UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

Dec. 5, 1968

Dear Harold,

Thanks for the package of goodies. Enclosed are copies of all the frames we copied, but no big blowups. Mike is working very hard in his little spare time. The blowups will come in about a week. Enclosed is the original instruction sheet to the film (I mean my original). Could you make some copies (i.e. on Jim's xerox) and send a few, or keep them yourself and send me the original. All I have is two carbons which might smear. I made the ultimate sacrifice and counted frames one by one. This totally exhausted me and caused headaches due to eyestrain but will be worth it in the future, provided I don't do poorly on my exams. This way we can check any versions of the film for editing just by counting frames and we can easily designate any of the frames, and add to the list at any time.

I followed your instructions and looked for Shaw, but the only guy coming towards the picture is definitely not Shaw in my opinion. Not only the face but the hair is quite unlike his, although the face can't be seen clearly so that I never marked it for copying when I decided which ones to copy. Unless somehow I have the wrong guy, and that would be hard to do with your using the Pizzo exhibit as a reference, I am sure that it isn't Shaw. If you have further instructions or comments I will be glad to abide by whatever you want, although I will be leaving Mlps on the 10th.

I wrote to Bud but didn't have time to give him any particulars--saaid that you and Vince could--in regard to Turner. I just have no time.

RE: your letter--

Who is Roberto Martinez Martinez? The Archives stuff you sent is all interesting and will be helpful. Where did the book review come from. It is excellent and is about what I would have written. O in NO, unfortunately, requires previous# knowledge of the case--that was unavoidable. In regard to Bernebei giving the Cuban all of those books to read, I would recommend Sylvia's book and then O in NO, unless this guy is really going to read all of that. I would only recommend Mark's book because it is short and provides enough brief introduction for the understanding of O in NO. Sylvia had the advantage of writing after much of the mystery about various things had been cleared up and it is therefore much better organized and more readable and understandable whan your 3 Whitewash books. This was inevitable since they were written so much earlier and sort of provided a running account of what was going on in your investigations.

I don't know who your unofficial Dallas source is, but he comes up with interesting and important stuff. The May 3, 1967 memo to the Oswald file sounds like a little too much. Besides, that's a crazy way to try to get away with the rifle. Why not just file the serial # off or use a stolen weapon? Only a nut could expect to get away that way.

Thanks for the Nagell clipping, and other items. Also, Dawnay is a very poor source for anything. Take a minute to page through his assassination newsletter. It is mostly pure lunacy. Most recently he is linking the great train robbery to the assassination. He is so far out that he can be a real liability like George Thompson in California or Lifton's paper mache grassy knoll theory. I wouldn't believe a word he said unless he had documentation. His newsletter is filled with inacuracies--all of the kind which elaborate the case.

I will write again before I leave but don't worry if you don't hear from me for a while. For now I will try desperately to salvage my academic situation and still get a few more things done here before I leave. Because of the film and public appearances I have not been able to mop up my own work on the case. Take care and good luck. Give my regards to Matt, Jeanine, Vince, etc.

Gary