

DECEMBER 18, 1967

DEAR TINK,

YOUR LETTER OF DEC 15 ARRIVED TODAY AS I WAS PREPARING TO MAIL MINE OFF THE SAME DATE.

NOTHING IN MY LETTER WOULD BE CHANGED BY ANYTHING YOU SAID IN YOURS. HOWEVER, AS YOU KNOW FROM YOUR PHONE CONVERSATION WITH VINCE ON THE 16TH, I NOW STRONGLY SUSPECT THE MOTIVATION FOR YOUR ACTIONS, AS WELL AS FOR YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE CASE, TO BE RATHER DIFFERENT FROM THOSE INDICATED IN MY LETTER.

NEVERTHELESS, I LEAVE MY LETTER AS IT IS BECAUSE I CANNOT PRESENT DOCUMENTATION PROVING MY NEW ASSESSMENT OF YOUR ROLE.

SINCERELY,

Roy

(AT THIS TIME, COPIES OF THIS NOTE ARE BEING SENT ONLY TO VINCE, SYLVIA, AND ARNON.)

1249 H: POINT STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90035
DECEMBER 15, 1967

PROF. JOSEPH THOMPSON
PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT
HAVERFORD COLLEGE
HAVERFORD, PA.

DEAR TINK,

I HAVE YOUR LETTER OF NOVEMBER 27. YOUR TONE IS ONE OF MEASURED REASON-
ABLENESS AND INJURED INNOCENCE. IN FACT, YOUR LETTER IS A CLASSIC STUDY IN
DISSEMBLING, CONTINUING THE INSPIRED VIRTUOSITY YOU DISPLAYED IN YOUR SAT-EVE POST
ARTICLE; AND WHICH I NOW FIND IS ALSO AMPLY EVIDENCED IN YOUR BOOK.

I REALIZE SOME WOULD CONSIDER IT BAD FORM TO EMPLOY WHAT COULD BE DESCRIBED
AS DIRECT OR BITING LANGUAGE IN A DISAGREEMENT SUCH AS OURS, BUT I WILL NOT
HIDE BEHIND DELIBERATELY SOFTENED WORDS. INSTEAD, I WILL TELL YOU WHAT I FEEL
MUST BE SAID, BOTH IN JUSTICE TO MYSELF AND FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE RECORD. TO
A GREATER DEGREE EVEN THAN YOUR ARTICLE, I FIND ARTFUL DODGING IN VIRTUALLY EVERY
LINE OF YOUR LETTER. THEREFORE, I WILL RESPOND POINT BY POINT.

YOU SAY YOU WISH I ". . . HAD PAUSED FOR A MOMENT" BEFORE WRITING SO
"HARSH AND UNFAIR" A LETTER. IT IS NOW MORE THAN TWO WEEKS SINCE I WROTE TO YOU,
AND IN RE-READING IT, I FIND I WOULD NOT CHANGE A WORD WERE I TO WRITE IT TODAY.
I AGREE IT WAS HARSH, BUT ANYTHING LESS WOULD NOT HAVE REFLECTED MY TRUE FEEL-
INGS OR BELIEFS. TRUTH IS OFTEN HARSH. I AM CONVINCED IT WAS NOT UNFAIR, AS I
WILL ATTEMPT TO DEMONSTRATE.

YOU SAY YOU ". . . CAN SEE NO GOOD TO BE SERVED BY THE . . . CRITICS . . .
ENGAGING IN INTERNECINE CONFLICT".

THIS IS A MEANINGLESS "FOR HOME AND MOTHER" SMOKE SCREEN. THE IMPLICATION
IS THAT REGARDLESS OF WHETHER OR NOT AN ALLEGED TRANSGRESSION BY A CRITIC CAN BE
PROVEN, AND REGARDLESS OF ITS SERIOUSNESS, IT SHOULD BE IGNORED. I AM NOT AN
ABSOLUTIST, BUT I DO HAVE STANDARDS WHICH I APPLY, NO LESS STRICTLY TO MYSELF
THAN TO OTHERS. SINCE IT IS YOU WHO I AM ACCUSING OF WRONG DOING, YOUR PLEA
AGAINST "INTERNECINE CONFLICT" MUST BE VIEWED AS SELF-SERVING. THE CHARGES I
HAVE MADE AGAINST YOU ARE EITHER FALSE, IN WHICH CASE I HAVE BEHAVED WITH GROSS
IRRESPONSIBILITY AND HAVE DONE YOU A SEVERE INJUSTICE, AND THEREFORE DESERVE THE
DISRESPECT OF OUR COLLEAGUES; OR THEY ARE TRUE. EITHER WAY, ONCE HAVING BEEN
MADE (AND, I MUST STRESS, I REPEAT THEM AS OF THIS DATE), THEY ARE OBVIOUSLY
MUCH TOO SERIOUS TO BE SWEEPED UNDER THE RUG OF UNITY. I INTEND TO DOCUMENT THESE
CHARGES FULLY.

I AGAIN POINT OUT THAT YOUR ARTICLE AND BOOK ARE SEPARATE ENTITIES, AND
SHOULD PROPERLY BE EVALUATED AS SUCH. THIS IS TRUE BECAUSE WHILE YOUR BOOK MAY
ENJOY A READERSHIP OF PERHAPS 100,000, THE ARTICLE WILL BE READ BY MOST OF THE
POST'S 28 MILLION READERS.

REFERRING TO YOUR ARTICLE, THE OPENING SENTENCE OF MY NOVEMBER 20 LETTER TO
YOU STATES:

"I AM APPALLED AND DISGUSTED AT YOUR FLAGRANT PLAGIARISM OF MY
DISCOVERY OF THE 238 CONNALLY SHOULDER DIP, AND ONLY SLIGHTLY LESS SO AT
YOUR FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE MY EARLIER DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE
DOUBLE HEAD-HIT".

IN YOUR REPLY, YOU STATE: "NOW WITH RESPECT TO YOUR CHARGE OF FLAGRANT PLA-
GIARISM CONCERNING YOUR EARLIER DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE

DOUBLE HEAD HIT" AND YOUR DISCOVERY OF THE 238 CONNALLY SHOULDER DIP:
 --LET ME TAKE THE QUESTION OF THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT FIRST."

MY LETTER TO YOU WAS EXTREMELY BRIEF, CONSISTING OF ONLY FOUR SENTENCES. HOW IS IT POSSIBLE THEN FOR ONE OF YOUR INTELLECTUAL COMPETENCE TO HAVE SO MISREAD THE MEANING OF MY OPENING, AND MOST IMPORTANT, SENTENCE? I CLEARLY DID NOT ACCUSE YOU OF PLAGIARIZING THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT, BUT OF ". . . FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE MY EARLIER DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION" OF IT. I BELIEVE ANY HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENT OF AVERAGE READING ABILITY WOULD HAVE NO DIFFICULTY IN PERCEIVING THAT THE CHARGE OF PLAGIARISM WAS SPECIFICALLY APPLIED TO THE 238 CONNALLY SHOULDER DIP, AND SPECIFICALLY NOT APPLIED TO THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT. HOW THEN DID, YOU MANAGE TO MISREAD IT? WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAD A MOTIVE FOR DOING SO, BY ERRONEOUSLY STATING IN YOUR LETTER THAT I HAD ACCUSED YOU OF SOMETHING OF WHICH IN FACT I HAD NOT, A SITUATION IS SET UP WHEREBY ANY THIRD PERSON READING YOUR LETTER, AND KNOWING THAT YOU IN FACT MADE AN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY OF THE DOUBLE-HIT PHENOMENON, WOULD THEREFORE BELIEVE THAT I HAD MADE A FALSE AND UNJUSTIFIED CHARGE, THEREBY TENDING TO DISCREDIT MY ENTIRE REACTION. IS IT BY ACCIDENT OR DESIGN THAT YOU MADE THIS ERROR?

I REALIZE THAT BY MAKING A POINT OF THE ABOVE, I RUN THE RISK OF HAVING OTHERS BELIEVE I AM BEING PICAYUNISH; THAT IT IS EASY TO ACCIDENTALLY MISREAD A SENTENCE; AND THAT TO TRY TO READ INTO SUCH AN ERROR AN ULTERIOR MOTIVE IS PETTY AND MEAN. I WOULD AGREE, WERE IT NOT FOR THE FACT THAT I DETECT A PATTERN, SUBTLE BUT NONETHELESS CLEAR, IN YOUR WRITING. WERE I TO BELIEVE THAT THIS PATTERN IS MERE HAPPENSTANCE, I WOULD NEVERTHELESS HAVE TO NOTE THAT IN EACH INSTANCE THE "ERROR" IS SUCH THAT, IF UNDETECTED, IT WOULD TEND TO SUPPORT YOUR POSITION -- WHETHER IN REGARD TO OUR RESPECTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS, OR TO SOME OTHER THESIS YOU WISH TO UPHOLD.

SINCE YOU RESPONDED FIRST TO MY CHARGE RE THE DOUBLE HIT (OR, MORE ACCURATELY, TO YOUR OWN DISTORTION OF MY CHARGE), I ALSO WILL DEAL WITH IT FIRST. IN MY LETTER TO EMERSON OF NOVEMBER 20 I SAID, OF THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT:

" I INITIALLY MADE THIS OBSERVATION IN DECEMBER, '65, AND WROTE OF IT IN AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER TO RAMPARTS IN JUNE '66. IT WAS FIRST PUBLISHED IN EPOCA MAGAZINE, ROME, NOVEMBER 27, '66; AND IN RAMPARTS LETTER COLUMN IN MARCH '67".

IN YOUR RESPONSE, YOU TREAT MY DOCUMENTATION AS FOLLOWS:

"YOU SAY THAT YOUR DISCOVERY WITH RESPECT TO THE HEAD HIT WAS MADE AND ORIGINALLY NOTED IN AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER TO RAMPARTS IN JUNE OF 1966. SINCE IT WAS UNPUBLISHED, I NEVER HAD A CHANCE TO SEE IT. YOU SAY THAT THE CONCLUSION FIRST APPEARED IN PUBLISHED FORM IN EPOCA MAGAZINE FOR NOVEMBER 27, 1966. I HAVE NOT SEEN THIS MAGAZINE BUT I'M PERFECTLY WILLING TO BELIEVE YOU WHEN YOU TELL ME YOUR OBSERVATION WAS PUBLISHED THERE. BUT AS I SAY IN THE POST ARTICLE AND IN THE BOOK, I MADE THE DISCOVERY IN THE SUMMER OF 1966 WHILE STUDYING THE FILM IN THE ARCHIVES."

YOU DISMISS MY LETTER TO RAMPARTS IN JUNE OF '66 BECAUSE IT WAS UNPUBLISHED, AND YOU "NEVER HAD A CHANCE TO SEE IT" (SINCE MY LAST LETTER TO YOU, I HAVE LEARNED, FROM DAVE LIFTON, OF EARLIER NON-PUBLISHED DOCUMENTATION FOR MY DISCOVERY THAT THE JUNE 10, '66 LETTER TO RAMPARTS -- MORE LATER). ALTHOUGH YOU ARE "PERFECTLY WILLING TO BELIEVE" ME, YOU DISMISS THE ARTICLE IN EPOCA BECAUSE YOU ". . . HAVE NOT SEEN THIS MAGAZINE" (I AM ENCLOSED A COPY OF MY INTERVIEW IN EPOCA, SO THAT YOU NEEDN'T RELY ON MY WORD THAT THE DOUBLE-HIT APPEARED THERE). (AS TO YOUR LACK OF AWARENESS OF THIS ARTICLE, I MUST NOTE THAT YOU WERE IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH VINCE SALANDRIA AT THAT TIME, AND THAT HE, ALSO, WAS PROMINENTLY

FEATURED IN THE SAME EPOCA ARTICLE. HOWEVER, SINCE I AM NOT IN A POSITION TO PROVE OTHERWISE, I MUST ACCEPT YOUR WORD THAT YOU WERE UNAWARE OF ITS EXISTENCE TILL NOW).

BUT WHAT OF MY FINAL CITATION; RAMPARTS, MARCH '67? YOU FAILED TO MENTION IT AT ALL. THEREFORE, OF THE THREE DOCUMENTS I CITE AS PROOFS OF MY EARLIER DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE DOUBLE-HIT, YOU PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE FIRST TWO, ONE PUBLISHED AND THE OTHER UNPUBLISHED; AND FAIL COMPLETELY TO CONFRONT THE THIRD -- THE ONE IN REGARD TO WHICH SUCH A PLEA WOULD HAVE BEEN SCARCELY BELIEVEABLE. YOU THEN IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS BY SAYING:

"BUT AS I SAY IN THE POST ARTICLE AND IN THE BOOK, I MADE THIS DISCOVERY IN THE SUMMER OF 1966, WHILE STUDYING THE FILM IN THE ARCHIVES".

THEREFORE, HAVING THUS DISPOSED OF MY DOCUMENTATION, AND ESPECIALLY BY OMITTING COMPLETELY ANY MENTION OF THE LETTER IN RAMPARTS, MARCH, '67, THE NET EFFECT OF YOUR CONSTRUCTION -- TO ONE UNACQUAINTED WITH THE FACTS, -- WOULD BE THAT THE VALID AND GOVERNING FACTOR WAS YOUR CLAIMED DISCOVERY OF THE PHENOMENON IN JULY OF '66 (YOU OF COURSE ALSO IGNORED COMPLETELY MY CLAIM THAT I HAD MADE THE OBSERVATION IN DECEMBER '65). I ACCEPT YOUR STATEMENT THAT YOU TOLD VINCE OF THIS IN JULY '66, AS SOON AS YOU ". . . THOUGHT IT WAS ESTABLISHED ON SOUND GROUNDS", BUT I WILL COMMENT FURTHER LATER. IS IT BY ACCIDENT OR DESIGN THAT YOU FAILED TO CONFRONT MY MARCH '67 RAMPARTS CITATION?

BESIDES, ANY THIRD PARTY READING YOUR LETTER AND RELYING ON IT FOR HIS INFORMATION, WOULD BE TOTALLY UNAWARE OF THE FACT THAT WE HAD AT LEAST THREE PERSONAL CONVERSATIONS, AND POSSIBLY FOUR, INVOLVING THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT (THE FIRST, FACE-TO-FACE, AT LIFE IN N.Y., IN MID-OCTOBER '66, BY WHICH TIME YOU WERE ALREADY AWARE THAT I HAD MADE AN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY OF IT; AND EITHER TWO OR THREE PHONE CONVERSATIONS DURING 1967 -- MORE LATER ON THESE). BY OMITTING MENTION OF THESE PERSONAL MEETINGS AND CONVERSATIONS, YOU LEAVE THE IMPLICATION THAT YOUR AWARENESS OF MY INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY WAS DEPENDENT ON PUBLISHED SOURCES. SINCE IT IS IMPOSSIBLE THAT YOU DON'T REMEMBER THAT OUR MEETING AND CONVERSATIONS TOOK PLACE, YOUR FAILURE TO ALLUDE TO THEM, ALTHOUGH I MENTIONED THEM IN MY LETTER TO YOU, MUST BE CONSIDERED.

WHAT CAN IT MEAN WHEN YOU IGNORE OUR PERSONAL MEETING AT LIFE IN OCTOBER, '66, AT WHICH TIME YOU INDICATED YOU KNEW OF MY INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY, AND THEN CLAIM IGNORANCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF A SUBSEQUENT ARTICLE (EPOCA) IN A CONTEXT WHICH WOULD IMPLY YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF MY DISCOVERY WAS DEPENDENT ON IT?

WHAT CAN IT MEAN WHEN, IN THE CONTEXT OF IMPLYING YOU DIDN'T KNOW OF MY DISCOVERY BECAUSE OF IGNORANCE OF MY DOCUMENTATION, PUBLISHED AND OTHERWISE, THAT YOU NEGLECT ANY MENTION OF OUR PERSONAL CONVERSATIONS? IS THIS OVERSIGHT OR DESIGN?

YOU NO DOUBT UNDERSTAND (ALTHOUGH YOUR LETTER GIVES NO INDICATION OF SUCH UNDERSTANDING) THAT IT IS COMPLETELY INVALID TO CITE THE DATE OF ONE'S CLAIMED DISCOVERY WITH THE DATE OF ANOTHER'S PUBLICATION OF A LIKE DISCOVERY, IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH ONE'S CLAIM OF PRIORITY. OBVIOUSLY, YOU MUST KNOW THAT ANOTHER'S PUBLICATION ALSO HAD TO BE PRECEDED BY HIS DISCOVERY (ASSUMING BOTH WERE INDEPENDENT DISCOVERIES). THEREFORE, AS I AM CERTAIN YOU REALIZE, WE MUST CONSIDER MORE THAN ONE CRITERION IN ANY DISPUTE INVOLVING AUTHORSHIP OF AN IDEA. I BELIEVE THE IMPORTANT ONES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. EARLIEST CLAIMED DATE IDEA WAS CONSIDERED.
2. EARLIEST CLAIMED DATE THE IDEA BECAME A DEFINITE CONCLUSION.
3. EARLIEST SUPPORT OF CLAIM BY DOCUMENTATION, UNPUBLISHED BUT CORROBORATED BY THIRD PARTIES; OR INDEPENDENT WARRANT BY THIRD PARTIES.

ANDRIA IN JULY '66. I CERTAINLY ACCEPT VINCE AS YOUR WARRANT THAT YOU MADE AN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY OF THE DOUBLE-HIT. HOWEVER, VINCE TOLD ME (IN A PHONE CONVERSATION DECEMBER 2, '67) THAT HE INFORMED YOU THAT I HAD ALREADY DRAWN THE SAME CONCLUSION. IN HIS LETTER TO ME OF DECEMBER 3, '67, HE STATES:

" ON THE QUESTION OF THE DOUBLE HIT ON THE HEAD, YOU CAME UP WITH THIS BEFORE TINK THOMPSON. BUT, IT IS TRUE THAT HE CAME UP WITH THE CONCEPT INDEPENDENT OF YOU. YOU HAVE PRIORITY RIGHTS ON THE MATTER, BUT HE DID NOT TECHNICALLY SPEAKING STEAL IT FROM YOU. HE DID KNOW THAT YOU CAME BEFORE."

THIS, OF COURSE, IS CONSISTENT WITH YOUR INDICATION, AT THE TIME OF OUR MEETING AT LIFE IN MID-OCTOBER '66, THAT YOU ALREADY KNEW OF MY INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY (I DON'T RECALL WE DISCUSSED DATES THEN). THIS KNOWLEDGE ON YOUR PART OBVIOUSLY CAME THROUGH VINCE.

ALTHOUGH I ACCEPT THAT YOU WERE FIRM IN YOUR CONCLUSION WHEN YOU TOLD VINCE ABOUT IT, IT MUST BE NOTED THAT MANY MONTHS LATER, ALTHOUGH DISCUSSING THE HEAD SHOT AT LENGTH, YOU MADE NO MENTION OF A DOUBLE HIT IN YOUR HANDWRITTEN LETTER TO DAVE LIFTON, RECEIVED BY HIM IN JANUARY '67 (IT IS UNDATED, BUT MAKES REFERENCE TO DAVE'S UCLA BRUIN ARTICLE, WHICH APPEARED EARLY IN JANUARY '67). IN THIS LETTER YOU SAY:

"THE HEAD SHOT IS A REAL FOCUS OF INTEREST FOR ME. ALTHOUGH I'M STILL PERSUADED THAT THERE WAS A SHOT FROM THE FRONT, CERTAIN THINGS BOTHER ME. HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THE FOLLOWING FACTS (I HOPE THEY ARE FACTS--IN THIS CASE, YOU NEVER KNOW):

- (1) THE MOVEMENT OF THE HEAD IS QUITE DEFINITELY FORWARD AT Z312-313. RIDDLE SAYS "DOWNWARD", AND THERE IS A DOWNWARD VECTOR TO THE MOVEMENT. BUT THE PRINCIPAL VECTOR (IT SEEMS TO ME) IS FORWARD. WOULD YOU AGREE ON THIS OBSERVATION AND, IF SO, HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN IT?
- (2) DO YOU KNOW OF ANY EVIDENCE OF IMPACT DEBRIS OVER THE REAR END OF THE CAR? IN Z313 ++ I CAN'T FIND ANY AND IN A PICTURE TAKEN OF THE CAR AT PARKLAND HOSPITAL REAR END SEEMS QUITE CLEAN. DO YOU KNOW OF ANY TESTIMONY ABOUT THIS? MY THOUGHT IS THAT THE DEBRIS ON THE MOTORCYCLISTS MIGHT BE EXPLAINED AS DUE TO A FORWARD EXPLODING HIT WHICH THE SLIPSTREAM OF THE CAR (AND THE RELATIVE MOTION OF THEIR OWN CYCLES) THREW ALL OVER THEM.
- (3) AN ANALAGOUS OBJECTION CAN BE MADE TO WEITZMAN'S FINDING OF THE PIECE OF SKULL. WE KNOW IT'S 8"-12" FROM THE CURB, BUT WHERE ALONG THE CURB? THE LARGEST FRAGMENT VISIBLE IN Z313 SEEMS TO BE ARCHING UP AND SLIGHTLY FORWARD. THIS TOO COULD BE CONSISTENT WITH A FRONT RANGING HIT.
- (4) IN THE Z FILM, ESPECIALLY (E.G.) IN Z323 (WHICH YOU PRINT) THE MAIN HEAD DEFECT APPEARS IN THE FRONT OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEAD. THE BACK APPEARS RELATIVELY UNDAMAGED. WHAT WE SEE ON FILM CERTAINLY MAKES US DOUBT SOMEWHAT McCLELLAN'S DESCRIPTION OF THE OCCIPITAL/PARIETAL WOUND. IS A WOUND AS WE SEE IT IN Z323 CONSISTENT WITH A SHOT FROM THE FRONT? DR. BOSWELL TOLD ME THE OTHER EVENING THAT THE MAIN FORCE OF THE BULLET EXITED THROUGH THE FRONT--RIGHT WHERE WE SEE THE DEFECT IN Z323.
- (5) RIDDLE HEDGES HIS ACCOUNT BY SAYING HE IS BARRING NEUROLOGICAL PHENOMENA. THIS SEEMS TO ME TO BE A CRUCIAL NUT IN THE ARGUMENT. IF WE CAN RULE OUT SUCH A THING AS "DECEREBRATE RIGIDITY", (THE EXPLANATION FOR THE MOVEMENT WHICH BOSWELL GAVE ME THE OTHER NIGHT) THEN IT SEEMS

MOVE AHEAD ON THIS POINT? ANY SUGGESTIONS?

"UNDERSTAND THAT ALL THIS IS MEANT IN THE CONTEXT OF A BELIEF THAT THE MAIN BURDEN OF EVIDENCE SUGGESTS A SHOT FROM THE FRONT. I'M JUST WORRIED ABOUT WHAT SEEM TO ME TO BE OBJECTIONS OR LACUNAE IN THE ARGUMENT.

"I'M JUST NOW IN THE PROCESS OF TRYING TO MEASURE VERY ACCURATELY THE MOVEMENT OF KENNEDY'S HEAD Z312-330. IN THIS REGARD I'M MORE THAN A LITTLE FASCINATED BY RIDDLE'S STUDY. RAMPARTS SAID IT WAS A STUDY COMMISSIONED BY THE MAGAZINE BUT ONLY EXCERPTS WERE PRINTED. IS THERE ANY POSSIBILITY THAT YOU COULD SEND ME A XEROX COPY OF THE WHOLE STUDY? IT WOULD BE INTERESTING, FOR EXAMPLE, IF I FOUND THAT HIS MEASUREMENTS AND MINE AGREED. I'M USING A COMPLICATED MACHINE FROM THE ASTRONOMY DEPARTMENT TO MAKE THE MEASUREMENTS AND IT WOULD BE AN ADVANTAGE FOR ME ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ TO CHECK THEM AGAINST HIS FIGURES AND ALSO TAKE NOTE OF HIS OBSERVATIONAL PROCEDURES. DID HE MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO QUANTIFY DATA ON THE DOWNWARD MOVEMENT? WAS HE ABLE TO DO ANYTHING WITH THE LATERAL MOVEMENT OF THE HEAD SHADOW ACROSS THE SEAT CUSHION? ALSO, DO YOU HAVE ANY REFERENCES I MIGHT LOOK UP WITH REGARD TO (1) THE PHYSICS OF IMPACTING BODIES, (2) WOUND BALLISTICS WITH RESPECT TO BONE IMPACTS, AND (3) NEUROMUSCULAR RESPONSES TO BRAIN DAMAGE?

"YOU'RE BUSY AS CAN BE (I SHOULD GUESS) AND I'M SORRY TO BOTHER YOU WITH ALL THESE REQUESTS AND QUESTIONS, BUT I'D BE TREMENDOUSLY GRATEFUL FOR ANY HELP.

"AS I HOPE YOU KNOW, THE THING I'VE BEEN WORKING ON SINCE LAST SUMMER ALSO REQUIRES THREE GUNMEN FIRING ON THE MOTORCADE. THUS I WAS TICKLED TO SEE THAT YOU AND THE CALIFORNIA GROUP HAD REACHED THE SAME RESULT INDEPENDENTLY. IT DOES SEEM TO ME THAT A CONSENSUS IS BEGINNING TO EMERGE ON AN ALTERNATE THEORY. IT IS FOR THIS REASON THAT I'M ANXIOUS TO WORK OUT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE SOME OF THESE THORNY PROBLEMS ON THE HEAD HIT. BOTH OF US, I'M SURE, WANT OUR THEORY TO BE THE MOST ACCURATE ONE THAT CAN BE ARRIVED AT -- TO BE ONE WHICH HAS NO RESIDUAL PROBLEMS IN IT. . . III"

YOU MUST ADMIT, TINK, THAT IT SEEMS STRANGE THAT SIX MONTHS AFTER YOU CLAIM YOU WERE FIRM IN YOUR CONCLUSION OF A DOUBLE-HIT, THAT YOU MENTION NOT A WORD OF IT, OR EVEN HINT THAT YOU WERE CONSIDERING IT, IN A LETTER 75% OF WHICH IS CONCERNED WITH THE HEAD SHOT? ONLY THREE ALTERNATIVE CONCLUSIONS ARE POSSIBLE:

1. DESPITE YOUR STATEMENT INDICATING THAT YOU WERE FIRM IN YOUR CONCLUSION IN JULY '66, THIS WAS NOT IN FACT THE CASE; AND YOU THOUGHT SO LITTLE OF THE IDEA BY JANUARY THAT YOU CHOSE NOT TO MENTION IT.
2. ALTHOUGH YOU WERE FIRM IN JULY '66, BY THE TIME YOU WROTE TO DAVE IN JANUARY, YOU HAD ABANDONED THE IDEA, OR THOUGHT SO LITTLE OF IT YOU CHOSE NOT TO MENTION IT.
3. YOU WERE FIRM IN JULY '66, AND RETAINED FULL CONFIDENCE WHEN YOU WROTE TO DAVE IN JANUARY, BUT CHOSE TO WITHHOLD THIS INFORMATION; AND CHOSE INSTEAD TO COUCH YOUR QUESTIONS IN SUCH A WAY AS TO AVOID REVEALING YOUR TRUE BELIEFS.

BY RESOLVING THIS DOUBT IN YOUR FAVOR, IT IS STILL CLEAR THAT THE EARLIEST DATE OF INDEPENDENT CORROBORATION FOR MY DISCOVERY CAN BE FIXED FROM DAVE'S LETTER RE FEYNMANN AS NO LATER THAN APRIL '66 VS YOUR 'S OF JULY '66.

4. EARLIEST DATE OF PUBLICATION

THIS ONE, OF COURSE, IS THE EASIEST TO RESOLVE. MY FIRST PUBLICATION OF THE DOUBLE-HIT WAS IN THE AFOREMENTIONED EPOCA INTERVIEW OF NOVEMBER 27, '66, THEREFORE PRECEDING YOUR SAT/VE POST ARTICLE BY A FULL YEAR. OTHER PUBLISHED APPEARANCES WERE MY LETTER IN MARCH '67 RAMPARTS, AND IN THE MAY '67 ESQUIRE, WHICH NOTED OUR INDEPENDENT DISCOVERIES WITHOUT INDICATING DATES.

I BELIEVE I HAVE SHOWN THAT BY EACH OF THESE CRITERIA, I PRECEDED YOU IN DISCOVERING, PROPOUNDING, AND PUBLISHING THE DOUBLE-HIT. AND, ACCORDING TO THE WORD OF YOUR OWN WARRANT, VINCE, YOU WERE INFORMED OF MY PRIORITY SOON AFTER MAKING YOUR INDEPENDENT FIND. FURTHERMORE, IN OUR IN-PERSON AND PHONE CONVERSATIONS, WHEN DISCUSSING THE DOUBLE-HIT YOU NEVER QUESTIONED MY PRIORITY OF DISCOVERY. I CERTAINLY ASSUMED YOU KNEW, AS VINCE NOW CONFIRMS, THAT I HAD DISCOVERED IT EARLIER. ALSO, YOU WERE WRITING A BOOK AT THE TIME, NOT I. THEREFORE, EVEN IF VINCE HAD NOT INFORMED YOU; EVEN IF I NEVER TOLD YOU OF MY EARLIER DISCOVERY; EVEN IF NOVEMBER '66 EPOCA AND MARCH '67 RAMPARTS HAD NOT CONTAINED MY FINDING; YOU STILL WOULD HAVE HAD, IT SEEMS TO ME, AN INTELLECTUAL OBLIGATION TO ASCERTAIN THIS. HAD YOU QUESTIONED IT, I COULD HAVE DOCUMENTED IT FOR YOU AS EASILY THEN AS NOW.

YOU CLOSE YOUR COMMENTS ON THIS MATTER IN YOUR LETTER AS FOLLOWS:

"I BELIEVE THAT YOU REALIZE THAT HAROLD WEISBERG INDEPENDENTLY ARRIVED AT THE SAME CONCLUSION IN THE FALL OF 1966. THE FACT THAT MANY RESEARCHERS ARRIVE AT THE SAME CONCLUSION WHEN STUDYING THE SAME EVIDENCE IS A COMMON ENOUGH EVENT IN ANY SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE. TO MY MIND, WHEN SUCH MUTUALITY OF DISCOVERY AND CONCLUSION EXIST, IT SHOULD BE A SOURCE NOT OF RESTRICTION BUT OF REJOICING AMONG THE RESEARCHERS THEMSELVES".

THAT YOU SHOULD RAISE WEISBERG'S "INDEPENDENTLY ARRIVED AT" CONCLUSION WOULD BE SURPRISING, DID IT NOT FIT SO WELL INTO THE PATTERN OF EVASION AND OBFUSCATION WRITTEN INTO YOUR LINES. IN A PHONE CONVERSATION WITH ME DURING THIS SUMMER, YOU VOICED IF ANYTHING MORE SUSPICION THAN I REGARDING HIS CLAIM. IT WAS HIS CLAIM TO HAVE DETECTED THIS DOUBLE MOVEMENT, NOT IN THE SLIDES, BUT IN THE FILM AS PROJECTED IN MOTION THAT SEEMED PARTICULARLY DUBIOUS, ESPECIALLY SINCE THE FORWARD MOTION INVOLVES ONLY 1/18 SECOND. MY STATEMENT TO YOU WAS TO THE EFFECT THAT SINCE AN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY BY WEISBERG WOULD BE HARD TO DISPROVE, HE MUST PROPERLY BE CREDITED, DESPITE OUR SUSPICIONS.

I DID NOT HAVE ALL MY RECORDS WITH ME IN BOSTON, AND A REVIEW OF THEM HERE SHOWS THAT A COPY OF MY "HYPOTHESES RE: THE ZAPRUDER FILM", WHICH BY THEN INCLUDED THE DOUBLE-HIT, WAS MAILED TO WEISBERG THE SECOND WEEK IN JULY '66, ALONG WITH COPIES OF MY ZAPRUDER PHOTO PANELS, LAYOUT MAP, AND OTHER MATERIALS. HIS WHITEWASH II WAS PUBLISHED IN DECEMBER '66, AND THEREFORE AFTER THE EPOCA ARTICLE. IN A MEETING WITH ME HERE LAST MONTH, HE CONCEDED MY PRIOR DISCOVERY, AND PROMISED NOT TO CHALLENGE MY CLAIM IN MY INTENDED LETTER TO EMERSON (WEISBERG HAS SINCE REPEATED THIS CONCESSION TO ME IN WRITING). ALAS, HE APPARENTLY FORGOT THIS COMMITMENT, AND I NOTE IN A COPY OF A LETTER HE SENT TO MICHAEL MOONEY OF THE POST ON NOVEMBER 25, HE APPEARS TO CLAIM PRIORITY. HE IS INCORRECT, AS I'M SURE HE REALIZES. FURTHER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT IN HIS ONLY REFERENCE TO THE BACKWARD-FORWARD HEAD MOTION IN WHITEWASH II (PG 221), HE DOES NOT EXPLICITLY STATE THAT A DOUBLE-HIT HAD OCCURRED, ALTHOUGH THAT IMPLICATION IS PRESENT IN THE VERY BRIEF PASSAGE DEALING WITH THE QUESTION. IT IS QUITE UNCHARACTERISTIC OF HAROLD TO BE BRIEF ABOUT ANY THESIS, LET ALONE ANY IMPORTANT ONE. IN "PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH", PUBLISHED DURING THE SUMMER OF '67, I CAN FIND NO REFERENCE WHATSOEVER, EITHER TO THE DOUBLE MOTION, OR TO A DOUBLE-HIT; DESPITE NUMEROUS REFERENCES TO THE ZAPRUDER FILM. THIS LACK OF REPETITION IN A SUCCEEDING BOOK IS ALSO QUITE UNCHARACTERISTIC OF HAROLD.

I THINK YOUR INVOCATION OF WEISBERG'S "INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY"--ONE WHICH YOU

YOURSELF CONSIDERED SUSPECT--CONSTITUTES A RED HERRING. THAT GENUINE "MUTUALITY OF DISCOVERY" SHOULD BE A "SOURCE OF REJOICING" IS CERTAINLY TRUE. "REJOICING" PRECISELY DESCRIBES MY FEELING WHEN I FIRST LEARNED LAST FALL THAT YOU, TOO, HAD ARRIVED AT THE DOUBLE HIT. BUT YOU, WHOSE "SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE" WAS EVIDENTLY INSUFFICIENT TO REMIND YOU, WHEN WRITING FOR AN AUDIENCE OF 28 MILLION, OF THE NECESSITY OF CREDITING YOUR SOURCE FOR THE CRUCIAL 238 SHOULDER-DIP, OR CREDITING ANOTHER'S PRIORITY IN DISCOVERING THE DOUBLE-HIT, ARE SCARCELY THE ONE TO EXPECT ME TO REJOICE AT YOUR OVERSIGHTS.

(I AM AWARE THAT ON PAGE 112 OF YOUR BOOK, THERE IS A NOTE WHICH REFERS TO YOUR STATEMENT ON PG 89, WHICH SAID:

"WHAT I HAD DISCOVERED WAS A DOUBLE MOVEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEAD SEPARATED BY ONLY 1/18TH SECOND."

THE NOTE ON PG 112 SAYS:

"THE DOUBLE MOVEMENT WAS DISCOVERED INDEPENDENTLY BY RESEARCHER RAYMOND MARCUS OF LOS ANGELES". (EMPHASIS ADDED)

EVEN THOSE WHO MAY TAKE THE TROUBLE TO TURN TO PAGE 112 TO READ THE NOTE, WILL NOT LEARN FROM IT THE FOLLOWING RELEVANT FACTS, WHICH WERE KNOWN TO YOU:

1. THAT I MADE THIS OBSERVATION LONG BEFORE YOU DID.
2. THAT, FROM THIS OBSERVATION, I CONCLUDED A DOUBLE-HIT HAD BEEN STRUCK WELL BEFORE YOU EVEN MADE YOUR OBSERVATION (AS YOU KNOW, SOME CRITICS DO NOT ATTRIBUTE THE DOUBLE MOTION TO A DOUBLE HIT).
3. THAT MY FINDINGS ON THIS WERE PUBLISHED IN EPOCA MORE THAN A YEAR--AND IN RAMPARTS, MORE THAN NINE MONTHS--PRIOR TO THE APPEARANCE OF YOUR BOOK.
4. THAT YOU WERE AWARE OF ALL THE ABOVE, SAVE POSSIBLY EPOCA.

THAT YOU YOURSELF CONSIDER THE OBSERVATION OF THE DOUBLE MOVEMENT TO BE SEPARATE FROM THE CONCLUSION OF A DOUBLE-HIT IS CLEARLY SHOWN BY THE FACT THAT AFTER THE QUOTED LINE ON PAGE 89, YOU GO ON FOR SIX PAGES IN WHICH THE TENSION MOUNTS AS YOU BUILD TOWARD YOUR (SEEMINGLY ORIGINAL) CONCLUSION THAT THE DOUBLE MOTION WAS CAUSED BY A DOUBLE-HIT. IS THE ABOVE ARRANGEMENT OF YOURS ACCIDENTAL OR BY DESIGN?)

CONNALLY SHOT, 238

THE HISTORY OF THE 238 CONNALLY SHOULDER-DIP IS QUITE DIFFERENT. MY "HYPOTHESES RE: THE ZAPRUDER FILM" WAS COMPLETED IN EARLY MARCH '65. A COPY WAS IMMEDIATELY SENT TO MARK LANE, AND VIA MAGGIE FIELD, SHORTLY AFTERWARD TO SYLVIA MEAGHER. IN THE SAME MONTH, DAVE LIFTON CAME TO MY HOME FOR THE FIRST TIME, AND I WENT OVER MY HYPOTHESES WITH HIM IN DETAIL. COPIES WERE ALSO SENT TO VINCE SALANDRIA IN AUGUST '65, EPSTEIN AND FRED COOK IN SEPTEMBER '65, AND WEISBERG IN EARLY JULY '66. IN ADDITION TO THESE CRITICS, COPIES WERE ALSO SENT TO A NUMBER OF NATIONAL MAGAZINES.

IN MY HYPOTHESIS B, I DREW TWO CONCLUSIONS: (1) THAT CONNALLY WAS NOT HIT BY THE SAME SHOT THAT FIRST HIT JFK; AND (2) THAT CONNALLY WAS HIT FROM A LEFT-REAR DIRECTION, AND THEREFORE NOT FROM THE TSSD.

I DEMONSTRATED THE FORMER BY SHOWING THAT IN 232 CONNALLY'S RIGHT HAND AND WRIST WERE ELEVATED IN A POSITION WHICH WOULD PRECLUDE ITS HAVING BEEN STRUCK BY THAT POINT, WHILE JFK WAS CLEARLY REACTING TO A HIT (I MISTAKENLY BELIEVED CONNALLY WAS GRIPPING A HOLD BAR, INSTEAD OF HIS HAT). I DEMONSTRATED THE

LATTER BY SHOWING THAT CONNALLY WAS TOO FAR AROUND IN HIS TURN TO THE RIGHT TO HAVE BEEN HIT FROM THE TSBD.

IN PART (E) OF THIS HYPOTHESIS, I STATED MY BELIEF THAT THE SHOULDER DIP STARTED AT 241, AND HYPOTHESIZED A HIT BETWEEN 237-240. IN JULY '65, I MADE MY 8"x10" PHOTO PANEL JC-1, BY WHICH TIME I HAD AMENDED THIS HYPOTHESIS TO INDICATE A 237-238 HIT, WITH THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP. ANY COPIES SENT OUT AFTER THAT TIME WERE SO AMENDED, AND MY COVER LETTER TO VINCE OF AUGUST 30, '65 SPEAKS OF IT.

(THE OTHER MAJOR CONCLUSIONS WERE:

- A. THAT THE SINGLE-BULLET THEORY WAS CRUCIAL TO THE COMMISSION'S CASE, BASED ON AN EARLIEST OPENING SHOT OF 210, PLUS THE FORTY-TWO FRAME LIMITATION.
- D. THAT JFK WAS FIRST HIT AT 189 (BY IMPLICATION, IN THROAT)-- BASED ON HIS RIGHT-HAND DROP, JACKIE'S SUDDEN HEAD-TURN TOWARDS HIM, AND THE THREE-FRAME BLUR AT 190-192.
- E. THAT JFK HIT AT 227, NOT IN HEAD (BY IMPLICATION, IN BACK)-- BASED ON SHARP RISE OF ARMS AND ELBOWS IMMEDIATELY AFTER 226. ALSO NOTED THAT OCCUPANTS OF CAR WERE EXTREMELY BLURRED AT 227.
- G. THAT 313 HEAD-SHOT CAME FROM RIGHT FRONT. (THIS, OF COURSE, WAS SUBSEQUENTLY REVISED TO THE DOUBLE-HIT, IN WRITING IN JUNE '66)
(VINCE HAD ALREADY PUT FORTH THE SINGLE-HEAD-SHOT-FROM-KNOLL THEORY IN JANUARY '65 LIBERATION. WHILE I HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF HIS PIECE WHEN I BEGAN TO FORMULATE MY OWN NOTES THAT SAME MONTH, I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT HIS DISCOVERY PRECEDED MINE).

AS YOU ARE AWARE, I ENGAGED IN A FRIENDLY ARGUMENT WITH VINCE ABOUT THE TIMING OF THE CONNALLY HIT FOR WELL OVER A YEAR, BEGINNING IN AUGUST '65. IN FEBRUARY '66 I DREW UP NEW AND MORE DETAILED NOTES TO ACCOMPANY MY NEW CONNALLY PHOTO PANEL, JC-2, WHICH COVERED FRAMES 225-258. COPIES OF THESE MATERIALS WERE SENT TO VINCE AND OTHERS. IN THESE NOTES I POINT OUT NOT ONLY THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP (WHICH I WOULD CONSIDER DECISIVE EVEN BY ITSELF), BUT ALSO THE ADDITIONAL FACTS THAT HIS BODY TURN WAS INTERRUPTED MOMENTARILY FOR A FEW FRAMES AFTER 238 (UNTIL APPROX. 244), AND ALSO THAT HE SNAPS HIS HEAD AROUND TO HIS RIGHT IN 237-241, AND HOLDS IT THERE THROUGH 244. I ALSO POINTED OUT IN A LETTER TO VINCE THAT A SECOND ROSE COMES INTO VIEW, BEHIND CONNALLY'S SHOULDER, WITH THE DIP IN 238; WHEREAS ONLY ONE WAS VISIBLE IN 237.

ON PAGE XI OF YOUR BOOK, YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT VINCE "IN THE SUMMER OF 1966 . . . SPARED NO EFFORT IN ACQUAINTING ME WITH THE LATEST WORK IN THE FIELD". I HAVE EVERY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT MY HYPOTHESES AND THE ABOVE NOTED JC-2 NOTES WERE INCLUDED IN THIS ACQUAINTANCE, NOR DO I MEAN TO SUGGEST THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN ANYTHING IMPROPER IN THIS. ON THE CONTRARY, I WAS HAPPY TO HAVE MY WORK EXAMINED BY OTHERS.

WHEN WE MET AT LIFE IN OCTOBER '66, YOU STILL DID NOT ACCEPT MY 238 THESIS, AND STILL LEANED TOWARD VINCE'S 292 FOR THE CONNALLY SHOT. SINCE YOU THEREAFTER BECAME A PAID CONSULTANT TO LIFE, I'M SURE YOU WERE SOON MADE AWARE, IN CASE YOU MISSED IT DURING OUR MEETING, THAT ON THAT DAY I HAD CONVINCED LOUDON WAINWRIGHT AND ED KERN OF THE DECISIVE SHOULDER-DIP AT 238.

(I DON'T BLAME YOU FOR ATTEMPTING TO GET AS MUCH MILEAGE AS POSSIBLE OUT OF YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH LIFE BY REPEATEDLY ADVERTISING IT, NOR DO I THINK YOU CAN BE FAULTED FOR THE FACT THAT NONE OF YOUR CONCLUSIONS SHOWED UP IN THEIR ARTICLES OF NOVEMBER 25, '66, OR NOVEMBER 24, '67. NEVERTHELESS, I THINK IT SHOULD BE PART OF THE RECORD TO NOTE THAT MY SINGLE VISIT, IN WHICH I PROVED TO THEM VIA 238 THAT CONNALLY WAS HIT BY A SEPARATE BULLET, BECAME THE BASIS FOR THEIR NOVEMBER 25, '66 COVER STORY, CALLING FOR A NEW INVESTIGATION. THAT ED KERN IN HIS ARTICLE

APPEARED TO ACCEPT CONNALLY 'S OWN 234 VERSION DOES NOT MATERIALLY ALTER THE FACT. ED TOLD ME LATER THE 234 WAS CONNALLY 'S VIEW; ED INDICATED AFTER THE ARTICLE THAT HE STILL FAVORED 238. HE ALSO SAID, IN A LETTER DATED DECEMBER 7, '67:

" . . . I DO REMEMBER YOUR POINTING OUT THAT CONNALLY HAD BEEN STRUCK BETWEEN FRAMES 237 AND 238. I DO NOT HAPPEN TO REMEMBER YOUR THESIS THAT THE SHOT CAME FROM ANOTHER POSITION--OTHER THAN THE TSBD. BUT THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT YOU DIDN 'T TELL ME ABOUT IT. THAT POINT AND OTHERS ALSO WERE OVERSHADOWED AT DISCOVERING HOW CLEARLY OUR COPY OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM REVEALED THE SLUMP IN CONNALLY 'S SHOULDER IN Z238.

"I BELIEVE ALSO--ALTHOUGH I CANNOT BE ABSOLUTELY SURE--THAT THOMPSON FIRST NOTICED THE IMPORTANCE OF Z238 WHEN I POINTED IT OUT TO HIM AFTER TALKING WITH YOU. IF I AM RIGHT, THEN THOMPSON OWES HIS THEORY ON Z238 TO YOUR--SELF INDIRECTLY AND SHOULD GIVE YOU CREDIT FOR IT. YOU AND THOMPSON MET IN MY OFFICE, I RECALL. DIDN'T YOU AND HE DISCUSS THE POINT AT THAT TIME?"

(YES, WE DID DISCUSS IT AT THAT TIME. ED, OF COURSE DID NOT KNOW THAT YOU WERE ALREADY FAMILIAR WITH MY WORK VIA VINCE).

YOU EVIDENTLY BEGAN TO COME AROUND TO MY VIEW SOON THEREAFTER. ON NOVEMBER 3, '66, VINCE WROTE ME:

"TINK THOMPSON, WHOM YOU MET AT LIFE, AND WHO WAS A CONVERT TO THE 292 THEORY (VINCE 'S), NOW IS INCLINED TO AGREE WITH YOU CONCERNING THE 237-238 HIT. CONGRATULATIONS!"

I DON 'T KNOW WHETHER OR NOT YOU READ MY PRE-PUBLICATION "BASTARD BULLET" MANUSCRIPT IN AUGUST '66 WHEN VINCE DID, BUT YOU DO INCLUDE MENTION OF THE PUBLISHED VERSION IN YOUR LISTING OF "SECOND GENERATION" BOOKS ON PAGE VIII OF "SIX SECONDS". ON PAGE 5 OF MY BOOK, I AGAIN REFER TO THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP, AND TO THE FURTHER FACT THAT CONNALLY 'S TURN WAS INTERRUPTED THERE. IN DAVE LIFTON 'S "THREE ASSASSINS" ARTICLE IN THE UCLA BRUIN OF JANUARY 5, '67 (ON WHICH YOU COMMENTED IN YOUR HANDWRITTEN LETTER TO HIM) IT IS NOTED THAT I DISCOVERED THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP AND ITS IMPLICATIONS, AMONG WHICH WAS THE FACT, AS DAVE CITES, OF A LEFT-REAR DIRECTION AS THE PROBABLY SOURCE.

DURING SEVERAL PHONE CALLS THIS YEAR (IN EACH CASE, FROM ME TO YOU) YOU PRAISED MY DISCOVERY OF THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP, WHICH YOU BY THEN HAD COMPLETELY ACCEPTED, ESPECIALLY NOTING--AS YOU DO AGAIN IN YOUR LETTER--THE "LOUBY" COPIES I HAD TO WORK WITH. IT WAS DURING THE FIRST OF THESE PHONE CONVERSATIONS THAT YOU TOLD ME YOU HAD ABANDONED THE 292 THESIS AND ACCEPTED MY 238. YOU ALSO INFORMED ME THAT YOU HAD DISCOVERED, AS FURTHER CORROBORATION OF 238, THAT CONNALLY 'S CHEEKS PUFFED OUT AT THAT POINT, AND EXPLAINED ITS SIGNIFICANCE. I WAS, AS I TOLD YOU, DOUBLY PLEASED; FIRST, THAT YOU HAD ACCEPTED MY VIEW THAT CONNALLY WAS HIT THEN; AND SECOND, THAT TO MY DISCOVERY OF THE SHOULDER-DIP (WHICH I DID AND DO CONSIDER DECISIVE IN ITSELF), AND TO MY OBSERVATION THAT HIS TURN WAS MOMENTARILY INTERRUPTED IMMEDIATELY AFTER 238; YOU HAD NOW ADDED THE FURTHER PROOF OF THE CHEEK-PUFF (THE TURN INTERRUPTION IN ITSELF HAD TWO COMPONENTS; THE BODY TURN, FOLLOWED BY HIS HEAD-SNAP TO HIS RIGHT).

WELL, TINK, HOW DO YOU HANDLE THESE FACTS IN YOUR WRITING? IN YOUR ARTICLE--WHICH I REPEAT IS A SEPARATE ENTITY, AND IN TERMS OF PUBLIC IMPACT, BY FAR THE MORE IMPORTANT--NO CREDIT WHATEVER IS GIVEN ME FOR THE 238 HIT. ON PAGE 46 OF THE POST, WE READ:

"FINALLY, IN FRAME 238, WE SEE A VERY DEFINITE CHANGE INDICATING THE IMPACT OF A BULLET: HIS RIGHT SHOULDER COLLAPSES, HIS CHEEKS AND FACE PUFF, AND HIS HAIR IS DISARRANGED. THE GOVERNOR LOOKS LIKE SOMEONE WHO HAS JUST HAD THE WIND KNOCKED OUT OF HIM. CONNALLY DID NOT DECIDE TO DISARRANGE

HIS HAIR, OR PUFF HIS CHEEKS, OR COLLAPSE HIS RIGHT SHOULDER, NOR WERE THESE NERVOUS REFLEX ACTIONS. THEY WERE DIRECT EFFECTS OF THE STRIKING BULLET".

NEAT TRICK, TINK; YOU NOT ONLY FORGOT TO MENTION THE AUTHOR OF THE SHOULDER-DIP, YOU ALSO NEGLECTED TO MENTION THE INTERRUPTION OF CONNALLY'S TURN, OF WHICH YOU HAD KNOWLEDGE; AND TO YOUR OWN SUPPORTIVE OBSERVATION OF THE CHEEK PUFF, YOU MADE A COMPARITIVE LAUGHER--HIS HAIR IS MUSSED. NATURALLY, SINCE YOU FAILED TO TAKE NOTE OF MY OBSERVATION OF HIS HEAD-SNAP, YOU HAD NO NEED TO CONFRONT THE FACT THAT THE HAIR-MUSS WAS MOST PROBABLY A CONSEQUENCE OF IT, AND SECONDARY TO IT IN IMPORTANCE BY A CONSIDERABLE LENGTH (REMEMBER (NOTE, ON PAGE 72 OF YOUR BOOK, HOW MUCH TO HIS RIGHT CONNALLY'S HEAD HAS TURNED BETWEEN 237-238).

AS THE RESULT OF YOUR INTELLECTUAL SLEIGHT-OF-HAND, IN YOUR ARTICLE A TROIKA EMERGES AT 238: THE SHOULDER-DIP; THE CHEEK-PUFF; AND THE HAIR-MUSS; AND DESPITE THE FACT THAT OF THE THREE ONLY THE SHOULDER DIP COULD BE CONSIDERED DECISIVE IN ITSELF, YOU GIVE THEM EQUAL WEIGHT--SO IT APPEARS TO BE TWO-TO-ONE IN YOUR FAVOR.

(WHAT ELSE BUT A BULLET'S IMPACT COULD HAVE CAUSED SO NOTICEABLE A SHOULDER-DIP IN A SINGLE FRAME? ON THE OTHER HAND, THE CHEEK PUFF BY ITSELF--UNACCOMPANIED BY THE SHOULDER-DIP--COULD WELL BE ATTRIBUTED TO A COUGH, OR AN EXCLAMATION OF FEAR AND SURPRISE AT THE SOUND OF SHOOTING. THE HAIR-MUSS--WITHOUT THE SHOULDER-DIP--COULD WELL BE ATTRIBUTED TO ANY SUDDEN MOTION OF HIS HEAD; YES, EVEN A COUGH OR SUDDEN EXCLAMATION; OR, FOR THAT MATTER, THAT PORTION OF HIS HEAD SUDDENLY BEING EXPOSED TO "SLIP STREAM" OR TO A GUST OF WIND.

(DO YOU SERIOUSLY PROPOSE THAT, IN THE ABSENCE OF THE SHOULDER-DIP, AND TURN-INTERRUPTION, YOU COULD REALLY PROVE TO KNOWLEDGEABLE PEOPLE THAT CONNALLY WAS HIT AT 238, SOLELY ON THE BASES OF THE CHEEK-PUFF AND THE HAIR-MUSS? ON THE OTHER HAND, A MAJORITY OF THE SMALL NUMBER OF CRITICS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE ZAPRUDER FILM WERE CONVINCED ON THE BASIS OF MY 238 DISCOVERIES ALONE, AS WAS LIFE. YOUR FINDS WERE OBVIOUSLY NOT ESSENTIAL, BUT SUPPORTIVE TO THE 238 HIT, AS I AM CERTAIN YOU WOULD BE QUICK TO POINT OUT HAD MY DISCOVERIES BEEN YOURS, AND YOURS, MINE)

IN YOUR LETTER OF NOVEMBER 27, '67 TO EMERSON OF THE SATVEPOST, YOU MAKE A NUMBER OF CORRECTIONS IN THE ARTICLE. HERE, ALSO, WHILE CREDITING ME WITH THE SHOULDER-DIP, YOU ARE CAREFUL TO STATE:

"THIS COLLAPSE, ONE OF THREE INDICES OF A BULLET HIT AT THIS POINT, WAS FIRST SPOTTED BY MR. MARCUS IN THE SPRING OF 1965, AND IS NOTED IN HIS MONOGRAPH, THE BASTARD BULLET".

AS TO THE CREDIT, BETTER LATE THAN NEVER, EVEN IF IT MAY HAVE TAKEN MY LETTER TO YOU OF NOVEMBER 20 TO PROMPT YOU. BUT HERE AGAIN, YOU IMPLICITLY EQUATE THE HAIR-MUSS TO THE SHOULDER-DIP IN IMPORTANCE, AND WITH NO MENTION THAT IT WAS MY DISCOVERY OF THE LATTER THAT LED YOU TO YOUR BELATED CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE OTHER TWO (I NOTE MY LETTER DID NOT MOVE YOU TO ACKNOWLEDGE TO EMERSON MY INDEPENDENT AND PRIOR DISCOVERY OF THE DOUBLE-HIT, EVEN THOUGH VINCE SAYS YOU WERE INFORMED OF THIS BY HIM WELL OVER A YEAR AGO).

BUT WHOM AM I LECTURING HERE? A NOVICE, WHO HAS LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OF THE CONTENTS OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM? NOT AT ALL; I AM ADDRESSING TINK THOMPSON, WHO MUST SURELY QUALIFY AS ONE OF THE MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE NON-GOVERNMENTAL INDIVIDUALS IN THE WORLD ON THIS VITAL EVIDENCE (I CONSIDER THE OTHERS TO BE LILLIAN CASTELLANO, DAVE LIFTON, VINCE SALANDRIA, AND MYSELF). YOU YOURSELF REFER TO IT AS "A CRUCIAL HISTORICAL DOCUMENT" AND AS "THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF EVIDENCE". (I, OF COURSE, AGREE, AND CONSIDERED IT SO FROM THE

THE FIRST TIME I SAW THE BLACK AND WHITE FRAMES IN LIFE, NOVEMBER 29, 1963. THAT 'S WHY MY FIRST CONCERTED EFFORTS AFTER THE RELEASE OF THE VOLUMES IN NOV '64 WAS THE DEVELOPMENT OF MY "HYPOTHESES").

SINCE WE KNOW THAT YOU DO NOT BELIEVE THE CHEEK-PUFF AND HAIR-MUSS TO BE EQUAL IN IMPORTANCE TO THE SHOULDER-DIP (EVEN LEAVING ASIDE THE TURN-INTERRUPTION), WHY DO YOU PRESENT THEM, IN YOUR ARTICLE, AND LETTERS TO ME AND TO EMERSON, AS IF THEY WERE -- EVEN WHILE INDICATING THE CONTRARY ON PAGE 74 OF YOUR BOOK? IS THIS ACCIDENT OR DESIGN?

IS IT ACCIDENT OR DESIGN THAT IN NONE OF THESE WRITINGS, NOT EVEN IN YOUR BOOK, DO YOU NOTE THE FACT THAT YOU CAME TO MY 238 VIEW ONLY AFTER HOLDING ANOTHER VIEW FOR MANY MONTHS?

IN YOUR LETTER TO ME, YOU DEAL WITH THIS IN SIMILAR FASHION. YOU SAY:

" WE ARE ALL IN YOUR DEBT FOR THIS DISCOVERY MADE WITH THE POOREST DATA IMAGINABLE, NAMELY THE LOUSY COPIES ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM IN LIFE MAGAZINE (I ALSO USED THE LOUSY COPIES IN VOL. 18, AND THE LOUSY BLOOPS I MADE FROM ALL THOSE LOUSY COPIES--RM) NOW, THE OTHER TWO INDICES OF A BULLET HIT, NAMELY, THE DISARRANGING OF THE GOVERNOR'S HAIR, AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, THE PUFFING OF HIS CHEEKS AND FACE--I TAKE IT THAT YOU DO NOT CLAIM CREDIT FOR DISCOVERING THESE TWO OTHER INDICES?"

THAT 'S RIGHT, TINK-- I DON'T. NOR, IF I WERE YOU, WOULD I BE PROUD OF YOUR SOPHOMORIC DEBATING-SOCIETY PLOY OF SUGGESTING THAT I MIGHT TAKE CREDIT FOR YOUR "DISARRANGING OF THE GOVERNOR 'S HAIR", OR YOUR "MOST IMPORTANTLY, THE PUFFING OF HIS CHEEKS AND FACE." YOU DAMN WELL KNOW I HAVE NEVER ATTEMPTED TO TAKE CREDIT FOR ANYTHING YOU HAVE DONE--OR FOR THAT MATTER, WHAT ANYONE ELSE HAS DONE.

(INDEED, OUTSIDE OF THE CHEEK-PUFF, UNTIL THE APPEARANCE OF YOUR ARTICLE AND BOOK I HAD NO WAY OF EVEN KNOWING WHAT YOU HAD DONE; AND NOW THAT I KNOW, I'M NOT PARTICULARLY HAPPY WITH WHAT I SEE).

IT WAS NOT I; BUT YOU, WHO WROTE AN ARTICLE FOR 28 MILLION PEOPLE, GIVING THE FALSE IMPRESSION THAT ITS TWO MOST CRUCIAL PROPOSITIONS WERE YOUR OWN ORIGINALS, REMEMBER? (NOR CAN I REALLY ACCEPT AS A VALID EXCUSE YOUR STATEMENT THAT ". . . THE SATVEPOST WAS UNABLE TO USE FOOTNOTES" IN THEIR PRESENTATION. THE ARTICLE WAS WRITTEN BY YOU, AND APPEARS UNDER YOUR NAME. YOU CAN'T READILY ESCAPE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS CONTENTS AND OMISSIONS. THE FACT THAT SOMEONE OTHER THAN YOURSELF MADE THE ORIGINAL DISCOVERY OF EVEN ONE OF THESE PROPOSITIONS, LET ALONE BOTH, SHOULD HAVE WARRANTED INCLUSION IN THE BODY OF YOUR ARTICLE. COMPARE, FOR INSTANCE, YOUR INCLUSION OF SUCH OBVIOUSLY VITAL INFORMATION AS YOUR RACY ACCOUNT OF YOUR REVIEW OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM AT LIFE:

"I KNEW EACH MOVEMENT IN DETAIL--YET THIS TIME THERE WAS SOMETHING ABOUT THE IMAGE ON THE SCREEN THAT ASTOUNDED ME. I WAS CERTAIN THE PICTURE WAS INFINITELY BRIGHTER AND CLEARER THAN THE ONE I HAD SEEN EARLIER IN THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES IN WASHINGTON. I KNEW THAT NEITHER THE LENS OF THE ARCHIVES PROJECTOR NOR ITS BULB COULD HAVE ACCOUNTED FOR THE WEAKER IMAGE BECAUSE I HAD CHECKED THEM BOTH . . ." -- ALL THIS, LEADING UP TO YOUR QUESTION TO A LIFE EDITOR WHO OPINED THAT THE ARCHIVES COPY WAS A COPY OF A COPY, WHICH WHEN YOU ". . . LATER CHECKED THE RECORD, TURNED OUT TO BE THE CASE".

I HATE TO THROW WEISBERG BACK AT YOU, OLD BOY, BUT A CONSIDERABLE NUMBER OF LINES COULD HAVE BEEN SAVED (PERHAPS EVEN ENOUGH FOR PROPER CREDITING OF SOURCES?), ALBEIT AT THE EXPENSE OF SOME EXCITING PROSE, HAD YOU CHECKED PAGES 212-213 OF WHITEWASH II, PREDATING YOUR ARTICLE BY ONE YEAR. ALTHOUGH LIKE MOST OF HAROLD'S STUFF IT REQUIRES VERY CAREFUL READING, HE REALLY DOES SAY--AND DOCUMENTS IT--THAT THE ARCHIVES COPY IS INDEED A COPY OF A COPY).

AND AGAIN, IN YOUR LETTER, NO MENTION OF THE INTERRUPTION OF CONNALLY'S TURN, WHICH YOU HAD TO KNOW ABOUT FROM PAGE 5 OF "BASTARD BULLET", IF NOT FROM MY JC-2 NOTES, OR OUR CONVERSATIONS. I FEAR SUCH NEGLECTFUL TREATMENT MIGHT MAKE IT FEEL LIKE "THE BASTARD INTERRUPTION".

YOUR LETTER CONTINUES: "I FOUND THEM WHEN WORKING AT LIFE MAGAZINE ON THE GOOD COPIES OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM".

AND I'M GLAD YOU DID. I'M GLAD MY VISIT TO LIFE, DURING WHICH I PROVED A 238 HIT, STIMULATED YOU TO LOOK FURTHER FOR A HIT AT 238; DESPITE YOUR EARLIER REJECTION OF IT. I BELIEVE THE WILLINGNESS TO ABANDON PREVIOUSLY HELD BUT ERRONEOUS IDEAS, IN THE FACE OF CONCLUSIVE PROOF, IS AN ADMIRABLE TRAIT FOR ANYONE - EVEN COLLEGE PROFESSORS.

THEN YOU SAY: "IF YOU AGREE WITH ALL THIS, THEN IT SEEMS TO ME THAT YOU MUST AGREE THAT IN MY BOOK I'VE GIVEN YOU PROPER CREDIT FOR THE DISCOVERY YOU MADE, NAMELY THE COLLAPSE OF THE GOVERNOR'S SHOULDER AT ZAPRUDER 238."

WELL, IF NOTHING ELSE, I BELIEVE I HAVE THUS FAR DEMONSTRATED THAT I DO NOT ". . . AGREE WITH ALL THIS". ~~HOWEVER~~ I CONCEDE THAT YOUR BOOK, WHILE FAR LESS IMPORTANT THAN THE ARTICLE IN TERMS OF IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON VAST NUMBERS OF PEOPLE, IS OBVIOUSLY MORE IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF THE PERMANENT AND FULL RECORD OF YOUR WORK.

I THINK IT IS APPROPRIATE TO STATE HERE WHAT I SINCERELY BELIEVE TO BE THE CASE; THAT MY DISCOVERY OF THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP WAS THE SINGLE MOST CRUCIAL FOUNDATION BLOCK UPON WHICH YOUR ENTIRE BOOK IS BASED (SECOND, OF COURSE, REMKE WAS THE DOUBLE-HIT). WITHOUT IT, THERE WOULD BE NO CONCLUSIVE PROOF INDICATING THE FRAME AT WHICH CONNALLY WAS HIT, MAKING IT DIFFICULT IF NOT IMPOSSIBLE TO DISPROVE THE COMMISSION'S ESSENTIAL SINGLE-BULLET THEORY. WITHOUT 238, THERE WOULD BE NO ABSOLUTELY FIXED TIME POINT IN THE ZAPRUDER FILM, EXCEPT 31B; AND THEREFORE WE WOULD NOT HAVE THE NECESSARY MINIMUM OF TWO SUCH FIXED POINTS UPON WHICH TO BUILD OUR RECONSTRUCTIONS. FEW PEOPLE IN THE COUNTRY WILL FULLY APPRECIATE THAT THIS IS SO, BUT YOU MOST CERTAINLY ARE ONE OF THOSE FEW (IF YOU HAVE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THIS EVALUATION I'LL BE ANXIOUS TO SEE THEM).

WITH THIS IN MIND, LET US SEE HOW YOU DEAL WITH THE MATTER IN YOUR BOOK, AND THEN CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAVE ". . . GIVEN . . . PROPER CREDIT FOR THE DISCOVERY".

THE FIRST THING OF NOTE IS THAT, (IN MARKED CONTRAST TO THE IMPRESSION CONVEYED IN YOUR ARTICLE, AND IN YOUR LETTERS TO EMERSON, AND ME) YOU ARE INDEED AWARE OF THE CRUCIAL NATURE AND PRIMARY IMPORTANCE, OF THE SHOULDER-DIP. YOU STATE THE OBVIOUS TRUTHS THAT ". . . THE DISARRANGEMENT OF A LOCK OF THE GOVERNOR'S HAIR AT 2238 IS THE LEAST IMPORTANT ^{OF THE} SIGNS OF IMPACT", AND THAT ". . . THE clearest indication of the impact of a bullet is the sudden collapse of the Governor's shoulder". IN VIEW OF THIS, I DO NOT FEEL THAT THE CREDIT LONE AT THE END OF THE CHAPTER, NOTING MY DISCOVERY OF THE SHOULDER-DIP IN SPRING OF 1965, IS ADEQUATE. I CERTAINLY DO NOT MEAN TO DICTATE YOUR CHOICE OF LANGUAGE IN RENDERING CREDIT; BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT, IF AN AUTHOR WISHES TO BE FAIR AND HONEST, HE IS OBLIGATED TO RENDER SUCH CREDIT IN A MANNER THAT WILL CONVEY TO HIS READERS HIS OWN RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE GIVEN FINDING. IN THIS CASE, THAT WOULD MEAN, AT A MINIMUM, A NOTE ON THE PAGE WHERE THE MATTER WAS BEING DISCUSSED; AND, MORE PROPERLY, MENTION IN THE BODY OF THE TEXT. NOR CAN THIS PUREUNCTORY AND MINIMAL TREATMENT IN ATTRIBUTING THE SOURCE OF SO IMPORTANT A FINDING BE EXPLAINED BY A GENERALLY SPARE AND CLINICAL WRITING STYLE; FOR IT CONTRASTS SHARPLY WITH THE NUMEROUS EXAMPLES OF SELF-DRAMATIZATION IN BOTH YOUR ARTICLE AND BOOK.

AND, AS IN YOUR ARTICLE, NO MENTION OF THE TURN INTERRUPTION. EVEN IF, CONTRARY TO THE FACT, WE HAD NEVER DISCUSSED THIS, AND EVEN IF IT HAD NOT APPEARED IN "THE BASTARD BULLET"; AND IN MY JC-2 NOTES, YOU COULD HARDLY HAVE FAILED TO MAKE THIS OBSERVATION IN YOUR STUDY OF THE FILM, ONCE YOUR ATTENTION WAS DRAWN TO 238. THE SKETCHES OF FRAMES 237-240 ON PAGE 75 OF YOUR BOOK ARE SUFFICIENT TO ILLUSTRATE THE TURN-INTERRUPTION OF THE BODY, AND HIS HEAD-SNAP TO HIS RIGHT -- ALTHOUGH SEVERAL ADDITIONAL CONSECUTIVE FRAMES WOULD DEMONSTRATE THIS MORE FULLY.

(IN MY JC-2 NOTES OF FEBRUARY '66, I ATTEMPTED TO ROUGHLY QUANTIFY THE BODY-AND-HEAD-TURN/INTERRUPTION. YOU YOURSELF PRESENT A VALUABLE QUANTIFICATION OF THE SHOULDER-DIP ON PAGE 75; SOMETHING WHICH I DID NOT DO).

AFTER CONCEDING ON PAGE 74 THAT THE SHOULDER-DIP IS "THE clearest INDICATION" OF AN IMPACT, YOU DEAL WITH THE COMMISSION'S ATTEMPT TO DESCRIBE CONNALLY'S REACTION AS A DELAYED ONE (TO THE SAME BULLET THAT STRUCK KENNEDY) AS FOLLOWS:

"THE COMMISSION'S LAME EXCUSE THAT "THERE WAS, CONCEIVABLY, A DELAYED REACTION BETWEEN THE TIME THE BULLET STRUCK HIM AND THE TIME HE REALIZED THAT HE WAS HIT" IS QUITE BESIDE THE POINT. WHAT WE SEE AT 238 IS NOT THE EFFECT OF HIS REALIZING HE WAS HIT (THIS WILL SHOW UP LATER IN THE FILM), BUT SIMPLY THE PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCES OF A BULLET STRIKING HIS BODY. THIS INDISPUTABLE PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE SHATTERS BOTH THE "SINGLE-BULLET THEORY" AND ITS OFFSPRING, THE "DELAYED REACTION" THEORY."

ALTHOUGH YOU FAILED TO MENTION "THE BASTARD BULLET" IN THIS CONNECTION, IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE HOW SIMILAR THE ABOVE-QUOTED PASSAGE IS TO THAT APPEARING ON PAGES 4-5 OF MY MONOGRAPH:

"THE COMMISSION ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE THE TIME DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE TWO REACTIONS (JFK'S AND CONNALLY'S--RM) OF THE VICTIMS BY SUGGESTING THAT GOVERNOR CONNALLY'S WAS A DELAYED REACTION. BUT THE ZAPRUDER FILM PRECLUDES SUCH A POSSIBILITY, FOR IT SHOWS NOT MERELY THE GOVERNOR'S REACTION, BUT ALSO PROVES THAT HE WAS HIT IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO FRAME 238.

"AT THAT POINT GOVERNOR CONNALLY HAD BEEN TURNING TO HIS RIGHT, WHEN SUDDENLY--IN THE 1/18 SECOND WHICH HAD ELAPSED SINCE PRECEDING FRAME 237-- HE IS HALTED IN MID-TURN, HIS RIGHT SHOULDER IS THRUST FORWARD (TOWARD THE CAMERA) AND DOWN, AND IMMEDIATELY THEREAFTER HIS MOUTH POPS OPEN. (GOV. CONNALLY, IN HIS TESTIMONY, STATED: "I IMMEDIATELY, WHEN I WAS HIT I SAID, 'OH, NO, NO, NO!'"

"THE SUDDEN FORWARD THRUST OF HIS SHOULDER, IN A DIRECTION OPPOSITE FROM THAT IN WHICH HE WAS TURNING, IS CONCLUSIVE PROOF THAT THIS WAS NOT A DELAYED REACTION TO PAIN, BUT THE VERY MOMENT OF IMPACT. TO MAINTAIN IN THE FACE OF THIS IRREFUTABLE PROOF THAT BOTH MEN WERE STRUCK BY A SINGLE BULLET, ONE MUST ALSO ACCEPT THAT THE COMMISSION'S MAGICALLY WEAVING MISSILE SOMEHOW PAUSED IN MID-AIR FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE SECOND AFTER EXITING THE PRESIDENT'S THROAT BEFORE ~~RECONCILING THE TIME DIFFERENCE~~ STRIKING THE GOVERNOR'S BACK." (UNDERLINES IN ORIGINAL)

IS IT CONSISTENT WITH INTELLECTUAL ETHICS AND THE "SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE" OF WHICH YOU SPEAK IN YOUR LETTER FOR YOU TO OMIT MENTION OF THE FACT THAT, FOR MONTHS, YOU YOURSELF HAD PREVIOUSLY HELD AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT VIEW OF WHEN CONNALLY WAS STRUCK (292), AND EVENTUALLY CAME TO MY VIEW ONLY AFTER RESTUDY ON YOUR PART, AFTER DISCUSSING THE POINT WITH VINCE, ME, AND KERN? EVEN IF ONE JUSTIFIES SUCH AN OMISSION, FOR REASONS OF SPACE, FROM YOUR ARTICLE; SURLY NO SUCH JUSTIFICATION IS APPLICABLE TO YOUR BOOK. SHOULD THIS NOT PROPERLY HAVE BEEN MADE A PART OF YOUR PERMANENT RECORD?

THIS OMISSION IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH A DESIRE ON YOUR PART TO HAVE THAT RECORD AS ACCURATE AS POSSIBLE; AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ALREADY DISCERNIBLE PATTERN, IN CASES WHERE WE ARE CONNECTED TO THE SAME OBSERVATIONS, OF MAXIMIZING YOUR OWN CONTRIBUTIONS AND MINIMIZING MINE.

(I BELIEVE THE PROPER LISTING OF CRITERIA OF THE CONNALLY 238 HIT, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF IMPORTANCE, WOULD BE AS FOLLOWS: (1) THE SHOULDER-DIP; (2) THE TURN-INTERRUPTION OF, (A) HIS BODY, AND (B) HIS HEAD; (3) THE CHEEK-PUFF; (4) THE HAIR-MUSS

BY NO OBJECTIVE STANDARD OF INQUIRY CAN THE TURN-INTERRUPTION BE LEFT OUT; AND WHILE SOME MAY HONESTLY ARGUE THAT THE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF THE INTERRUPTION AND THE CHEEK-PUFF SHOULD BE REVERSED, THIS CERTAINLY CAN NOT BE SAID OF THE INTERRUPTION AND THE HAIR-MUSS.

(FURTHER, I BELIEVE IT IS WORTH NOTING HERE THAT WHILE YOU LIST THE HAIR-MUSS AS A SIGNIFICANT INDEX OF A HIT, AND INDEED IN WRITINGS OTHER THAN YOUR BOOK CONVEY THE IMPRESSION IT IS EQUAL IN IMPORTANCE TO THE SHOULDER-DIP, YOU IGNORE MORE COMPELLING EVIDENCE APPLICABLE TO OTHER SHOTS, WHEN THEY DO NOT FIT THE PATTERN YOU HAVE SELECTED. FOR EXAMPLE, A SHOT SIGNIFICANTLY PRIOR TO Z210 WOULD UPSET SOME OF YOUR KEY CONCLUSIONS. THIS PERHAPS EXPLAINS YOUR FAILURE TO CONFRONT THE FACT THAT BETWEEN FRAMES 189 AND 198, THE FOLLOWING PHENOMENA OCCUR:

1. JFK RAPIDLY DROPS HIS RIGHT HAND TO CHIN/THROAT LEVEL.
2. JACKIE SNAPS HER HEAD AROUND TO FULLY FACE HIM
3. THE ZAPRUDER FILM BREAKS UP DRAMATICALLY INTO A BLUR (190-192).
(FROM MY NOTES, JFK-2)

SINCE, THESE OBSERVATIONS WERE POINTED OUT TO YOU OVER A YEAR AGO, AND DISCUSSED BETWEEN US, AND BETWEEN YOU AND VINCE, SEVERAL TIMES, YOUR FAILURE TO DEAL WITH THEM IS SUSPECT. CERTAINLY, ~~IN~~ A LITMUS TEST OF INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY IS THE WILLINGNESS TO CONFRONT OPPOSING ARGUMENTS, AND TO DEAL WITH THEM OBJECTIVELY.

UNFORTUNATELY, THIS FAILURE TO CONFRONT INCONVENIENT EVIDENCE FITS INTO A SECOND PATTERN DISCERNIBLE IN YOUR WORK; THAT OF CONSISTENTLY OPTING FOR RELATIVELY INNOCENT INTERPRETATIONS OF CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH, OBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED, INDICATE PROBABLY FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY BY HIGHER-UPS.

ANOTHER STRIKING EXAMPLE IS YOUR RATHER LUDICROUS ATTEMPT TO LEGITIMIZE BULLET 399 AS HAVING BEEN INNOCENTLY PLANTED BY A "CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN SOUVENIR HUNTER". OF COURSE, YOU DON'T ACTUALLY SAY THIS HAPPENED--YOU MERELY RESOLVE THE QUESTION BY ASKING ANOTHER ONE:

" . . . IS IT BEYOND THE REALM OF POSSIBILITY THAT SOME HOSPITAL EMPLOYEE FOUND BULLET 399 ON THE FLOOR, IN THE PRESIDENT'S CLOTHES, OR ON HIS STRETCHER, AND MOMENTARILY SNATCHED IT AS A SOUVENIR, ONLY TO RECOGNIZE ITS IMPORTANCE AND QUICKLY SECRETE IT ON A STRETCHER WHERE IT MIGHT BE FOUND BY SOMEONE ELSE--NO QUESTIONS ASKED?"

No, TINK, IT IS NOT BEYOND THE "REALM OF POSSIBILITY" -- JUST AS IT'S NOT BEYOND THE REALM OF POSSIBILITY THAT YOUR THREE ASSASSINS HAD NO CONFEDERATES, AND NO KNOWLEDGE OF EACH OTHER; A "POSSIBILITY" CERTAINLY IMPLICIT ON PAGE 55 OF YOUR ARTICLE:

"WHAT DOES THIS COLLECTION OF NEW EVIDENCE PROVE? IT DOES NOT PROVE CONSPIRACY . . . "

A FULLER ANALYSIS OF THIS PATTERN WILL BE THE SUBJECT OF A LATER LETTER.)

Z-314-315 TRANSPOSITION

ANOTHER INSTANCE OF "CARELESSNESS" WAS YOUR FAILURE TO CREDIT ME FOR HAVING EXPOSED THE 314-315 SWITCH. IN A FOOTNOTE ON PAGE 89 OF YOUR BOOK YOU RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RECTIFICATION OF THIS "PRINTING ERROR", AS FOLLOWS:

"AS DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER OF THE FBI HAS ADMITTED IN A LETTER DATED DEC. 24, 1965, FRAMES 314 AND 315 OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM WERE SWITCHED IN BEING PRINTED IN VOLUME XVIII. CURIOUSLY, THIS IS THE ONLY SWITCH IN THE PRINTING OF 163 ZAPRUDER FRAMES. THE EFFECT OF THIS MISTAKE IS TO MAKE A BACKWARD MOVEMENT LOOK LIKE A FORWARD MOVEMENT." (EMPHASIS IN ORIGINAL)

ALTHOUGH I FIRST WROTE OF THIS IN THE CAPTION OF MY PHOTO-PANEL JFK-1 IN JUNE '65, WHICH I'M QUITE SURE WAS AVAILABLE TO YOU THROUGH VINCE, YOU TOLD ME DURING ONE OF OUR PHONE CONVERSATIONS THAT YOU HAD BEEN UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT THIS WAS DAVE LIFTON'S DISCOVERY. WHEN I EXPLAINED TO YOU THAT HE HAD LEARNED OF IT FROM ME, AND HAD SUBSEQUENTLY OBTAINED FROM J. EDGAR HOOVER WRITTEN CONFIRMATION OF MY OBSERVATION (FACTS WHICH DAVE WOULD HAVE PROMPTLY AFFIRMED, HAD YOU DOUBTED ME) YOU TOLD ME YOU WERE PLEASED TO HAVE THIS INFORMATION SO THAT YOU COULD PROPERLY CREDIT MY DISCOVERY, AS WELL AS DAVE'S EXTRACTION OF HOOVER'S WRITTEN CONFIRMATION. I SEE YOU NEGLECTED TO DO EITHER; THUS LEAVING THE IMPLICATION THAT IT WAS YOU WHO MADE BOTH CONTRIBUTIONS.

FOR ONE WHO BASES VIRTUALLY HIS ENTIRE PRESENTATION ON THE ZAPRUDER FILM, THIS WOULD BE A STRIKING OMISSION ON YOUR PART, EVEN IF IT DID NOT FORM PART OF THE PATTERN I HAVE NOTED. HOWEVER, THE OBVIOUS FACT IS THAT IT DOES FIT THIS PATTERN. ANOTHER "OVERSIGHT" PERHAPS, BUT THE ODDS ARE ACCUMULATING.

BULLET 399

BY UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT C.E. 399 IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT SINGLE PIECES OF EVIDENCE IN THE CASE; AND OBVIOUSLY THE MOST IMPORTANT ITEM OF BALLISTIC EVIDENCE. VIRTUALLY EVERY PIECE OF LITERATURE DEALING WITH THE FACTS OF THE ASSASSINATION, WHETHER BY CRITIC OR COUNTER-CRITIC, PAYS IT SOME ATTENTION. BY ITS IDENTIFICATION AS A PUTATIVE ASSASSINATION BULLET WITH THE MANNLICHER-CARGANO RIFLE, 399 IS A KEYSTONE IN THE COMMISSION'S CASE; AND AT THE SAME TIME, THE MOST VULNERABLE OF ACHILLE'S HEELS. VIRTUALLY ALL CRITICS HAVE SHOWN--WITH GENERALLY COMPELLING EVIDENCE--THAT 399 COULD NOT HAVE ACCOMPLISHED ALL THE WOUNDS OR THE TWO VICTIMS ATTRIBUTED TO IT BY THE COMMISSION. ALTHOUGH THIS HAD BEEN AMPLY DEMONSTRATED IN VINCE'S EARLY LIBERATION ARTICLES, AND OTHER WORK APPEARING IN 1965, I NEVERTHELESS FELT THAT ANOTHER PART OF THE STORY--AND POTENTIALLY THE MORE IMPORTANT PART--HAD YET TO BE TOLD. I SUSPECTED THAT 399 WAS NOT FIRED IN ANGER AT ANYONE, AND THAT IT WAS A PLANT.

I CERTAINLY WAS NOT ALONE IN THIS SUSPICION, BUT NO ONE HAD YET PROBED THIS QUESTION IN PUBLISHED ARTICLES; AND I URGED VINCE, DURING THE LATTER PART OF '65, TO TACKLE THE JOB. HOWEVER, WHEN HIS ARTICLE ON 399 APPEARED IN TMO MARCH '66, HE DID NOT EXAMINE THE "PLANTING" QUESTION; AND I THEN DETERMINED TO DO IT MYSELF. I HAD ALMOST COMPLETED MY MANUSCRIPT WHEN POPKIN'S ARTICLE, "THE SECOND OSWALD" APPEARED IN THE N.Y.R REVIEW JULY 28, '66, AN IMPORTANT PART OF WHICH WAS AN EXAMINATION OF 399 IN WHICH HE PUT FORTH THE "PLANT" THEORY FOR THE FIRST TIME IN PRINT.

HOWEVER (AND SOMEWHAT TO MY RELIEF, FOR I HAD BY THEN SPENT SEVERAL WEEKS ON MY MONOGRAPH), I FOUND HE HAD NOT USED THE APPROACH I HAD USED, NOR WAS HIS COVERAGE OF 399 AS EXTENSIVE AS MY OWN (I HAD EARLY DECIDED THAT, SINCE--IF PLANTED--EYEWITNESSES AND/OR CULPRITS WERE UNLIKELY BY THAT TIME TO MAKE THE FACTS PUBLIC, THE ONLY WAY TO ARRIVE AT A CONCLUSION OF 399'S ACTUAL ROLE WAS TO EXAMINE ALL REASONABLE HYPOTHESES CONVERGING ITS "LEGITIMATE" INVOLVEMENT AS AN ASSASSINATION BULLET. ONLY AFTER THIS WAS DONE, AS FULLY AND AS OBJECTIVELY AS I WAS ABLE, DID I FEEL JUSTIFIED IN CONCLUDING THAT 399 WAS PLANTED).

VINCE READ A PRE-PUBLICATION COPY OF MY MONOGRAPH IN AUGUST '66. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU READ IT AT THAT TIME, OR NOT UNTIL AFTER ITS PUBLICATION IN DECEMBER; BUT, AS NOTED EARLIER, YOU DO LIST IT NEAR THE FRONT OF YOUR BOOK. A NUMBER OF ITEMS IN YOUR BOOK LEAVE NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT YOU READ IT, AND USED IT FREELY --WITHOUT SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTION--WHEN COVERING 399 AND THE COMMISSION'S SINGLE BULLET THEORY.

IN THE TABLE OF CONTENTS OF MY BOOK YOU ARE, I'M SURE, AWARE THAT THERE IS LISTED A CHAPTER 5 ENTITLED "WHICH STRETCHER?". I CERTAINLY DO NOT CLAIM PROPERTY RIGHTS OVER THE WORDS "WHICH" OR "STRETCHER", EVEN WHEN SPOKEN TOGETHER, BUT ISN'T IT UNUSUAL, AND IS IT PROPER, FOR YOU TO USE THE EXACT SAME TITLE FOR A SECTION HEADING DEALING WITH THIS QUESTION (YOUR PG 154) WITHOUT REFERRING THERE TO MY WORK -- ESPECIALLY SINCE MY BOOK WAS (AT LEAST FIGURATIVELY SPEAKING) ON YOUR DESK AS YOU WROTE YOURS?

FURTHER, IN MY CHAPTER BY THAT NAME, I STATED THAT NEITHER OF THE TWO STRETCHERS NEAR TOMLINSON WHEN HE FOUND THE BULLET COULD HAVE BEEN JFK'S; INCLUDING THEREIN A TIME-RECONSTRUCTION WHICH ALL BUT PRECLUDED THE POSSIBILITY. IF SO HAPPENS, THIS WAS THE FIRST TIME SUCH A RECONSTRUCTION, AS APPLIED TO THE STRETCHER QUESTION, HAD APPEARED IN ANY OF THE LITERATURE (LILLIAN CASTELLANO FIRST SPOKE TO ME OF THE POSSIBILITY OF PRECLUDING JFK'S STRETCHER ON A TIME BASIS. I AM INDEBTED TO HER FOR THIS, ALTHOUGH THE TIME CRITERIA SHE SUGGESTED WERE NOT THE ONES I USED).

QUOTE FROM "BASTARD BULLET", PAGES 16-17:

"THE EVIDENCE, ALBEIT CIRCUMSTANTIAL, APPEARS TO ADEQUATELY SUPPORT THE COMMISSION'S CONCLUSION THAT NEITHER OF THE TWO STRETCHERS COULD HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S. TOMLINSON TESTIFIES THAT ON NOVEMBER 22, HE WENT TO THE ELEVATOR AT APPROXIMATELY 1:00 P.M., FOUND AN EMPTY STRETCHER THERE, AND MOVED IT INTO THE CORRIDOR NEXT TO THE SECOND STRETCHER. BUT AT 1:00 P.M., PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S BODY WAS STILL LYING ON HIS STRETCHER IN ANOTHER ROOM OF THE EMERGENCY AREA. HE WAS NOT LIFTED OFF IT INTO A COFFIN UNTIL SOMETIME AFTER 1:40 P.M. THEREFORE, IF TOMLINSON IS ANYWHERE NEAR CORRECT AS TO THE 1:00 P.M. TIME HE GIVES, NEITHER THE STRETCHER HE REMOVED FROM THE ELEVATOR NOR THE ONE HE FOUND IN THE CORRIDOR COULD POSSIBLY BE PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S. FURTHERMORE, UNLIKE EITHER THE CORRIDOR OR THE ELEVATOR STRETCHER, PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S HAD BEEN STRIPPED OF ALL SHEETS AND PARAPHERNALIA AFTER HE WAS LIFTED FROM IT, LEAVING ONLY A RUBBER MATTRESS, AFTER WHICH IT WAS PUSHED INTO A NEARBY EMPTY ROOM. THERE IS NO INDICATION THAT IT WAS MOVED FROM THERE ANYTIME (SOON) THEREAFTER -- NEAR THE ELEVATOR OR ELSEWHERE.

"TO BELIEVE, THEN, THAT EITHER OF THE TWO STRETCHERS OF WHICH TOMLINSON SPEAKS COULD HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S, ONE MUST BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING:

THAT SOME UNKNOWN PERSON REPLACED SHEETS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STRETCHER AFTER THEY HAD BEEN REMOVED; THAT SOME UNKNOWN PERSON THEN WHEELED IT ONTO THE ELEVATOR OR INTO THE CORRIDOR; THAT THIS WAS DONE PRIOR TO TOMLINSON'S INITIAL ARRIVAL AT THE ELEVATOR; AND THEREFORE, THAT SENIOR ENGINEER TOMLINSON WAS IN ERROR BY AT LEAST FORTY MINUTES IN GIVING THE 1:00 P.M. TIME FOR HIS ARRIVAL THERE. (UNDERLINES IN ORIGINAL)

ONE YEAR LATER, THE SECOND WRITEUP OF THIS TIME CONTRAINT APPEARS IN THE LITERATURE; THIS TIME, QUITE APPROPRIATELY, IN YOUR "WHICH STRETCHER?" SECTION (PG 158):

"COULD IT HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STRETCHER ON WHICH TOMLINSON FOUND A BULLET? ALMOST CERTAINLY NOT. THE PRESIDENT WAS TAKEN TO TRAUMA ROOM 1, WHERE HE WAS PRONOUNCED DEAD AT 1:00 P.M. HIS BODY REMAINED ON THIS STRETCHER IN TRAUMA ROOM 1 UNTIL THE CASKET ARRIVED AT 1:40 P.M. IT WAS THEN LIFTED UP AND PLACED IN THE CASKET WHILE THE STRETCHER WAS STRIPPED OF

SHEETS AND ROLLED ACROSS THE HALL INTO TRAUMA ROOM 2. THERE IS EVERY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THE PRESIDENT'S STRETCHER WAS STILL IN TRAUMA ROOM 2 WHEN THE PRESIDENTIAL PARTY DEPARTED AT 2:00 P.M. BUT TOMLINSON FOUND THE BULLET AT APPROXIMATELY 1:45 P.M. THUS, THE KENNEDY STRETCHER COULD NOT HAVE BEEN THE ONE ON WHICH THE BULLET WAS FOUND BECAUSE (1) IT WAS STRIPPED OF LINEN WHILE TOMLINSON'S STRETCHER CARRIED BOTH SHEETS AND EQUIPMENT, AND (2) ITS MOVEMENTS ARE ACCOUNTED FOR UNTIL AFTER THE TIME THE BULLET WAS FOUND."

I AM WELL AWARE THAT RESEARCHERS CAN AND DO COME TO SIMILAR INDEPENDENT CONCLUSIONS, BUT, ON THE FACE OF IT, I THINK YOU WILL HAVE TO ADMIT THIS DOES APPEAR A MITE SUSPICIOUS.

ON PAGE 72 OF "BASTARD BULLET" I WROTE THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS IN EVALUATING ONE OF MY HYPOTHESES (JC-7B) AS TO THE POSSIBILITY OF "LEGITIMATE" INVOLVEMENT OF 399:

"A BULLET DOES NOT FALL OUT OF ITS ENTRY WOUND UNLESS ITS PENETRATION IS EXTREMELY SHALLOW; ALMOST CERTAINLY, NOT UNLESS ITS PENETRATION WAS SO SLIGHT AS TO HAVE COME TO REST WITH PART OF IT STILL PROTRUDING FROM THE WOUND. BUT A PENETRATION ANYWHERE NEAR THIS SHALLOW BY 399 WOULD INDICATE THAT IT WAS ALMOST COMPLETELY SPENT, RETAINING ONLY A FRACTION OF ITS VELOCITY WHEN IT STRUCK THE LEG. THE FACTS ARE, HOWEVER, THAT THERE IS A BULLET FRAGMENT IN GOVERNOR CONNALLY'S FEMUR, WHICH COULD HAVE ENTERED IN NO OTHER WAY EXCEPT THROUGH THE SINGLE WOUND OBSERVED ON HIS THIGH, THE SAME WOUND THE COMMISSION SAYS WAS CAUSED BY 399. HOW COULD A TINY FRAGMENT HAVE THE NECESSARY MOMENTUM TO PENETRATE THE TISSUES OF THE THIGH CLEAR TO THE BONE, AND THEN PENETRATE DEEPLY INTO THE BONE ITSELF (THE HEAVIEST OF THE HUMAN BODY), IF THE BULLET FROM WHICH IT CAME HAD IMPACTED THE THIGH WITH SO LITTLE FORCE AS TO HAVE BECOME DISLODGED AND FALLEN BACK OUT? (UNDERLINES IN ORIGINAL)

"TO BELIEVE, THEREFORE, THAT JC-7B MAY SOLVE THE MYSTERY OF 399, ONE MUST BELIEVE EITHER OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. THAT 399 STRUCK THE GOVERNOR'S THIGH WITH SO LITTLE FORCE THAT IT FELL FROM THE WOUND IT CREATED; AND THAT DESPITE THE FEEBLENESS OF ITS IMPACT, A FRAGMENT NEVERTHELESS INSTANTLY DISLODGED FROM IT AND PENETRATED INTO THE FEMUR.
2. THAT THE FRAGMENT IN THE GOVERNOR'S FEMUR CAME FROM A DIFFERENT BULLET, AND THAT -- SINCE IT IS UNDISPUTED THERE WAS ONLY A SINGLE WOUND ON THE GOVERNOR'S LEG -- THE THEN IMPOTENT 399 MUST HAVE STRUCK HIS THIGH AT THE EXACT SAME PLACE WHERE THE FRAGMENT HAD ENTERED (OR VICE VERSA), THEREBY CAUSING TWO SEPARATE ENTRANCE WOUNDS TO APPEAR AS ONE."

THIS WAS AN ORIGINAL FORMULATION WHICH HAD APPEARED NOWHERE BEFORE, AND WHICH WAS DEVELOPED AS A LOGICAL CONSEQUENCE OF MY MULTIPLE-HYPOTHESES APPROACH. HAVING STUDIED MY MONOGRAPH (A FACT WHICH I BELIEVE I CAN PROVE, SHOULD YOU CARE TO DENY IT), YOU THEN WRITE A FOOTNOTE WHICH APPEARS ON YOUR PAGE 149, AS FOLLOWS:

"THE EXISTENCE OF A METAL FRAGMENT EMBEDDED IN THE GOVERNOR'S THIGH CASTS FURTHER SUSPICION ON THE HYPOTHESIS THAT CE 399 LODGED IN HIS THIGH. FOR HOW COULD A SPENT BULLET WITH ONLY SUFFICIENT VELOCITY TO BREAK THE SKIN THROW OFF A FRAGMENT OF SUCH HIGHER VELOCITY THAT IT PENETRATED SEVERAL LAYERS OF FASCIA AND MUSCLE BEFORE EMBEDDING ITSELF IN THE FEMUR? DR. GEORGE S. SHIRES, THE PARKLAND SURGEON WHO OPERATED ON CONNALLY'S THIGH, WAS ALSO PUZZLED BY THIS. IN A CONVERSATION ON MAY 31, 1967, HE CONFIRMED TO THE AUTHOR THAT THE FRAGMENT WAS INDEED EMBEDDED IN THE BONE."

(EMPHASIS IN ORIGINAL)

MY, MY, ANOTHER COINCIDENCE.

I WILL NOTE TWO ADDITIONAL CASES OF YOUR HANDLING OF 399 DATA, ALTHOUGH THEY ACTUALLY BELONG TO "PATTERN TWO", THAT OF EVADING EVIDENCE TENDING TO SHOW IMPORTANT CONSPIRACY. I DO NOT ACCUSE YOU OF TAKING THESE FROM ME. INDEED, THE FIRST OF THESE TWO WAS NOT EVEN INCLUDED IN YOUR BOOK; AND IT IS PRECISELY FOR THAT REASON THAT I TAKE NOTE OF IT. IN YOUR ATTEMPT TO LEGITIMIZE BULLET 399, WHILE REJECTING IT AS HAVING FULFILLED THE "SINGLE BULLET THEORY" ROLE, YOU FAIL COMPLETELY TO CONFRONT IMPORTANT EVIDENCE TENDING TO PROVE IT HAD NEVER ENTERED A HUMAN BODY. ON PAGES 44-45, ON MY CHAPTER TITLED ". . . THE BULLET WAS CLEAN . . ."; I ILLUSTRATED THE SUBVERSION BY EISENBERG OF THE TRUE MEANING OF FRAZIER'S TESTIMONY; WHEREIN EISENBERG, WHEN CONFRONTED WITH FRAZIER'S DAMAGING STATEMENT (3H428) THAT ". . . THE BULLET (399) WAS CLEAN AND IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO CHANGE IT IN ANY WAY", ATTEMPTS TO "CORRECT" THE RECORD BY TELLING FRAZIER, NINE PAGES LATER IN THE TESTIMONY (3H437): "YOU ALSO MENTIONED THERE WAS SOME BLOOD OR SOME OTHER SUBSTANCE ON THE BULLET MARKED 399."*

THIS IMPORTANT AND RATHER STARTLING SLEIGHT-OF-HAND HAD NOT BEEN EXPOSED, PRIOR TO MY INCLUSION OF IT IN MY MANUSCRIPT.* WHY DID YOU CHOOSE TO PASS UP THIS TIDBIT, WHILE PLUCKING THE OTHERS? THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE REASONABLE ANSWER; FRAZIER'S STATEMENT THAT THERE WAS NO BLOOD ON 399 (AND THE FURTHER DEVELOPED TENDING TO PROVE THAT THERE NEVER WAS ANY) WOULD MAKE YOUR CHARMING STORY OF 399'S INNOCENT PLANTING BY A CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN SOUVENIR-HUNTER EVEN MORE ENTERTAINING, IF THAT IS POSSIBLE.

ANOTHER ITEM IN THIS VEIN IS YOUR PERVERSION OF THE TESTIMONY OF BALLISTICS EXPERT JOSEPH D. NICOL. OSTENSIBLY BASED ON HIS TESTIMONY (5 H505) YOU SAY ON YOUR PAGE 166-167:

"WHEN A BULLET PENETRATES CLOTH, THE WEAVE OF CLOTH TENDS TO ETCH FINE LINES ON THE BULLET'S TIP. BALLISTICS EXPERT JOSEPH D. NICOL EXAMINED THE TIP OF CE 399 AND FOUND THAT 'ALTHOUGH THERE WERE SOME FINE STRIATIONS, THERE WAS NOTHING OF SUCH A NATURE THAT IT WOULD SUGGEST A PATTERN'. THE POSSIBILITY ARISES THAT THESE 'FINE STRIATIONS' MIGHT HAVE BEEN CAUSED BY A PROJECTILE PASSING THROUGH CLOTH AT A GREATLY REDUCED VELOCITY."

I WILL QUOTE NICOL SOMEWHAT MORE FULLY; AS I DID ON PAGES 48-49 OF MY BOOK:

"THE ONLY OTHER WORK I DID WAS WITH RESPECT TO AN EXAMINATION OF THE NOSE OF (399) TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER THERE WAS ANY EVIDENCE OF RECOCHET OR PERHAPS CONTACT WITH FABRIC AND SO ON. HOWEVER, ALTHOUGH THERE WERE SOME FINE STRIATIONS ON THERE, THERE WAS NOTHING OF SUCH A NATURE THAT IT WOULD SUGGEST A PATTERN, LIKE A WEAVE PATTERN OR ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE. SO THAT EXCEPT FOR THE NICK, WHICH I UNDERSTAND HAS BEEN EXPLAINED AS A SITE WHERE SPECTROGRAPHIC TESTS WERE CONDUCTED, NO FURTHER TESTS WERE RUN . . ."

I THEN NOTED THAT NICOL'S STATEMENT AT LEAST SUGGESTED THAT A BULLET WHICH HAD PIERCED THE CLOTHING OF TWO MEN MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO HAVE IMPRESSED UPON IT SOME SORT OF WEAVE PATTERN. YOU TURN IT AROUND AND EXTRACT FROM HIS TESTIMONY SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT EVEN IMPLIED; THAT THE "FINE STRIATIONS" WHICH HE CLEARLY SAID DID NOT SUGGEST A WEAVE PATTERN, SOMEHOW COULD HAVE RESULTED

* ALTHOUGH IT DID NOT APPEAR IN POPKIN'S ARTICLE IN JULY, IT DID APPEAR IN HIS PAPERBACK BOOK, WHICH CARRIES A SEPTEMBER '66 PRINTING DATE. A XEROX COPY OF MY PRE-PUBLICATION MANUSCRIPT WAS IN HIS PUBLISHER'S HANDS FROM MID-AUGUST THROUGH THE END OF SEPTEMBER (ROBERT SILVER OF THE N.Y. REVIEW HAD REQUESTED I SEND HIM A COPY). I NOTE THE FACT; I DO NOT SAY IT WAS TAKEN FROM MY MONOGRAPH.