

Florida
8 April 68

Hartmann
Meagher
Weisberg
Jones


Dear People,

Enclosed is a handful of random notes. If only one note in twenty might be useful, that would be enough reason to read thru it all. Hope you will.

There is no proprietary interest in this unless I'm accidentally plagiarizing someone else.

Any items considered interesting must, of course, be checked before use. Nothing is guaranteed.

Regards,



Steffen Sorenson

The consequence of this situation is that all the various 26ers everywhere with just one or two others somewhere form little groups of ~~#####~~ two or three who swap notes & commiserate with one another. And as everything remains within the small groups, for the most part, this is tantamount to flushing the effort down the nearest what-all. But then that is the state of things...

As I am not requesting a reply of you this time (but please file the letter as some do go astray), let me continue with some examples. Mrs H & I have been corresponding back & forth for several months re the 26. Every time each of us seems to have found some new distraction or clue or something, we wonder if it is indeed "new". Picking back thru a tall stack of recent letters between us, here are a few random samples:

Many questions can be asked about the page numbering of CE 2003. If this is indeed "all pages" of ~~##~~ CD 8lb, then CD 8lb is missing the following pages:

70	107	173-176
71	159	255
72	160	378
104		

Judging by Bledsoe, CE 1985, dated 24 Nov, there ought never have been any question about her owing Lee 2 days rent; she didn't. But the charge was made later, presumably toward some end or another.

Hill B seems like it must have been taken with the photographer's flash mounted on the end of a fishing pole. The photo was, after all, supposed to have been taken within the theatre. Or was it taken under the marquee, just as Lee was being brought out? In the latter case, judging by Lee's lack of wanting to go along quietly, it might seem that some of the reported 150-200 spectators might have had a story to tell. Not living in Dallas, I never did hear any such stories.

Sen Ford (or was it Cooper?)(missing note) on April 22nd, during a testimony, was under the impression that Tippit was riding a motorcycle. Can you beat that?

As a 6.5 mm shell is 11 or 12 percent smaller in diameter than either a 7.5 or a .30-.30, and inasmuch as the shells were photographed a number of times while lying on the floorboarding... and the flooring is still there, preserved under a new layer of plywood... well? Here is something either a pro-Commission type or and anti-Commission type might make use of. So far neither has, as far as I know. But then this would be a useless thing unless it were agreed by all that the various CD photos of the shells on the floor were taken when they were said to have been taken. But the lack of expertise in everything else makes it possible to believe that the printed photos of shells-on-floor could have slipped into print accidentally.

CE 361. Nobody talks about it. Yet Belin (who said nothing else during that testimony except for this:) got out of his chair & made a point of declaring for the record just who provided that one particular exhibit, even giving the names of the persons involved. Not ~~##~~ thing like it ever happened before or after. And CE 361 is that very confusing map, the upside down one, the one which must have been a very annoying thing for the draftsman who had to prepare it. He must have had to turn his original map upside down one or more dozen times while preparing this special copy. South up & north down, my neck, to say nothing about east & west.

Some Sen on items of evidence

Which leads to Worrell, one of those to whom the confusing map was submitted. In spite of the confusion, Worrell apparently did have a sense of direction & was not flabberghasted by the exhibit. What is wrong with Worrell's testimony is that the dotted lines he was dotting out (which were also referred to in the testimony as dotted lines after he had finished dotting on CE 361)... his dots just don't show up in the exhibit. Worrell's man, the one who came flying out of the back door, this man wasn't running north; he was running south. The line to the north parking lot is another thing, whatever it is.

Also, does the man going south coincide with the man seen (from the top of the PO bldg?) going south on Houston, East on Commerce, picking up a car or stn wagon & driving over to Houston, up to Elm & then West? And did it stop where Craig saw a stn wagon stop for a passenger?

Ruby. His note, "Brother Bear - HAL-1026" HAL-1026, my neck. 22/498. The odds against a 4 figure number falling against some other 4 figure number are 8.1 million to one, if I'm figuring it right. And unless I've lost my last marble, no W/C critic anywhere has made a point of mention this one, despite the marvelous coincidence.

And "Brother Bear" leads to another: Hebert/Abear. This thing just wasn't introduced right. Or if it is true that a 9th grade student anywhere filling in a questionnaire will have it remain on permant file for posterity, maybe that in itself is a pretty interesting revelation.

The Minox light meter, 22/196a. Minoxes, by Oswald's time, contained their built-in exposure meters. But if a separate light meter popped up somewhere, it did not pop up on any of the various inventories. At least not the ones which have been revealed to us in the 26. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the question was put to Marina as late as 18 Feb. Today we are told (Weisberg, WLCY) that the Minox was Paine property.

Cameras. The only two that were inventoried (to us) were the Minox & the Stereo Realist - both of them being rather unusual & special purpose cameras. What was that reference, somewhere, to a drawer-ful of camera equipment? The Minox & the Realist together you could conceal within a baby's hat.

My copy of 22/820 shows Lee with a moustache & beard, even if light, no matter how I look at the photo.

(Sorry about this, but on page 271, ACCESSORIES, you leave out# the white jacket from the radio log. And then on p272 you leave out the white shirt. But don't worry: if you never got blurry-eyed in the 26 you wouldn't be a humming bean.)

The "Z" on Worrell's CE 361 can't be Worrell's "Z". It is 200 ft north of where Worrell would have wanted his Z, according to his words in the testimony. Also Worrell's man ran "along the side" of the TSBD. The Z should be where Worrell first saw the man - coming out the back door. The back door does not lie a half block to the north, on top of a railroad track.

Oswald's ring, or rings, and Sims, and the dresser, etc. It it all confusing. But anyway, in CE 749 Lee is wearing a ring on his third finger, right hand. In Destiny in Dallas, pll, a ring is on 3rd finger left hand. They do not appear to be the same ring, unless one ring is turned around backwards. The ring on the dresser is interesting no matter how you read it, or whether you believe it.

The citizen "breaking in" on the dispatcher from 78's radio. Unless DPD chan 1 was specifically arranged to accomodate such an advantage, it could not have happened. And this advantage, had it been a special design advantage of the DPD radio, could not have been employed except at the expense of better advantages. 99.99% of two-way radiotelephone systems would not, by design, allow for the ability of the citizen having "cut in". But then the radio logs in the 26 are a bunch of malarky anyway, I think.

Lee marks down "C" for race on his 17/159 driver's license application - & also on his application for employment at TSBD. Now he didn't really mean C for Caucasian, did he? Mrs H attributes it to possibly a very certain kind of smug, wry, personal "humor" - if I'm not misreading her. As of now I'm thoroughly agreeing with this. It's easier to believe that Lee was something more than an extraordinary dumbell or something.

Lee's vaccination certificate. The rubber stamping of his own name on it. And the rubber stamped birth date. Crazy. And did # anybody ever notice that when you read the Authentification Seal backwards it reads BRUSH IN CAN?

Certain CE photo exhibits might have built within themselves what it would take to thwart amameur experts with dividers. In fact many surely do have, whether by accident or design, the thwarting coming out the same in any case. A favor#ite seems to be in the simple stretching of a print in one direction or another, leaving the right-angle plane unstretched. It allows you to arrive at less, because W/C protect-ors can always at least call attention to one stretch & then say, quite correctly, that the same question then has to be introduced into all claims.

Photos. See CE 753, right. This picture, showing the back border outline of the mask within the camera, this picture could not have been produced except by a two-step process. You can't dodge any one negative under an ## enlarger & have it come out this way. If you can, tell me how. Wasnit the point of it all to preserve & exhibit the sharp border? Even if this photo were provided for the sake of con-vincing the reader of some true & actually honest, real-to-gosh fact - I would still insist on having the evidence prepresented to me in straight fashion. Truth is one thing that can always be presented straight, without having to employ devices of one sort or anotyer.

Photos. Another? CEs 751,2. The blackened portion of the negative is perfect-ly square. You'd think it was a 2 1/4 X 2 1/4, pure & simple. But it came out of the camera which measures to be & authenticated to be a non-square format camera. But of course we are faced with this stretching bit & therefore cant' put up very much of an argument.

In the same vein of complaint, ##### Shaneyfelf 23 would be another example. If it were the same rifle & scope as represented then the rifle wouldn't be 4.8 times the scope length. Here is one photo where nobody can give you an argument about photographic perspective. No splitting of hairs is necessary. Maybe the fact of it not being the same rifle is not important to the case. But I do nevertheless damn well resent any such attitude as "Well, they won't know the difference anyway, so what the hell...". This is an attitude which seems to have prevailed in the assembling of the 26. Has success in deception become so commonplace that the forthcoming success is taken for granted, there being really no need to try very hard to pull it off?

"Hey, George, Hello? Say, make up & send down some photos for us to prove thus & such, willya? No, don't strain over it. But send down a selection so we'll have something to pick from. What? The rifle? Well, I dunno, but it was a yard or two long & had some kinda telescope on top of it. Don't you know? Etc..."

In Sawyer B (represented as Sawyer A), p ### 394,5, after the Citizen calls in the dispatcher calls Tippit three times. In the second (CE 705) version he calls him one time. And in the third (CE 1974 rendition) he calls him two times.

There appear to have been not fewer than 41 police & sheriff cars, including motorcycles, in the Greater Oak Cliff area at the time of Lees arrest, manned by not less than 57 police type people of all various sorts. Of the vehicles, not fewer than 26 of them were present at the theatre (or as close as they could get to it, considering their number) by # 1:52 pm, bringing with them not fewer than 40 men. These are "preliminary" figures for the vehicles, which surely must have numbered more. In these figures, 28 vehicles were presumed to have contained only the driver, nothing to the contrary having been found.

C F Bentley, Jr, 24/233. Only reference to him anywhere is by DPD detective Paul Bentley, the polygraph operator who bumped into him in the theatre balcony that day. Unfortunate that so few depositions were taken from those present in the theatre, C F Bentley, ## Jr, et al. And not only don't we have any information from 80% of the civilian audience in the theatre at the time, but it seems that the list of names & addresses of these people got misfiled someplace, or something, after the pains that were taken to gather up the witnesses inside the doors. Too bad, ain't it? Fritz must have rolled over in bed worrying about the missing list of witnesses.

Depositions from newsmen# who were carried out to Oak Cliff by police & sheriff cars (four that I've counted) aren't in the 26 - I don't think.

Why did reporter Scholkoef get out of the squad car at Zangs & Jefferson when the car was enroute to the theatre? Maybe it was only a traffic problem, & he just got out & walked toward the theatre. But is that where he went? I dunno.

The Commission, or some of the ##### staff, were obviously in knowledge of the Scrambled Sawyers. Vol 6 is full of hintful evidence that they were, based on question which would have been utterly stupid except in the context of wanting to establish for the record that the Sawyer exhibits existed, then, in some certain intersprinkled page sequence. This is an interesting example, typical of how so

much of the Testimony can be lost if the Questions, too, aren't considered.

Brewer, Postal, the Texas Theatre, not a bit of makes sense or adds up. It is just too much, and it is already pretty well, very well concentrated into vol 7 X. Brewer's police car, the one Lee was seemingly trying to escape, could not possibly have been in view of Brewer. Belin, without revealing, as usual, the intent of his questions - Belin established quite well that Brewer could not logically have described the maneuvers of a police car which made a U-turn a couple of blocks down the # street, not ever having come within his view at any time. And then Postal describes Lee as whizzing around the corner so fast that (by her own testimony) his shirt tail was flapping in his own breeze - while at the same time Brewer, hard on Lee's heels from the shoe store which was only 60 feet away, Brewer asks Postal if she had sold the man a ticket! And if it is ### not confusing enough already then it gets even better when you remember that Postal, who has just seen a man with flying shirt tails duck past her, is moments later asked by Brewer if she happened to have sold a ticket to a man just now. So how does ### she respond? She has been listening to her transistor radio, about the assassination, but does not believe she did. And Brewer, following Lee 60 feet up the street and watching him - and with the theatre box office front being in line with the other storefronts - can we believe that this man (the one in hot pursuit of a man & never beyond a 60-ft straight line unobstructed ## view of him), can we believe that he stopped at the box office to inquire whether or not the man had paused to buy a ticket? Etc? Etc? Etc?

Why can't the expert W/C critics make even a better case for themselves than they do? Each one of the small handful seem individually adept in illuminating some aspect of one thing or another now & then, but I have the feeling that no one critic anywhere does anything like a total job in any one area. Whether by coincidence or design or whatever, it does seem that this is so. If any part of anything requires destruction, then it ought seem that the one bent on the destruction of it would provide a total destruction of it rather than some half part destruction. The Brewer-Postal comedy, for instance. All aspects of it down to Belin having chit-chatted on the record with Brewer, how nice it was that Brewer had only the day before been promoted into managership of the Big, Main, Downtown S#tore. What a nice chit-chat. Reminds me of Belin's chit-chat, on the record, about how CE 361 came into being, & by whom.

What were all these code 3 police cars doing flashing up & down W # Jefferson, by the way? Postal was describing them. And Brewer, too, the one he heard but could not see. We must assume that Brewer, 25 feet (15 plus ten) back inside a store with a 20 foot wide front, must have been able to tell from the sound of the siren# that his police car,## the one he mentioned, came down a certain street, made a U-turn at a certain intersection & then proceeded ## back up that certain street - knowing this all from the siren he was listening to while Lee was standing outside his door. If Lee ever stood there in the first place, that is, which I gather from the W/C he must have done. And if Brewer is endowed with radar ears & has a PPI plotting scope in his head, maybe we should know it. Anyway - just what were all these police cars doing under full siren at a time when it had not been announced that any suspect anywhere was hiding in the area? And without such knowledge as that, is it conceivable that police cars searching the area for possible

suspicious pedestrians would be doing so under siren & flashing red light (and, therefore, reasonably expected to be travelling at high speed)? Is that the way police cars conduct themselves while searching out a wanted man? Do hunters make noise in the woods? And all this took place before it was ever announced that there was "a suspect in the balcony". Ugh...

What brought FBI Agent Barrett & jr DA Bill Alexander & others to the Oak Cliff area, away from the primary interest at the moment - the assassination of the President? It also seems to be a problem to discover how various people got out to Oak Cliff in the first place. For three conflicting carloads:

Car A	Car B	Car C
7/47	7/79	7/111
Gerald Hill	Calvin Owens	Capt Westbrook
Calvin Owens	Capt Westbrook	Sgt Stringer
Bill Alexander	Bill Alexander	A patrolman
Reporter Jim Ewell		

The above carloads represent the first leg of the journey, not to be confused with the various switching from car to car which took place after arrival there, prior to proceeding to the theatre.

Penn Jones & the Midlothian article re Craig's 14 misquotes in the Testimony. We learn of four of them. Great that we should have Craig standing up on his hind feet & calling attention to falsified (in the printing) testimony, & ~~###~~ wish we could have more of it now that I can no longer trust any inch of any line of any page of the Testimonies anyway. But what of what Craig is now saying? A blue shirt? and an out of state license plate on that station wagon? If all this doesn't make me go off at a right-angle or something, I don't know what would. It is something like breaking a case & coming out with worms as a reward.

Now how would Meagher classify Jones & Craig?

Ha. Julia Postal again. In addition to seeing Lee flit by with flying shirt tails, moments before Pursuer Brewer came up behind him asking if he might have bought a ticket - Postal also testifies that Lee did his frantic spin around her corner "with a panicked look on his face", 7/10. And if I remember it right, from the same testimony, his hair was fussed up too (but you couldn't tell it by looking at the Hill Exhibit photos, taken ten or fewer minutes later after a brutal shuffle). And Here Brewer, the man upon whom the Commission depends for having provided the first clue to the whereabouts of the man who was caught, Brewer come up to Postal seconds later - whence the idiotic dialogue between them begins. And if not on the basis of actions by these two people, with which the Commission apparently could not quarrel, then by what other means could the DPD or the sheriff's office or anybody at all have known that there was a very much # wanted man hiding in the balcony of this theatre? (Not considering the fact that he wasn't in the balcony in the first place, unless he actually was except for the way it appears in the 26, I don't know). While the DPD might have costly apparatus for such things as automated alphabetizing machines for their routine record keeping (study Cason 5135, interesting), I'm not convinced that telepathy plays any part of the Oswald capture. Bluntly, if it wasn't Brewer, then just who was it?

And if it isn't already crazy enough, the nearly one mile separation from