5/16/69

Dear Gary,

Briefly, before leaving for Archives, I read your psychological memos and the Newsweek piece last night while Dick Bernabei was reading other things. They are valuable, have helped my understanding, and Newsweeks says in essence what I have said and believed. I think it possible the statements you suggest might be of help, but as of now, it is my instinct to handle that very briefly, to dismiss the Sirhan trial as simply confirmation of what I had written earlier, that there would be no conspiracy trial and what was necessary to prevent it would be done, with only enough of the "science" to establish it was but a prostitution of science by both sides. Perhaps before I get to writing that you'll have been here and we can discuss further.

In our work on the range here, and with the fortuitous arrival of an authentic expert who was cooperative, we have validated part of what Frazier ignored. I think I have it in pictures. I snapped them, anyway. We were able to duplicate some of the shell dents in operating two different M-C rifles. Some we have not yet accounted for-and Frazier accounted for none.

Today we are going to study the original evidence, photograph it. I also have an authentic buff (guns) who is an excellent photographer who is in our safari and will take the pictures. My hunch is that we will still have solid evidence of fudging, which is clear in Frazier's testimony anyway.

In yesterday's mail was a simple note from Marlynn reading, "Dear Harold, Please pay Gary Schoener $10.00 for the enclosed". Lil had already credited. She included Fred's three pieces from "Probe". I am more than even apprehensive about his work and the frivolity of his accusations as against Bowers. Some of it is obviously in error, as for example, his ignoring the closer position of the rifle to the lens in his measurements from which he derives a proportion. Yet he uses "perspective" as an argument against others (and omits all reference to the published sources of much of his material, pretending it originates with him, which is no less than a measure of his mind and motivation). What is obvious in the rifle photos still escapes him. It is not that I believe there was no train, for I believe I was the first to mention it, in the first book. I am just not satisfied he had properly, dependably, located and described it. His Willis-Betzner stuff is nonsense, and he has ignored the significance of the different locations of the photographers. The difference in angles could explain what he describes as the lopping off of the lower branch of the tree. I have found similar distortion in the peggole mullions in other pictures and believe this can be explained as a combination of fuzziness caused by enlargement and the play of light and shadows. He compares pictures that cannot be because the lighting is so entirely different. And a glaring omission is the absence of adjacent Nix frames. In short, I have in no way changed my basic belief and attitudes after seeing more of his work. I again urge caution and the closest analysis. Gotta get the pit helmet and get on the road.

Best,

May 12th

Dear Harold-

Please pay Gary Schaener
$10.00 for the enclosed.

Marlynn