



Haverford College

HAVERFORD, PA. 19041 215-649-9600

June 3

Professor Richard Bernabei  
Department of Classics  
Queen's University  
Kingston, Ontario


Dear Mr. Bernabei,

I don't really feel much compulsion to "satisfy" you about anything. I have tried to be civil to you in the face of communications that have become increasingly offensive. I told you earlier that my examination of the cases in January 1967 was not made under the most tranquil circumstances, for, as I pointed out, my responsibility at the time was overseeing the photographing of all the relevant physical evidence for Life. I looked at CE 577 to verify the presence of absence of the chambering marks; I think it unlikely that I would have missed the dented tip, but it's possible. I have reviewed my notes and find no mention of the dented tip in those notes, nor is such a dent visible in the photo of CE 577 printed in the Volumes. What I take to be an oversight you can interpret as some desperate dishonesty, and even see it (as you point out in your letter) as part of a complicated plot to undermine your own research when it appears at some future time. This all strikes me as rather silly but I have no control over your fantasy life or over your judgments on others.

In a way I regret the fact that your offensive tone precludes a continuing discussion. You have persuaded me that one of the cases marked 577 has a dented tip, and I am grateful for the information. For your part I am surprised that you haven't realized that Nicol's remark at 3H506 remains quite beside the point given Lt. Day's testimony at 4H253 telling how he put all three cases unmarked into an envelope shortly after they were found on the 6th Floor of the TSBD. Day's action made it logically impossible for anyone in the future to even guess which case was the "lone" one. Likewise, you do not seem to be aware of Day's statement at 4H255 that CE 543 "is the hull that was retained by homicide division when the other two were originally sent in with the gun." It would be interesting to discuss at some

time the significance of Day's subsequent recantation under Commission prodding. Likewise, with respect to the explanation of the chambering marks and their absence on CE 543, you leave around a number of promissary notes, but never (as far as I can see) give a consistent account of what caused the chambering marks, or why they are absent on CE 543. It would be interesting to pursue some of these points; I regret that the tone and attitude of your last letter makes such a discussion an unwelcome prospect.

Sincerely,

  
Josiah Thompson