

8/7/67

Dear Maggie,

promptly
I respond to your letter of 8/1, which took but six days to fly here, for I want you to learn the very simple thing I learned about the 3M Dry Copier. Perhaps by now you have discovered it yourself.

There are two means that I have already learned for improving the legibility or darkness of illegible or gray documents. One is to make a bit darker in first exposure than you ~~may~~ ordinarily would, to the point where the faint gray begins to appear (the faint shade will not show in black-and-white offset) and the other is to make it paler than you would and run it through the bottom of heat part only a second time, printed side down. As you say, you can expose it to the light twice. I prefer the way I have told you. Try it on some. There is an additional way I have not taken the time to learn, by a shadowgraph. When I do, I'll let you know, for too many of these documents are too far from legible when this need be true of none.

I bought a second-hand machine, which carries a 60-day guarantee. I have run into a few small problems that are being made good. I have tried copying pages from a book. It works, but I'll need practise to get it down right. These didn't turn out as well as they could have.

After I wrote you, I wondered if I might be embarrassing you, for you are very sensitive. Let me make it clear: I regard these documents as your literary property. I will not use them without your permission, and I see nothing at all wrong with your wanting to reserve them for your own use. That I got them for you is really not material, for you could have obtained them by correspondence. There is really no other way we can cooperate than by respecting each others rights. I wanted to use them because they fit with things I have already written and with things I have written but have not published. You recall my head-fragment documents, and I now have a little more on that. This fits with something in my Manchester book and something on the autopsy. Ditto with the car and the fragments, as perhaps you have forgotten, for we all read so much it is difficult to recall where.

If we do not respect each others rights to each others leads, we'd never be able to cooperate and would really be competitors. I might never have gotten around to these things if you hadn't asked me to get them. I have tried to always reserve to those who ask me to get things what I did get for them. If I would do this with what I did for Jones Harris on the shirt, would I any less for you. And if I do not credit, it is not on purpose. For example, although I had reached the conclusions I did with frame 202 separately and by other means that Lillian, I offer to credit her. She asked that I not. All of hers that I used was Clint Hill's left shoulder, which I had missed. I had actually forgotten my own notes on the missing 210-which I discovered not in the pictures but in my first reading of the Zap testimony, in Liebler's gaffe. I just forgot it until Sylvia called it to my attention, and I then wrote her. She told me Lillian told her and I wrote Lillian, who was then afraid, wanting no credit.

Further, you must not be embarrassed by wanting to reserve the use for yourself. It is I who showed Paul Hoch the receipts on the pictures, X-rays, notes etc., which I then already had, and told him how I planned to get the Sibert-O'Neill reports. There were, at that moment, other things that I regarded as higher priority. I told Paul I expected to use these things and would help him if he reserved them for me. He intended to, and it is not his fault if others he trusted were untrustworthy. I feel badly not that these were first used by two others who did not dig them out for themselves but that they were grossly misused, for neither Popkin nor Epstein understood what they had. More, I have extensive correspondence with Viking. I showed them my own stuff in confidence, because they asked for help

on his autopsy stuff, which was very weak. He hadn't even told them how to get things from the Archives. I gave them the applications for access! You know how they repaid this. So, I do understand how others can feel about material they plan to use.

I go into this detail so you will understand, for you must be entitled to the fruit of your own scholarship, and because there are a number of us who seek the truth more than anything else, it is only on a basis of respect and honor that we can help each other. And I want you to feel free to get material this way, for I can help you, and in so doing I can help what we all seek.

There was a degree of recompense in the Popkin things, when I read his wife's ecstatic description of the high point in his career, when he got hold of these same Sibert-O'Neill reports! I wonder that he ever married once he could read!

On your threeM machine: I presume you know you can make negatives from it. That special material costs about \$35.00 per hundred sheets. You can then make plates for offset printing from the negatives. Do not trust the salesman. Find out what you can about that machine. I didn't buy it when the salesman demonstrated it because he didn't tell me what I have learned for myself since and because he had old paper that didn't make copies as clear as they could. Had he done a good job, many of the illegible documents in PW would be clearer. If you do not learn this for yourself, as I think you will, send me a pale thing you'd like darker and I'll do and note the settings I use in doing it and send both back. I learned from you, incidentally. That pink median told me there was a newer paper. From it I discovered they had given me old stock. They took it back, but I wasted much time. I'll have to do over what I had done with the old paper, which did not turn out well. The pink is new. I also have legal-size, which does two pages of a book simultaneously. Faster and cheaper. It is about 7¢ per sheet.

On the check: this merely repeats what I have know about my mail. There was also a letter with that check. I sent it as soon as I returned from California and I learned the price of the scarf (now almost worn out!).

Progress report: I have just about finished with the appendix to Oswald in New Orleans. I await the reproproofs from Parallax, delayed by the delay in the introduction they asked Garrison to write. He is busy writing a piece for Playboy, so he will not have this before 8/14. I have deep misgivings about the full edition, which I shall do privately, for it will have immediate competition from a cheaper book with an identical text. But I feel, even if the end is virtual bankruptcy, that the documents must be seen and out. I may change my mind and make the next book a larger one than economically desirable, for a number of reasons. It will include the autopsy and everything else except Manchester Machiavelli and Tiger to Ride, if I change my mind again. But the appendix for it is now more than 300 pages. I may give it a very short text, mostly on the autopsy.

When you can, I'd appreciate it if you can check the larger bookstores in your area and see if they have PW. Raymer said they'd make a special mailing of the flyer I got up for them. Reports from Dan Francisco are that ~~none~~ none of the stores have it. The radio-TV suppression is tighter. I wish I could get to do some "talk" shows in LA by phone. One in Frisco is being delayed to give time for the books to get out. I have written a new man at KABC, who I met when he was in Boston, at a different station. Best to you all, and thanks for your kind thoughts,

1115^{NO} BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA
August 1, 1967

Dear Harold,

Many thanks for the 3 documents you were kind enough to send me. The one on Mary Brock was interesting mostly because it's an entirely new name. The rest was pretty much the same old stuff, unless one can take Barbara Jeanette Davis' timing seriously. The interview with Charles Brahm did not appear to me to be noticeably different from what we already know about his statements except for the phrase "the President...was leaning forward when he stiffened perceptibly" but I'm not certain that I have interpreted either of these 2 interviews correctly. The report on the car, however, is indeed interesting and contains much added information. I was of course particularly interested in the statement that "the car has never been used to transport the President", and in the statement that "bullet fragments were removed from the windshield" and finally "of particular note was the small hole...in the windshield from which...bullet fragments were removed."

I would like to use the documents concerning the car and the windshield if it is all right with you to do so. Also, do you want me to return the documents to you or not?

You have served as an inspiration to me on several occasions but, in particular, your purchase of a 3M machine prompted me to do likewise. (My last bill for xeroxing material came to about \$236.00.) I have bought it on the installment plan and I'm only sorry that I didn't have the sense to do this many months ago. I would be interested in how you make poor xerox copies blacker. The salesman here tells me that if the copies turn out too light one need only pass them through a second time.

Two things: first, I thank you for the check but I'm not aware of your having sent me one previously and two, I'm delighted with your inscription to me in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITENASH and I'm fascinated with much of what I've perused so far but I must be frank and admit that I simply have not had the time to really read it from beginning to end as yet.

I look forward to the day, not too far off I hope, when I can do so. Your research overwhelms me. I wish you tremendous and continuing success.

Many, many thanks, Harold, for your thoughtfulness which is always deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Maggie