIA lawsuit, C.A. 75-2264, three of the lab agents involved in the JFK case and the lawsuit retired. The FBI then claimed that they could not be deposed because they were no longer FBI employees. They know that to be a false and irrelevant claim. But it required that I appeal and that meant an extra trip to the federal court of appeals. That meant wasting much time and effort and ~~an~~ increasing costs for us and successful stonewalling for them.

The photo expert, Lyndal Shaneyfelt, is the only one who sent me a bill for the expert testimony not asked of him and that he did not give. It was in response to that that I really gave him hell. I told him he did not have the balls to sue me but if he did I'd waive the statute of limitations.

He is also the one who went through the charade of having what he knew had to be a phony scientific test (spectrographic analysis) of the curbstone he knew had been patched.

A Dallas FBI agent covered his own ass on that with the synopsis he wrote for a lengthy collection of reports he sent to Washington by saying that there had been a mark on that curbstone but that when Shaneyfelt had it dug up to carry it to Washington for analysis

no evidence of it ^was then visible.

in print and quite visible

note / use in caption

I have an Archives photo of the curbstones it exists there, which is to say as it existed ^{when} ~~that~~ Shaneyfelt had it dug up. That the patch is obvious is still clear in this photo but not to the degree it is when looking at it and feeling it. The texture is much finer because the usual coarse aggregates could not be used to fill such a small hole with concrete. And it is darker. I've taped a piece of paper with an aperture to indicate ~~what~~ where that is ~~is~~ on the print.

I was thinking, too, when driving this morning that this book should have some value to defense lawyers because of what it discloses about the FBI, its lab agents who testify in particular.

In plain English, ~~it~~ not only says they fake evidence. it also shows how they do it, particularly with pictures.

On the picture of the entire tie that is on what seems to be off-white paper I now do not recall but I believe I got it from the FBI because the Archives usually made its own notations on the back. But it could have been Archives. However, the photo itself was by the FBI. The rectangle in the lower left corner has the FBI Lab's identification for its own purposes, not the Commission's, "C31." It also has the Commission's exhibit number, 395. Thus, whether I got the print from it or not, it is an FBI photograph,

The square 7x9 print of Tom Dillard's pen pointing at the hole in the curbstone is a print Dillard made for me of ~~that~~ one of the series of shots he took with his reflex camera. That gave him a bigger negative so he used it instead of his 35mm. I have written "Dillard" on the back. But not as the Archives did on its curbstone picture, where there is photographic information on the other side. I do not think that the imprint will be visible when used. But it is there and perhaps there should be a note for the offset photographer.

7 note

Until I see them I do not know whether the print is clearer than the electrostatic copy of what the Dallas Morning News used. You have a xerox of it, made for me by Dillard in the paper's morgue, ^{Morgue of DMN} or Library. Either way on being copied for use permit the screen used in the original newspaper use to be visible. The offset camera, which provides that screen essential in printing the picture, ^{can} ~~to~~ also remove it. I have done that often and it is no problem at all.

On the claimed expert-witness fees, I should have told you that all the costs as interpreted by the court that the witness has, ~~must~~ be paid in advance and Shaneyfelt's bill lists and subtracts them.

Best, Harold