his P.M.H

10/4/69

Dear Dick,

Your valuable letters of 9/30 and 10/1 arrived today, with a nice one from Hoffmna you have by now seen, with enclosures I return to him today. His are valuable documents. I am satisfied the Hoover statement on when the weighing was done is (if not to his knowledge) a lie. It is not my recollection of Frazier's testimony.

There is a remarkable parallel between some of the things you say and what I was explaining to Henry Lippman, who spent the past two days here.

I will be in DC Wednesday. I expect to be able to get to the Archives. I will then order a copy of my picture you want and have it sent to you and one of P's for myself. I will better understand any comparisons then and you will have what you need as rapidly as possible and at less cost than shifting one back and forth my mail.

On the loss of base metal, I disagree to this extent (I actually agree with the conclusion): I think, from my picture, it is possible to argue the loss of a bit as much as 3mm in maximum dimension.

On your request, have you forgotten that while the ammo I have is military, it is not Western? Hence I cannot sent you Western.

I am in entire accord on the importance of getting Frazier on the stand. If they had done what I anticipated in N.O., what I had sought to prepare them for, this would not be academic. However, with his testimony there, any new testimony from him will be of the highest significance. I doubt very much he will perjur himself on the stand. I do not know whether pretrial depositions are possible in such a suit. I hope they are! They are the equivalent of testimony, and perjury in them is no less a crime.

Hoch is delaying copying the testimony until he receives Dick's. John had not yet sent it when last I heard.

On Dempsey, please use a tape recorder and just let him ramble, without effort to prevent digressions, later repeating as a test of accuracy and of his completeness of recall. Go into Haiti, recent, Hall's travels, when and to where, with whom, in what kind of car, with what state of registration, what sources of the loot with which he returned, etc. Also, the arrests, including Hall's 10/63 by customs, etc. I may have the picture you want. If you get a negative from Miami, I have a fine lad there I can send to the library of the newspaper morgue or both. Young enough to be a student, but good.

Time of back wound: About Z287 is out of place at the Archives. I have been trying since 1967 to get them to restore it from after ~~XXXX~~ Z313 to its proper place. Z 283 or 284 is duplicated in the hearings, the second being missing entirely. At about this point there is detectable, if you look at the movies carefully, preferably in slow motion or backward or both, a short, sharp motion of the upper torse and forward. If we assume, as I think you do also and as I am confident is justified, that JFK's nervous reactions were already blocked by the shock of having been hit, there would be no visible nervous reaction, like the reaching of a hand. There is no doubt there is such a forward motion, upper part body

Anterior neck: Is there any reason to believe any of the wounds were caused by military ammo? I do not and never have believed this. The Commission postulates this, but you may recall in WW I go through the search for the source and its abandonment. Our raiders were discovered in great quantity.

This morning Lipsman raised the question of this wound and asked if it were not possible to determine whether it was of entry or exit by tests. I told him tissue should have been removed from both holes for such testing. The description I have him is less complete than yours, but I did tell him there should be burning or searing on the entry hole, readily seen under the microscope. I then added that while the panel report or the proctocol may attribute such removed tissue xxx to the rear, it could have been from the front. This, of course, is just speculation and presumes real dishonesty, not simple error. Before the examination was completed, they knew of 399 and it was incumbent upon them to remove tissue from both front and rear non-fatals for such testing. This may well have been after the pictures were made. I am inclined to believe they did all such things only after the pix were taken, for they were, for the most part, taken immediately. I'd believe all exterior shots were taken before a knife was used, with organs, etc., during the examination.

Sprague's pictures sounds like the ones I have. There is an additional one in the hearings of this sequence. Except for the size, I agree with your belief it is brain, but bullet, and tried without success to silence Jim on this. However, that location is other than the one specified in the FBI reports in PM on the Harper find. I have asked Gary to check this in Dallas if he can get Harper and get him to talk. That identification, as I recall it, was 25 ft. south of 4313. I lack the knowledge to dispute your belief the fragment had to go in the direction of the bullet, but it appears the piece of skull did not and I seem to recall contrary opinion from Finck in his testimony. On this and the bruising of the upper chest I can find no confirmation in Z. At the same time, I can offer no contrary explanation. Remember, however, esp. in assessing McClelland's test., that the slit was transverse. Gary told me of this with some pride.

Now that I know you are an artist (as your fine sketches should have told me earlier), let me tell you what I wanted to get done with Z199-205. I want to make tracings of Willis outlines, especially the arms and legs, insofar as possible. I think the best way would be to make slides and project them. I'd like them in different colors and with different solid and broken lines, so they can be superimposed (as on tracing paper) and photographed separately also. My purpose is to better illustrate what I say in WSII, that he had taken his picture by Z202 and had begun to walk away. If you make slides, I'd appreciate a duplicate set so I can get another artist to do the same thing, for in some areas there will be a lack of clarity and it will be more persuasive if two independently come up with the same thing. It will also tend to show error, the possibility of which may be high.

I hope you approve my letter to Roffman. If he has begun to question his own conclusions, this is a good time for him to test them against evidence of which he is not aware. Do not worry about money, etc, for our situation is so bad a little worse is unfelt. Besides, you should deduct the cost of the slides, etc.

No time for more. Want to make outgoing mail. I want to return R's staff the day of receipt, which I believe he will take as a sign of intent, also the invitation. I presume you told him our work confirms Hoover on that particular dent. I'll let him duplicate here is he doubts. Many thanks. This exhange of ideas is very helpful, even in the areas of minor disagreement.

Sincerely,