

4/2/71

Dear Bob,

It is now 3 p.m., and except for taking my wife to work, whence I must soon ~~retrieve~~ retrieve her, and a hasty glance at the paper, I've done nothing but memos and letters all day. From this I hope you can understand that my response to your interesting memo of 3/31/71 need be brief.

You do not state any single purpose, so I assume you had none and were merely examining items of evidence no more directly related in your mind than any other such items.

In each case what you report is interest, and the project in itself was worthwhile if only to record what you have. From my limited knowledge of offset photography, your description of the paper is not typical of the kind used in it, which is heavier than average. Also, generally the camera builds in a screen you do not report, necessary in photoengraving. Because we know of no access Oswald had to home film processing, I can offer no explanation of the odd sizes of paper used. These are consistent with using up scraps.

Because I have never believe and never seen any reason to credit the notion that LHO shot at Walker, I've paid scant attention to this aspect. It is inherently without credibility.

I do not recall whether I ever ~~xxxxxxx~~ knew the significance of the "P" markings. One thing that comes immediately to mind is that those pictures with these numbers may be copies made for use in an interrogation, as of a person whose last name begins with "P", Paine being the most obvious.

Your assessment that some seem to be commercial prints is, I think, beyond question. Assuming this, and noting the differences in proportions, have you considered how many could have been taken with cameras that can be linked to LHO? Whether or not these are contacts or slight enlargements we may not be able to know, hence "proportions".

In the past I've spent some time on CE 5 and one you do not mention, a similar but different one in the Walker Exhibits, of a similar but different car in that approximate position. There are ways of holding and looking at this picture that makes one wonder if it is a double exposure.

With regard to the whole, if accounted for as Mike suggests, would this space be white or black? Could it be black because the entire thing was copied while mounted on a piece of black paper (where or not adhering)? In the original you saw I realize it is a hole, but I wonder why the copying was with a black, regular background. If this hole was made as Mike conjectures, it is a remarkable coincidence and not, seemingly, after having been mounted as the others seem to have been. Your assumption that P1 of CE 3 seems to have been printed from the same negative seems warranted. Could one also not assume that P1 was cut to its shape rather than printed that way? There is a similar crease between P4 and P3 in CE 4.

However, if this had been pasted to a sheet of paper no thicker than the average yellow pad, do you think that photpaper would have yielded first?

Your comment on the quality of this photo is warranted by the print they made for me, from the printed copy. It is much more the case with Walker 3 (the original of which you might want to check, for this has a strange and unlikely proportion, suggesting cropping).

133 A & B- can you buy the notion that not until 1968 did the FBI conduct a fingerprint examination of this (these) so-often handled pictures? I can't. But I do have prints made from the negatives for me before that date and I have studied them often and carefully. I also got a set for Fred Newcomb, some of whose work I agree with. I also disagree with some and have opinions he does not offer. He did his original work on these for me. The rest of what you say, with one exception is correct. There is a negative of 133 A, but it was made by the FBI from the original print. Sorry you didn't address the deformity or the illusion of deformity in the hand. And here you make no reference to blotches, although they do exist. And seem as those you describe, to be of ink.

Can you consider that the DPD original report on the jacket of the Walker bullet may be carelessness, a common-reference type of thing? While this can also be true of the calibre, it is not as likely to be.

Your inference that this is a substitute bullet need not be far out, especially with the missing marking, for that would require dirty-work by Day only, and who is there willing to declare that impossible? However, I disagree with your qualification. If there was any substitution, I'd assume it was not other than deliberate, regardless of anything else. It takes more than "characteristics", however, for this to be a conscious duplication of the alleged Oswald rifle. Calibre, for one thing. Any number of different rifles have similar characteristics, as the number and direction of grooves, etc. What Day did with fingerprints and what he refused to do can be questioned.

All very interesting.

HW