

10/29/69

Dear Sylvia,

On both counts in your note to Gary and me about Frazier's description of the rifle you are right and there may be significance. I was not certain of the W testimony, so in reading the Thermofax of the N.O. testimony while on the plane several months ago I put question marks in the margin. I am grateful to the specific citation to W, which will also save time for me in the future.

Frazier's description, let me add, is an accurate reflection of my Carcano, but not of an expensive gun. When good rifles (and the Mauser is one of the best) are made, they are blued in finishing. It sometimes happens, as could have happened with the rifle Ray allegedly returned, that an excess of the bluing material is deposited, to the point where it can interfere with the operation of moving parts. My Carcano shows no trace of any bluing. I do not know whether or not it was ever blued. It is, exactly as Frazier said, black, in every metal part. It would taken a beatenup and sadly abused Mauser, I would think, for this to be true, the kind of maltreatment that should have impressed itself on a buff like Weitzman. He should have been horrified and remembered it if this were the case. Now dark-oak brown is trickier. My rifle's butt and stock is not far from the color of my very ancient, oak-veneer stenographer's desk. But this desk is far from typical of a dark-oak finish. Compared with the floor, it is much darker, and the floors have a dark-oak finish, not a light oak. I cannot pretend to be an expert on the colors of rifle-stocks, but I would imagine that a properly cared-for good rifle, like a Mauser, would be considerably lighter than this very poor and very cheap weapen. I think the M-C is also a duller color, besides being darker.

If both descriptions are accurate, they certainly are not of the same rifle.

There is much more in the Frazier testimony I hope you will spot. I also hope you and Gary and Paul will find anything I have missed. Because of the suit I have not yet started my notes on his N.O. test, although the T'fax is marked up. Today I began those on Finck's. I want to have this done when Bud returns from Europe, which will be in a little over two weeks. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a solid case of perjury against Finck. These will be long notes, and I'll use them in PM II.

We now have Nichols' testimony. I have the T'fax and Paul should by now have at least part. I will let it wait until I can go over it without interruption. Without having read it, I would think you'd find it valuable. John is a good pathologist and he had done an enormous amount of work with duplicates of that rifle, with exactly the same ammo. I have seen some of it and it is impressive. He is his own kind of gun expert. The two make an ideal combination. And he had the benefit of reading my unpublished books on this subject and my documents not yet published or in a manuscript. His should be important testimony, significant and credible evidence, especially because it was subject to cross-examination and especially because it followed what we were able to establish in Washington court. I will let you know when we get other N.O. transcripts. I have been promised them, but I've had promises before. If I do not encourage you to get all of them, there are others I think you'll want if we get them. I believe the marks were added by Nichols, for these were not in Garrison's possession at the time of the trial.

Thanks, and in advance for any other similar things.

Sincerely,

H