

1/14/70

Dear Dick,

Re; L/9: I have been entirely without doubt since first seeing 399 that there is nothing missing that cannot be accounted for outside of human bodies. What I felt I could say beyond (then) question I said in PM. Since then, the major missing proof, to me, is yours on duplicating the removal of the sample. So on this we are agreed.

I am not sufficiently expert to say "beyond question" there was more removed after Howard's pictures were taken, but I believe the raised part to the right of center in my picture (with the metric scale on top) is missing in his. It is the lighting that helps persuade me. In my picture this is raised and well-lighted. In Howard's it appears to be cut out.

I have made a rough tracing of mine for you. I tried to copy it on the three-Mr machine and after five failures gave it up. However, you remember mine well enough, I believe, to know whether what was sent you is it. Nonetheless, when you can I'd like an electrostatic copy to compare. I have asked Howard to get a duplicate negative also.

Now there is no doubt they took this picture for me. It was down in the lab where you, Tom and I were, and you may recall my conversation with the photographer, who took them, about it. Same one who did ours then.

Where I believe a bit was removed is next to what you properly call the Frazier crater. It is really the top of one of the walls, the straightest one.

I love overkill on this, so I look forward to what else you think you see.

However, unless they lied to Howard, there is a small fragment of some kind missing, in mine, in his, or both. Both if they told the entire truth, for mine were taken after Thompson's. My hunch would be near where Frazier cut.

Have you done any more theorizing about what this bullet was fired into? I believe you have never responded to my question about plastics

Where the area in question is raised in my picture, in Howard's it is clearly cut down. On Howard's, looking as at mine, you can see the mark of the knife, a perfectly straight wall, beginning at the sharp point in the F cut, the original one. I have made a separate rough tracking of this for you, only what I believe cannot be attributed to lighting, but not all that is possible. If you take an engravers lens and look at one of the prints Howard made, I sent you, you can actually see the outlining of the knife, lie an arrow, where the cut was outlined before it was made. With the flat edge up, going to the right and slightly upward, are two parallel lines beginning at almost the lower, right-hand edge of the original F cut. In the enlargement I ket, this is about 1 cm long. at this point there is a cut-line intersecting in a point, like an arrowhead, from both lines, and the just fail to meet the line, giving the arrowhead effect. These do not exist in mine and moreover, to a large degree, cannot, they being where the removed metal was. I'M anxious to see the picture you got, now, if you can, a print, but if not or if that will delay, an electrostat. No response to my request for a new picture. Excuse haste. CC Howard only. I want this kept in complete silence, as my other recent correspondence should indicate, please, both. I have other things going with it. If you get down here the coming vacation you can see all, as H will when he comes. Best, HW

9 Jan 1970

Harold:

I got your 399 base photo and compared it with Roffman's-- not as carefully as I shall later when I have more time, but well enough to say that I do not see the change that you indicate. I will look at them more carefully later, so this opinion might change, but I think not. If you feel sure that the base lost a fragment between the times these two pictures were taken, you will have to specify for me exactly where on the base you mean. I cannot find a difference-- except those caused by changes in angle of photography and lighting.

However, your photo shows some important things that Roffman's does not-- things I wanted to know and couldn't learn from R's picture. Seeing these things in your photo makes me all the more confident that no fragment is missing from the base except at the conical crater where Frazier himself removed substance. I would like to have my opinion checked by a competent person, but I feel absolutely certain about it.

I'll explain more later when I have time. The indications that no fragments were lost are specific and positive.

The question will be settled for good only ~~if you~~ when you get another opinion or two. I think it will stand up solidly in court.

Have to stop. Will write more later.

Still,

*Dick*

cc Roffman