

Friday night 25.3.66

Dear Harold,

The American Academy of Forensic Sciences never sent any reply to my request for the proceedings in which the Warren Report was criticized; but this morning I came across a fuller account of the criticisms made by two MDs and a lawyer, in the AMA News, photocopy of which I sent you under separate cover earlier today. Tonight, I found your letter of 3/22/66 when I got home from the office. (I have just finished a 26-page new chapter on LHO's transactions with the State Dept—a fascinating exercise which does nothing to redeem the WR or its authors, who appear to have swallowed a bale of excrement but probably knew what kind of cover-up they were going along with.)

About the ammunition clip: you will find testimony on the clip in 3H 397-98, 3H 411 and 3H 441 (R Frazier); 4H 23 (Latona); and 4H 260 (Day). What is even more interesting is the testimony in which there is no reference to the clip, where you would expect to find such references if the account in the WR is authentic.

About the FBI agents (Stovall testimony 7H 189), as I read it the FBI agents are mentioned as having helped make up the list of property seized "the next day." I don't think that they were actually at Irving with the policemen.

You are quite right about the two negatives! That had escaped me completely.

About "page 142" (your manuscript) and my citation, CE 2003 pp 252-254—the pages refer to the exhibit, not to the volume. You will find what I had in mind in the report of F M Turner, Volume XXIV pp 328-329.

You will find the Clements/DeBrueys interview of Bogard in CE 3071. Yes, I did notice DeBrueys moments New Orleans/Dallas. At least three of us specialists on the WR and R&E independently have reached very similar conclusions about DeBrueys.

Page 156 of your ms (the last sentence and the word "only")—I am sorry but I no longer remember the paragraph in question and of course I don't have the manuscript to consult. Probably it was not an important comment on my part, in the first place. It probably involved a question of drafting rather than a question of fact.

I think I have been hearing that Lane's book will be out any minute for at least a lifetime...I will believe it when I see it...I have one colleague who read Lane's manuscript before it underwent what seems to be a series of surgical alterations, and who thought it was quite poor. Although I will always credit Lane for his contribution to the case in the early days, I must say that he has not done any useful work (that I know about) since the R&E were published (and he had teams of college kids doing his reading and research for him)...I missed the CBS replay of the BBC production but heard a five-minute segment of the audiotape on the Mike Wallace radio program Tuesday night...which made me retch. Re Oswald's autopsy, you will find it a veritable model (as compared to the JFK autopsy report)...see CEs 1981, 2024, 2778, and 3002. BUT THERE IS NO AUTOPSY REPORT or anything like it for JD Tippit, and no certainty even about the number of wounds...(At this point I answered your phonecall, so I will reserve comment on Ramparts, Al Newman, and Hartogs until we meet on Sunday.