

Dear Roger,

10/16/77

The transcript came in time's nick. It is an exhibit in this affidavit, for your info. attached to a Motion to Reconsider in C.A.75-226, many thanks, in haste now that I have my part of that past and can try to catch up on the new accumulation.

I have not heard further from Perry or Carrico. If they do provide affidavits, as now appears to be unlikely, it will not be in time to include. This makes the transcript more valuable in the case.

I expect to be hearing from Perry again. When I do I'll ask him when Hawks gave him a copy and for a copy of the first page. I'd appreciate a copy of the other first page to attach to this merely as a record for when these records are in an archive.

I can't imagine how I could have mislaid the other copy. Maybe I have what I have not been able to refile stacked up somewhere after my June trip to Dallas. In any event, to eliminate the possibility of a further misfiling I have made a separate file of this one, identified as of the press conference and filed with Perry as this separate file. There may be more on it in the future, too.

Having a separate file will be good for when he and I are in touch, over your request that I contact you first. When you have time please let me know what you want me to ask of him because I'll be wanting to do this before I can forget it.

I'd not be a bit surprised if Hawks gave it to Perry immediately. I would expect that.

Specter was walking on eggs over what Perry has said. It gave them a real problem, from the very first. My recollection of the first transcript is that Clark confirmed Perry but I have not read this one with care, just enough to get a quote to put in the affidavit on a shot from the front.

I don't know whether or not the receipt I obtained was meant to refer to the two small time fragments with which Sibert and O'Neill left the autopsy. It is hard to believe that experienced FBI agents would make so gross an error, or that the Navy personnel would. But I have never found anything else.

This fancy letterhead (over) is one of the practise runs for an exhibit to this same affidavit. Gallagher gave incredible testimony on deposition, that he had been directed not to test the cartridge found in the rifle for "posterity". I provide this exhibit to illustrate that posterity's alleged interest in the bullet that was not fired could have been preserved by pulling the bullet and taking test samples of jacket and core from the base and then putting the bullet back together again. When we put the two pieces in a baggie they stopped rolling around as the machine churned back and forth.

That the LBJ people changes the numbers on the transcript is not necessarily suspect. An innocent explanation could be that it was the first press conference sponsored by the White House after he was sworn in.

Delighted you are in law school! Let me look ahead:

If you have no job for the summer and do not go to summer school and do not plan any extensive writing, there may be a possible use of the court record in this CA75-226. I think it can make a book for this reason: it will be a testing of basic evidence in the JFK case subject to cross examination and with the moral, ethical and legal responsibility for contesting the evidence that of the FBI and the DJ. It thus becomes court-tested fact. I'll not have time to do it. It could be self-standing but would be stronger referenced to other works, like Post Mortem and the two final chapters of Whitewash (I).

Thanks and again best wishes,