7/30/70

Dear Dick (cc Harold),

I just got your excellent letter of 7/27. In general, your arguements are superb. I would not call it going for my throat for that implies a desire to clobber me. Maybe you should say going for my mind, for the intent and hopefully the result is a constructive one.

What you cite about a hit before 202 on JFK is persuasive. Let me add some things. First, you cite Mrs. JFK about the quizzical look on her husband when she looked at him (she also said something about the movement of his arm, saying left arm but doubtlessly meaning right). You fail to mention something which I believe I told you last summer. Mrs. Connally said when she turned around to see JFK, he had that look on his face and was reacting. In Willis 5 (Z202) Mrs. JBC is turned around or at least turning around to look at JFK. This is obvious if you compare her position in Willis 3 when she was obviously facing front. Now, Mrs. JBC said after seeing the Pres, she turned around and saw her husband get shot. At Z225 while you can't see her face, you can see her forehead which means, obviously, that she is facing Z, thus facing northwest, not looking into the back seat. This means she already saw JFK hit and reacting. While we can't be too sure of exactly when she laid eyes on JFK, I think her story combined with the photos lends substance to a hit before 202.

Second, is the quizzical look you mention, which several people saw. I don't know if I ever told you this but I developed it last summer also. It is in response to the nonsense that JFK goes behind the sign smiling. Look at frames prior to 189. You can obviously see that JFK is smiling. Why? Z does not have the resolution to show an actual smile. When a person smiles, the facial cavities are deepened. In a bright overhead sun, this results in very pronounced shadow highlights, which is what you see in the frames up to 189. It is my recollection that the hand blocks JFK's face till around 200. When the face does reappear, there are no shadow highlights on it. This is quite obvious, especially in frame 207 from the LIfe original which Tink prints. It is not that the frames are unclear--most are. In fact, JFK has come closer to Z thus should be seen better. Because there are no shadow highlights, the inference is that the facial cavities were not deepened then thus he was not smiling. Please don't pass this on for I may want to use it in my book, depending on how much of this I cut out.

RE Bennett, you point is excellent. I had never realized that before. Add to it this detail: Riding down ELm, JFK's back was not in the sun--it was shaded. This would have made it even harder to see a small hole there. This indeed comes close to my "absolute proof" request that Bennett actually saw the bullet hit.

I think you misunderstood my reference to "dirty work" which was not clearly expressed in my letter. What I meant to say is that on the basis on information we now have, for any theory about the upper thorax wounds to make sense, something has to be missing--some piece of information from someone somewhere. Or some informaion is false or distorted. Of course this is true and amply demonstrated, but it is not possible to say exactly what is missing.

Your reasoning about the front neck wound seems to be without fault. You indicate that the docs would have settled for an exit

from even a fragment. I don't believe this follows for such an admission would entail admission of fragments in the neck which the docs were abviously intent on suppressing. I just don't know ** how cognizant they were of some of these things--like the neck fragments. I would imagine they knew this meant other than military ammo, but did they know that military ammo was supposed to have been fired in accord with official belief?

SO, I too believe the front wound to be one of entrance. Even Fil given the characteristics said probably entrance. But I also believe the back wound to be entrance. This involves at least two bullets in the neck and accounting for them to me is the problem. I am suspicious of one falling out at Parklnad for several reasons. Thus, I would think there has to be more in the body than "several small fragments." Especially with the nonsense Morgan gave me.

You quote me about "not knowing what the dirty work was" and say or seem to say that the fact that they covered up something and reported on it falsely means they are actually covering up the opposite--or must logically be doing that. It does, I agree, seem obvious wjat the docs were covering up about the neck wound. Knowing this it follows that other related things must have been covered or lied about--both of which were done.

I think I often wind up going around in circles. Let me set up a progression of reasoning so perhaps you can see the dilemma better than I can explain. We'll work with the specific premise of two shots hitting this region.

IF 2 shots hit here, there would have to be pieces of metal in this region. Humes says there was no metal here and says it under oath.

THUS, for the premise of 2 shots hitting there to be true, there had to be some "dirt work" on Humes' part about metal in that region.

The panel report proves there <u>was</u> "dirty work" about metal fragments and settles once and for all that there was metal in this region. THUS, the theory of two shots hitting neck will be substantiated by this information <u>if</u>....

...there is enough metal in this region to account for two projectiles. A panel member says there is not.

THUS, for the 2 shot premise to be valid, there has to be some "dirty work" on the panel member's part.....

This is my vicious circle, constantly bumping up against information that is not credible. I suppose it ends when we see the X-rays ourselves or get a valid reading.

God, I'm going nuts from all this. It can drive me up a wall. Must stop.

Stay well,

**-I meant to say "how cognizant they were of the significance of some of ...."