Dear Dick, (Howard),

That paragraph on Specter is wonderful. You'll appreciate it more when you hear what Howard did to him in public. It might be more precide to say what he did to himself with Howard's skillful help, Howard having offered the petard and Specter having hoist himself. I won't take the edge off!

On 399, check, but on the test through fabric, I think it is waste of time because there are too many other conditions to duplicate to make it meaningful and they'll pose serious problems to you. I also thing it de trop at this point. Collom is supercautious, which for me and my purposes is fine. He falls just short of saying that it was impossible for these tears to have been made by a bullet. He says that the only condition making it possible require, among other things, a velocity of 5-700 fps, which is the end of it all, on that basis alone-even if it were a bullet, and I am as undeviating on this I was from my very first writing. Wecht is so busy he's had to give up things that are professionally rewarding and profitable. He should be left alone as much as possible. Otherwise, if we have something really important, we wont be able to use him.

Hoch: I suggest leaving him entirely alone. He is no Epstein, does not believe the Report, and, although I can't explain this radical departure from what he knows about real testing, I am satisfied his purpose was <u>not</u> to prove the Report right. He never intended publication and I think there is presently little likelihood of any by A. I think we took good care of that. You'll just turn him off, and he can and does do good work with the time he has.

Our weather is breaking. The ice clings to the sides of the pool and pond, but it almsot all gone from the lake, the bottom of which is beginning to disappear. Sunny and warm today.

Me and JFK motion: Nothing new in this. I said it in WWII. There are, to me, separate and discontinuous movements, the shorter and weaker to the front. I think that if we ever learn all about the wounds we might get an explanation. It is too violent, I believe, to be a muscular or nervous reaction, and it is sufficiently less violent to that backward to suggest lower force, hence lower hit, less leverage.

Garrison can't even steal sensibly. But he had similar stories about others going into better jobs. If they are true they mean nothing. Reily was low-paid, defense and aerospace higher-paid. However, on the side of your suspicion, I think one of the Reilys was CIA. You have to understand Jim and his special kind of ego to make sense out of the news story that was made into news when it wasn't. That happened much earlier. In court was the first public acknowledgement. I've known if for almost two years. But his thinking is that because he couldn't do it, it can't and won't be done.

You did not enclose the Mitchell letter.

Emory Brown: Rt. 4, Box 82, Farmingdale. Lives on Squankum Rd. The FBI has returned the bullet with the report it has no connections with the assassination-verbal!

Types ammo: try and remember or find the simple formulation I gave you having to do with design and the convention. I think it belongs in for any use. Head and evlocities is interesting point. It all hangs on Finck's testimony about his experiences. What were the velocities of the bullets causing the wounds he examined? Much higher, no? So he was talking about cabbages and they applied it to kings. Is there any reason I'd want a copy of the neutron activation article? If there is, even for understanding, thanks, yes. No rush on Morgan. ...I'm trying to get this and other things done to mail when I take Lil into town in a few minutes. Hope I've not forgotten anywthing in your 2/8 and 2/11, both here today...You are to get the rough draft of the book-length papers I filed in court after Sylvia. Jim Lesar can now provide copies from the clear xerox of the original before filing. He has it. Cost about $5.00. I don't think you need it, but the very rough rough draft can let you know. You send to CBS. Best, HW

12 Feb 71

Dear Harold (cc Howard):

To understand my silence over the past week or so, you have to understand what Kingston is like at this time of year. At all times it's a grey city, built in years past of the limesone that lies all about. Around the end of January and continuously for the next month or so, it's as grey as can be-- inside and out. Everybody feels it. The worst of winter gone, but still more to come; spring barely in sight. It presses hard on the soul and easily sets you in the doldrums. That's me now. Utterly blech. Besides, I have had an unusual lot of work to do lately with some Faculty and Departmental business. I get started with something, then wonder why I am doing it, then go on to something else, and in the end not getting much of anything done. What a feeling; it hits me every year about this time. But it makes the spring so much nicer when it comes.

My monograph is all but done-- the writing, at least. I have to make a few typographical changes, but otherwise that's it. I still have shooting to do, so as to get some illustrative photos, and some research into a certain aspect. Unless you request it, I'll not send a copy until it is complete in all ways. It's different in many ways from the previous version, with some important additions, so I would ask you to read it again. If I sent what I now have, it would mean reading not only this, but also the fully complete version. There is no need for you to trouble with that now.

The 399 pic that Howard sent is now being reproduced for me. I'll send you both copies. I should have it later in the day. I studied it, but not too carefully, when I received it, but found nothing that caused me to change my opinion about the bullet-- i.e., that it lost no substance in the form of fragments. (By the way, toward the end of his testimony in vol.5 Frazier says something implying that the bullet did lose substance from the base. The reference goes something like, "So little metal was lost from the base that...". He should know better; maybe he did. The statement at lest indicates that he took a good look at the base, which is something good to know.

No response from Hoch re my comments about his failing to refer me to Wound Ballistics.

I got a letter from Wecht enclosing and analysis of my monograph by a criminalist named Collom. The analysis is vacuous and largely meaningless. Wecht, I gather, has been very busy. I do not anticipate any help from him. Collom, like Howard, noticed an anomaly in my use of the term "burst" referring to severe fragmentation. (I'm making changes in that regard-- not important.) His other comments are just meaningless

On to some matters referred to in you mail. Please excuse if I jump about haphazardly, for I have a great stack before me and will just peel the pages off one by one in no order.

I look forward to seeing your recently-acquired Zapruder pictures. In your 20 Dec note you mention slight forward movement of the head after the car past the lamppost. This seems to imply that you think JFK might have been hit from behind then. I still tend to think the double-hit the most plausible. Largely for two reasons: (1) the evident forward movement of the head between Z312 and 313, and (2) the bruising of the supra sternal notch. That bruise cannot be explained in terms of a slight movement-- the chin had to come down pretty hard on the notch to cause a bruise. I see sufficient movement for that in Z312/313. I cannot think what else might have caused the bruise. (I believe it was noted by Parkland docs--not sure-- so that makes me think it wasn't invented by autopsy docs.)

I read Garrison's book a few months ago. If you ever write a chapter on it, may I suggest this title: "Wishywash"? It signifies nothing, and doesn't even have sound and fury. There were errors that you probably noted too. The only thing new to me was the information about LHO's fellow-workers at Reiley Coffee getting similarly oriented jobs shortly after LHO left. If that tale is true (is there reason to doubt it?), it certainly is provocative. I do not currently think of a government- sponsered assassination, but I don't put it out of my mind. Anyway, those guys could have been moved for some strong reason associated with LHO, but not necessarily with the assassination. I'll tell you, though, I was impressed by the information. But knowing Garrison, I don't know what to make of it.

Enclosed is your 23 Dec letter to Mitchell. You asked for return. Sorry to delay. I'll send this, the 23 Dec letter to Resor, and the 24 Dec letter to Rhodes-- these three I'll send to Howard, and he can forward them to you.

I have your 5 Jan letter to Emory Brown explaining your contact with FBI re new-found Plaza .30 cal. bullet. You did right. Emory lives in N.J. not far from Trenton, where I sometimes go to see my family. When I am next in that area, I'll give him a call. If you remember, send me his address.

Shirt picture: I look at this from time to time, and regularly fail to see anything that remotely suggest movement of a missile of any kind through there. Fascinating. If I could get some material duplicating that of the shirt, I would do some shooting of variously sized and shaped projectiles through it. I don't think using similar material would be very satisfactory, but may try some this summer when I have time. As you know, I did such shooting before, but didn't record the results.

Your long 13 Jan letter to me re Paul does much to convince me that he is not completely lost. Since you have more to lose than anyone in this matter-- I don't mean loss of material things, but of untouchable things-- I'll go along with whatever you say. And not entirely with misgivings, for my feelings now are ambivalent-- I go back and forth between extremes, and seem unable to settle on a mean. It's going to be interesting as hell to see what happens. Indications are that Paul has always felt the WC was right. The situation seems not different from that of Epstein-- WC right, but for all the wrong reasons. WE811 see. Keep me posted, anyway, on dealings with Paul. Once we have achieved some sort of settlement on the matters of his mellons and my framents, even if it's a settlement in the admission of an impasse, I'll bear down on him with other things-- like the front-neck wound. I think I can wax him with that, for of all matters it seems both the most soundly settled and the most damaging to "the good guys".

On your attitude to Paul, I am reluctant to interfere by offering you criticism or praise in the way you handle him. I do not know him well; you do. Besides, I am confused. I go up and down and don't know where to settle.

.....

15 Feb 71

We had a bad weekend storm. 12 inches of snow, with very deep drifts. Oh, winter, here is thy sting.

This morning I got mail from Howard-- 5 Feb letter to Harold, 10 Feb letter to me, and UPI article re Garrison copping out.

Howard-- know from what is written above that I have changed my mind about the use of the term"bursting". I am not yet sure whether I shall insert material dealing with distinctions between military rounds and hunting rounds. The matter is very complicated, full of unpredictables, and I don't think I can do it in small compass. WE'll see. Please let all comments and criticisms wait until I send you the near-final version, for what I now have is in important respects different from what I sent you before. I am convinced, too, that I cannot properly argue the point without good pictures illustrating frangibility and penetration. I shall soon have the makings for showing frangibility, but am having trouble getting a proper set-up for showing the effect of 1800 fps. lead alloy projectiles passing through soft material. I wanted to use cast bullets, but the guy I knew who did bullet casting has moved from Kingston, and I am now at a loss how to move projectiles as fast as I want. I have an idea that might work, but I have to check whether it's OK. I'll let you know more later.

The matter of publication does not concern me now. It will later-- maybe much later. I'll not revise that material until I know for what sort of an audience it is intended. Anyway, don't bother about this matter now, for all I want is to make a full and convincing account.

Howard: The reference that I mentioned in a past letter was to certain material in wound ballistics. I ordered the book and will copy relevant material for you when I get it. (I had to return the copy that I borrowed.) The gist of it is this: Projectiles of certain velocities cause certain types of fracturing of the skull. Low velocity (say, about 1200 fps.) produces relatively small wounds of entrance and exit, without much fracturing of other parts of the skull than those directly pressed by the projectile. Fracturing becomes more extensive as the veolocity of the projectile increases. Fracturing of JFK's skull corresponds with that produced by fairly high velocity missile. They illustrate skull fracturs with a cat's skull, but I belive they refer to tests on cadavers wchich gave similar results. This account is simplistic, but it just gives the gist. I'll send you more later.

Sorry about Bond slides. I completely forgot that I had them. I'll get them copied and return them to you within a week or two. Again, sorry.

I'mm following your comments re JFK politics in the months before the shooting, but prob. cannot offer much help. Do not count on it from me.

Among my mail is Harold's letter to Judge Williams. This, too, will go to Howard, then to Harold.

Also sending to Howard Harold's Nov 15 letter to Wecht (Man, am I behind in my correspondence! Sorry.)

Harold: I am not getting N.O. papers.

The UPI story on Garrison says he is finished "trying to prove there was a government plot to kill JFK", but does not mention whether he has dropped the perjury charges against Shaw. What's the story on this?

The Wash. Post article on ~~Wexx Bexi~~ WerBel was interesting, but there is nothing in it that I can comment on.

The American Rifleman just did an article on neutron activation analysis. Does anybody want a copy?

I'll send you my correspondence with Morgan later. I am not finished with him yet; will be in touch again.

I'm through the stack of letters. I skipped commenting on many of them, since there was nothing of interest that I could say. Must stop now. ~~xxxx~~ Sorry to be so curt, but I have been very busy lately.

Still,

Dick

Bernabei

8 February 71

Harold (Howard)

This is chiefly to acknowledge receipt of a CE 399 base photo from Howard. I'll have it copied and send to you and Howard.

I jus finished reading a frivolous, but enjoyable book called From Those Wonderful People Who Gave You Pearl Harbor-- about the advertizing industry. Very near the end of it, maybe the next to last page or thereabouts, there is a dandy paragraph dealing with Specter. Later I'll copy and send it to you. The guy who wrote the book had Specter as a client for the mayoralty campaign. The gist was this: I could never get to see or speak with S-- absolutely untouchable. So I asked about him. "What is Arlen Specter for?" "He is for getting elected." "Well, then, what is he against?" "He is against losing the election."

It's good to see such stuff in print.

I have other things to say, but will wait until I have more time to sit still for a while.

The new 399 pic is good, but not as good as Harold's. There are some things worth mentioning, but none that change my opinion that 399 lost no fragments whatever. (By the way, somewhere in his testimony in vol. 5, Frazier implies that 399 did lose some from the base. He says something like "it lost so little metal from the base"-- which implies, if nothing else, that he took a good look at it. If he didn't actually know better, he should have.

I think more 399 base pix might be a waste. We've got about all we can get from photos of this type. A look-

see at the base itself would probably sharpen our knowledge somewhat, and maybe provide something new, but I don't know.

Howard once mentioned a certain discoloration on a part of the base, and asked if I had an opinion on it. I have none. Why not check the possibility that the discoloration indicates that they might have done neutron activation analysis on it. My understanding is that n.a.a. does not affect the substance in any way, does not even discolor it, but I may be wrong. I know, though, that it would involve only a very small area. Other than that, I can't explain why it is discolored, and even that may not explain it.

More later.

Dick