

November 3, 1967

Dear Sylvia,

I have just finished your book, which arrived yesterday, and for which I thank you most sincerely.

It is, quite simply, a tremendous achievement. The fact that I profoundly disagree with the thrust of the final paragraph re Garrison should not and does not alter my view that "Accessories" is clearly -- and by considerable margin -- the finest book yet produced. You have presented a wealth of new material, and have placed in far sharper focus much that had appeared previously.

Without in any degree diminishing the value of other sections, all of which were presented with great power and precision, to me the most impressive were Parts II and IV; and were I to be even more specific, I would single out for further particular mention "The Interrogation Sessions", and "Oswald and the State Department". Kupferman does not overstate one bit in saying your case is overwhelming.

For your information, I want to comment on a couple of matters in which I feel you are mistaken; points which I believe important, although small indeed when considered against the massive and unchallengable array of facts you put forth.

On page 59 5-8 you deal with "The Mark on the Curb". By referring to a "mark" and dealing with it as such (as distinguished from a "chip"), you employ the FBI/WC terminology -- as have all previous critical books which deal with the Tague shot. This not only obscures the fact that the "mark" was originally a chip (which was clearly the FBI/WC's intention), but, more important, it gets them off the hook of one of the most readily demonstrable and dramatic instances of fraudulently manufactured evidence. Shaneyfelt #29 clearly shows a sizeable chip, the shadow cast into the crater by the rim clearly visible. (By comparing with the hand shown in the photo, the chip's size can be estimated as approx. 1-1/2" x 3/4". Since its exact location and the approximate time of day are known, an expert could probably estimate its depth from the shadow). The Dallas News story of 12/13/63 repeatedly speaks of a "chip", not a "mark".

But the curb section (Shaneyfelt #34) finally brought to the WC in August '64 clearly does not contain the chip, but only a mark, as the FBI says (I enclose excerpt from my letter to Fred Cook, Sept '65, and other supporting material).

What happened to the chip? Unless one can stop laughing long enough to accept the FBI's "explanation" that it may have been washed away by rain or street cleaning, there are only two possible conclusions; either Shan. #34 is a different piece of curb from that depicted in Shan. #29, or the chip was patched sometime after the assassination and before its presentation to the WC, with the intention of destroying this strong evidence of a bullet strike. (After examining the section at the Archives, I believe the latter more probable). It then follows that any metal on the surface of the "mark" must have been placed there artificially sometime after the assassination, also for the purpose of obfuscation. While the latter may seem too conjectural, the two basic facts cannot be so described.

I also must take exception to your statement on pg 27 that viewing the Zapruder film and slides do not "enable the viewer to pinpoint" the moment when JFK was first hit in relation to the Connally shot. My analysis of the film convinces me to the contrary. I have long held, and so stated in my "Hypotheses Re the Zapruder Film" early in '65, that JFK was first struck -- probably in the throat -- immediately prior to 189-190.

While one may obviously differ with my conclusion, the observations on which the conclusion is based are unmistakable once studied carefully in the 4x5 slides, or even in the less clear photo-panels I made. The observed phenomena are as follows:

1. JFK's right hand, which had been raised head-high in a wave, immediately following 190 (less than $\frac{1}{2}$ second) has dropped to chin-throat position, halts there, and remains visible in that position until disappearing behind sign in 207.
2. immediately after 189, Jackie -- who by that point had turned her head from her left to a slightly right-of-center position, snapped her head all the way around to her right, and by 200 is fully facing her husband (all pertinent eyewitness testimony, including her own, corroborates the fact that she did not turn to face JFK until no less than one shot had been fired)
3. An extremely blurred break-up of the Zapruder film occurs at 190-192; in the circumstances almost certainly indicating Z's reflex reaction to the sound of the shot.

Some may argue that the convergence of these three phenomena does not prove JFK was hit then, but I don't believe it is logically sound to reject the theory without confronting the phenomena, and offering an alternate explanation for their occurrence.

(Tink Thompson does not accept that JFK was hit then, but in past phone conversations with me he has not confronted the noted phenomena, or their convergence. I'll be anxious to see if he does so in his book).

I further believe that JFK was stuck in the back at 226-227; ~~xxxxx~~ arriving at this conclusion by correlating external evidence to the sudden upward and forward thrust of his elbows and forearms, accompanied by marked hunching of shoulders.

Next, of course, came the Connally shot at 237-238, indicated unmistakably by the dramatic drop of his right shoulder between those frames.

Since both 226-227 and 237-238 represent hits to fairly solid portions of the body, I take the two reactions noted to be impact reactions, the physical motion imparted to the bodies by the impacting bullets, and therefore to have occurred immediately after the bullets struck; as distinguished from reactions to pain, which could be relatively delayed. The FBI/WC, in speaking of reactions to hits, pretends to be unaware of the distinction, as suits its obfuscating purposes.

On the other hand, assuming the 189-190 hit was indeed a throat entry, the soft tissue there encountered makes it possible that JFK's reaction immediately thereafter was a pain reaction, and that the bullet could have entered several frames earlier -- perhaps 185-186, but certainly not from the TSBD window, for the reasons you stated.

However, even here, I am much more inclined to believe that the bullet actually struck in 189-190, due to Zapruder's jerking of the camera as recorded by the previously noted blur. On the virtually ~~entire~~ certain assumption that this indeed was Z's reaction to the sound of the shot, it obviously would have been a reflex (and therefore, immediate) reaction, again indicating 189 as the instant the shot was fired. (since the knoll is quite clearly indicated as the source of this shot, as Z himself believed, we may ignore the time required for the sound to reach his ears; a factor which we would have to consider had the shot come from the buildings approximately 100 ~~yard~~ yards distant).

Well, I see I've gone on at much greater length on these points than I had intended. However, since ~~these~~ these are areas in which I've spent a good deal of time, I trust you didn't mind the verbiage too much.

I have just received "Oswald in New Orleans", and in scanning it believe it makes an important contribution towards illuminating the current New Orleans situation. However, the point you make in your Nov 1 letter to Harold regarding his identification of Shaw as Bertrand is certainly valid. It was a serious mistake on Harold's part, both in regard to Shaw's rights, and tactically as well. If and when the case comes to trial, I have little doubt the Shaw defense will cite this passage in an attempt to have charges dismissed -- as they would have every right to do.

Again, you have--from both Letha and I--our warmest congratulations on the publication of your truly outstanding book.

Love,

