

Roanoke, Virginia
May 4, 1992

Mr. Harold Weisberg,
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

It was nice to hear your voice again on Saturday. You are very kind to make yourself available to an amateur researcher such as I am. I was particularly interested in the prices of your books. The total of all six is \$90.85. I have enclosed a check for that amount, and I look forward to receiving them a few days after you can find the time to put them in the mail.

In the entire assassination research community, your work must be recognized as the most thorough. It was from **WHITEWASH II** that I first learned of the fact that the man in the doorway might be Billy Lovelady. A fellow researcher, Dr. David K. Minton, concurs with me that it must be Lovelady. We realize that it was you who brought this to light and that for more than twenty-seven years you have maintained that it is Oswald. But, at risk of appearing an ingrate or upstart, I would ask you to consider the remote possibility that you may have been mistaken, after all this time. I hope this doesn't insult.

Going by the testimony of Carolyn Arnold, Oswald was in the second floor lunchroom after 12:15 (as late as 12:25). The FBI altered her essential information. In interviews with researchers, Ms. Arnold stated that it was in the lunchroom that she had seen Lee Oswald some minutes before the motorcade passed through. And it was within two minutes after the shooting that Baker and Truly found Mr. Oswald at that same location. With common sense showing a jury the impossibility of Oswald's alleged feat, using the facts of time and distance alone, he would have been acquitted. Without the thousands of other facts about our nation's worst event being examined, nearly all of which indicate that he wasn't the murderer, if Lee Oswald had lived long enough to be tried, his jury would recognize a fairly sound alibi --- that he was in the second floor lunchroom at the time of the shooting.

In J. Gary Shaw's latest book, **JFK: CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE**, sighting of Oswald by Ms. Arnold, on the first floor, at the front door, at 12:25 has been mentioned importantly. I spoke with Mr. Shaw on Saturday afternoon. He denied knowing of Ms. Arnold's averring that she saw Oswald in the second floor lunchroom. When I pointed out the extreme unlikelihood of Oswald's having entered the Texas Theatre at 1:40, that he was likely the man who entered just a few minutes after the 1:00 p.m. feature began, Mr. Shaw said he was attempting to show the reading public the inconsistencies of the official story. So, he simply mentions the 1:40 entry without explaining to his reader about the imposter.

One of the most important things about the John F. Kennedy assassination, of which I am certain, is that Lee Harvey Oswald was telling the absolute truth when he denied killing the President or the policeman. We don't know exactly what arrangement he had with the men who actually executed Mr. Kennedy. We may never know. But it is quite clear that a man would need to be very criminally oriented and definitely proficient beyond challenge with firearms to accomplish these acts. We have reliable information that Lee Oswald had a genuine respect for the President and a marked lack of affinity for shooting. It is possible that he did not even handle the pistol he was alleged to have used in the slaying of Officer Tippit. His connection with the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle is not unlike much of the other evidence in this appreciable frame-up. There's the testimony of the Crescent City Garage operator, Mr. A. T. Alba, indicating that Oswald did have a rifle in his possession in New Orleans, and we have the absurdly erratic testimony of Marina, which is so prolifically self-contradictive. Most of the evidence seems to be contrived.

Mr. Melanson went a long way in revealing the real person and work. But it would be a supremely vital contribution to the movement if an expert researcher and writer gave us an authoritative treatment of reasons to exonerate Lee Oswald of the charges.

CD 5, p. 41 is one of many, many instances of vitally altered testimony. I think we can be confident in the work of Anthony Summers, supported by Robert Groden, revealing the real testimony of Ms. Arnold concerning the whereabouts of the alleged assassin at approximately twenty minutes after twelve noon on that terrible day.

I am asking you, seriously, to consider that the man standing there in the Altgens photo, dressed similar to Lee Oswald, is actually Billy N. Lovelady. That he initially forgot what kind of shirt he wore that day, or that he had a strong reason to lie about it. This man has a remarkable, if coincidental, collection of circumstances in common with Lee H. Oswald. There is a strong physical resemblance, they work in the same building. Their clothing is similar, except the jacket. The man (or men) who shot Officer Tippit wore a light color jacket. Oswald owned a blue one, which was found several days later at the TSBD, and a light grey one.

The facial features of the man in the doorway must be re-examined by the research community also. The forehead is very long, much longer than Oswald's. The nose is longer than Oswald's and has the characteristic of a slight bulb that is missing in pictures of Oswald. The chin and jaw, in my opinion, are Lovelady's. But the most telling feature of Lovelady, which is appreciable in this, your blow-up of the Altgens photo, is the dented hairline. This man has an area of baldness that might be described as a reverse widow's peak. It is clearly visible.

Thank you for your kind attention, sir. I consider it a privilege.

Sincerely yours,
Jack Storm

Jack Storm