

Shooting

Dear Michael Dworetzky,

9/6/81

In your letter of August 15, 1980 to Mr. Keuch of the Justice Department you refer, correctly, to "a serious logical flaw." You had no way of knowing it, but your perceptive letter also suffers a serious logical flaw: you assumed that the official investigators were serious and intended diligent investigation. No official ~~HE~~ investigation of which I know intended anything other than further covering up. The real purpose of the House assassins committee was to put down all critics and criticism. To the best of my knowledge I am the only one with whom it refused to tangle. It was only when the anticipated results of the acoustical testing could not be used for any such purpose that those whitewashers decided to use it to escape total bankruptcy. But by then the overall and corrupted record did not permit proper use by HSCA anyway. It is because of the baseless HSCA theorizing that all shots came from that one rifle and that one sixth-floor window that the work it assigned to Barger et al required this as a preconception and built-in limitation.

If there had ever been any official interest in interviewing all the witnesses, the impressive statistics you compiled would have been even more impressive. You are restricted to those the FBI and Commission believed they could get away with ignoring. For one example, the FBI never interviewed a single one of the 18 Dallas motorcycle policemen about the JFK assassination until 1975, when it interviewed two and managed then not to report to Washington what was of most pertinence and interest in what they said. (The Commission was content.) I go into this in a current affidavit in a current, albeit the very oldest, of Freedom of Information (FOIA) lawsuits, for the results of the FBI's scientific testing in the JFK investigation, spectrographic and neutron activation analyses.

The person to whom your letter was originally routed sent it to the man who drafted the response for the Criminal Division chief. He then asked, "Perhaps we should sent to NAS?" Mr. Fogel decided to include the FBI also, from the response to you. I'd be interested in knowing if there was any serious expression of interest to you, from either the FBI or the NAS panel. Which includes a notorious if eminent partisan, Luis Alvarez, who should have disqualified himself and, in fact, should never have been considered because of his partisanship. He cannot find any evidence of any other shooting without condemning himself and his past. His own diatribes are based on the three-shot-only, Oswald only official mythology.

There is much evidence bearing on more than one shooting and shooting from another or other points. Some is involved in this ongoing litigation to which I refer above, C.A. 75-226, in federal district court in Washington. This is the case over which the Congress amended the investigatory files exemption in 1974. The FBI was forced to conduct testing pertaining to other shooting but to the degree possible it avoided all of this. One of the dodges that I regard as a more serious offense than "a logical flaw" is the rejection of anything not of 6.5 caliber.

It was known from the first, for example, that the slits in the front of the JFK shirt collar were not caused by a bullet but were made during emergency procedures, by a scalpel, but this was uncongenial to the official predetermination so all the tests and testimony were and remain ignored. HSCA knew of this and avoided it because of its own preconceptions.

Even though before digging it up the FBI knew that the Dallas curbstone that was scarred by the shot that inflicted the minor injury on Jim Tague had been patched it pretended otherwise. Does to this day. One of the bits of new information I will be presenting to the court soon is an FBI page saying this, withheld from the Commission. Not saying there had been a patch, saying that the nick which did exist exists no more.

What also exists no more, if the unsworn representations of the FBI in this litigation can be believed, is the samples submitted to KAL. These, if they do not lie,

FBI 11/15/80 11/15/80 11/15/80 11/15/80 11/15/80

/destroyed as radioactive trash. They were neither.

A similar fate is said to have befallen the curbstone spectrographic plate, the given reason being to save space! (Only lead and antimony are said to have been detected.)

There is no innocence. Even Dr. Baden admitted to me that he suspected that the knot of the tie had been undone before it was shown to him after being retied. It is the knot alone that had evidentiary value and the FBI undid it years ago. Spectrographic analysis, by the way, showed no metallic traces on it of the front of the shirt. It also was nicked by the scalpel, when the tie was cut off at the hospital.

The FBI was so upset over my earlier and accurate writing that for a while it considered filing a spurious libel suit against me, in Shaneyfelt's name, to "stop" me, the word of its own internal records. They finally chickens out.

Reference to spectrographic analysis is, I can now state definitively, to only qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis was never done. It was done, at least stated, with the Tip it killing evidence, so it was possible for the FBI then. I did not learn this, as proof rather than suspicion, until this year, when I deposed another FBI Lab agent. His testimony is explicit.

As you are aware, based on the timetable given to you a year ago the reporting of the results is now eight months overdue. Actually, all that work should have been done before you wrote Justice.

There was to have been enhancement of the motion picture taken by Charles Bronson. All knowledge of this had been suppressed, bearing of the existence of that film. I got the Dallas internal memos in another FOIA suit. As of my last information, the FBI was still stonewalling.

One of their problems is partly solved by having a "private sector" panel do the work. FOIA applies to official records only. They'll be able to claim that the records of the panel are "private sector" and immune under the Act.

The Bronson film, by the way, shows more than one object in that window. It also shows motion by those object. One purpose of the enhancement would be to identify those objects.

The date stamped on the letter to you appears to be October 31, 1980. The carbon states that it was typed 10/10/80. The date written on is 8/15/80. They did not get many letters like yours and it appears to have been disconcerting.

It is a careful and cautious letter. You did a good thing.

Sincerely,

Michael M. D
Dworetsky was of the
Department of Physics and Astronomy of the
University College of London, Gower Street,
London, WC1E 6 BT

Harold Weisberg