Dear Fred, (Newscan)

After calling you the other night to add the information about Stovall and the "miscellaneous photographs", I found myself wondering how it was that all of the critics seemed to have overlooked material of this high significance in their original study of the 26 volumes. My sense of uneasiness sent me the next night to examine the books and articles in my collection and in the very first book I picked up, Harold's Whitewash I, I discovered to my mortification that both the absence of the CEs 133 A and B from the inventories in UE 2003 and the Stovall testimony were discussed therein (to locate, check "Stovall" in the index of Whitewash).

I did read <u>Whitewash</u> very carefully, in manuscript as well as in its published form, so that I can only conclude that either I did not register these extremely important facts or that I subsequently suffered a total specific ammesia. My "holy mackerel" are therefore suffering from age and decomposition and should be credited to Harold (I have already informed him of my lapse of memory with appropriate and sincere breastbeating).

Turning now to your letter of the 9th: Yes, we are still imable to pinpoint the origins of CE 2788. If it was taken specifically for a view application, presumably at a passport photo place, would not the name of the establishment be present somewhere on the print? I have had many passport photos made but not for the last six years, so that I don't really know if that is necessarily the case. Anyhow, the Warren Commission must have had some reason for telling the FBI that there was evidence that CE 2788 was made in Mexico City on a particular day, on one of two dates, even if the ultimate version in the NR was that CE 2788 was "probably" made before INO left for Mexico. As for the photo of Oswald in Martelle's INO file (XXIXI 740), it might have been CE 2788 or it might have been the different passport photo which appears in INO's 1963 passport (I don't have the citation at hand, as I am writing this at my office, sans reference materials).

About the question of the hour of CE 133 A and B as deduced from the angle and direction of the shadows, I raised this possibility in a much narrower context than you may have thought from my sketchy and perhaps misleading exposition. What I had in mind was solely a further means of disproving the allegations made by the WC about these photos. They are accepting Marina's story that she took the pictures on a particular date. The hour was never really elicited. But if we can fix the hour even approximately—as, let us say, between 2:30 and 3:30 p.m. on the last Sunday in March 1963—and if the hour-by-hour log of the weather bureau indicates overcast or rain for the hour or hours in question, then we would have a further disproof of Marina's story as legitimized by the WC.

I don't know if the clarification above really does clarify my intent; but it's such a long-shot that it doesn't deserve more of your time, so don't give it another thought.

The photo in the Curry book on page 113 must be an official DPD photo. Maybe they would supply a large glossy of it? Probably not, but no harm in asking. Perhaps Mrs. Ferrell would have a suggestion? I wrote a deliberately innocuous letter to Curry when I first read his book, in the hope of starting a correspondence in which I could in due time turn to more material questions, but he never replied and as dumb as he is I suppose he is

smart enough not to engage in any dialogues with any critics.

You were very kind to type out that long section from CD 1408 and I am sorry that you took so much trouble, because I do have that CD and related CDs having to do with the leak of the historic diary and other WC documents in the Dallas Morning News. Those documents, in fact, sent me searching for a reference to the diary on the lists of property. At first I could not find any trace but after replying to your earlier letter re GE 2788 and while serutinizing the CE 2003 lists for CE 133 A and B, I did stumble over an item that does correspond to the diary, as I indicated in the corrected copy of my 6/6/70 letter.

My interest in Chiefs Lumpkin and Fisher was rather late is awakening and it was only within recent months, upon reading or re-reading the fascinating "Stevenson Exhibit" in XXI, the memo describing the activities before and on 11/22/63 of Fisher, Lumpkin and Stevenson, that I realized that I had neglected this trie. What struck me with the greatest force—for what it is worth—is the account of Pisher in the pilot car, proceeding from Love Field to the Trade Mart, and his singular stop to shat with the traffic officer at Houston and Elm.

An afterthought on the historic diary—the fact that its discovery is, after all, recorded on a property list dated 11/26/83 countersigned by FBI Warren de Brueys suggests its documentary legitimacy (in the sense that it was actually discovered among Oswald's property). But that still does not explain why Frits did not read the diary until the screening of the Recordak print in (I think) July 1964.

Before closing this letter, I must thank you most warmly, Fred, for the copy of the brief in the suit against the LA FD in re RFE/Sirhan. What a very interesting document! I shall keep my eyes open for further developments in this suit, which has somehow MOT been mentioned in the press here, even though Skolnick's "Chicago conspiracy" suit got rather prominent coverage. What you ask about policing the police, and investigating the investigators, is particularly poignant in the wake of the murders of Fred Hampton, the Kent State victims, and Jackson victims, and some of the bombings and other acts of violence attributed to radical students but which may have been instigated or even carried out by police infiltrators and spies. I have long felt that the country's failure to insist that the WR be junked and the real truth about Dallas be dug out of the mire and mase has conferred a license on those who engineered all these events, including the unpoliced police and the uninvestigated investigators.

All the best,