

WNAC

2/15/67

Dear Mr. Albee,

Oddly, your first letter arrived a day faster your second.

I wish I had time for adequate answer. I do try and answer all and now spend about four hours a day doing nothing else. This is the cause of a considerable reduction in my work, but the letters I get mean so much and are so helpful, I just must answer.

I'd like very much to see your correspondence with Rankin (he never answered me) and what you then wrote.

When you talk about how good you were with a bolt-action rifle yet could not have duplicated this feat, what if you had then used such a poorly designed and made weapon as this Mannlicher-Carcano instead of the good weapon you used?

The motorcade was five minutes late, not 30. But it could have gone straight down Main without the turn (map in WHITEWASH from that morning's paper) into Elm and a) have made an illegal but perfectly possible turn into Stemmons Freeway or b) gone straight to Industrial Bvd, which may have been a better route anyway. I further believe that had the Secret Service escort been concerned about being five minutes late they would have improvised. I do not for one minute think any of these men of such demonstrated brave character were in any way a part of a plot to kill the President.

The answers to the other questions you asked are in my books and I cannot go into lengthy explanations of them now. But there were five and not two fragments found inside the car, on two different searches the first of which was a half day after the assassination and the second the next day.

You will find that I treat the possibility of shots from the grassy knoll other than Lane did, including developing evidence that reloaded ammox was plentiful in Dallas. This was WW I stuff, none made since then.

When you read my books you will find that I alone of those criticizing say the best evidence is that Oswald shot nobody, not Connolly, either.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

G. NORMAN ALBREE
BOX 181
WINCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01890

9 February 1967.

Mr. Harold Weisberg,
Hyattsville, Maryland.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

It has occurred to me that I should supplement my letter of this morning by another giving you a little additional, pertinent information which should prove of real interest and possible value. At least it will prove that I have been at this matter for a long time.

The Warren Report was, as you knew, signed by the 'seven' and delivered to President Johnson on 24 September 1964. You will, too, perhaps, recall that a couple of days later the report was 'leaked' and the papers had quite a comprehensive epitomization. Upon reading this, I was filled with a feeling of chagrin and complete disbelief at such an incomprehensible document. So much so, in fact, that on the next day, 29 September 1964, I addressed a letter to Mr. McGeorge Bundy - this was, primarily with regard to a talk I had given, months before, to a group of old-timers (riflemen) like myself which was entitled "4.8 - 5.6 Seconds".

Under date of 1 October 1964, I received what was supposed to be a 'reply' from Mr. J. Lee Rankin. Other letters followed but about the only result was a copy of the Warren Report which Mr. Rankin had sent to me.

Many times I have been tempted to 'go after' the report as you and the other writers have done but decided to confine myself to the matter of the actual shooting and, as one shooting-pal said, instead of calling my lecture, as noted above - "4.8 - 5.6 Seconds" - I should have entitled it "A Rifleman Reacts, Violently, To The Warren Report". We, who have spent a long life-time with rifles, are quite aware of the fact that bullets can do some very strange things but we also knew that there are some things which they will NOT do under any circumstances. For many years I was regarded as the fastest man with a belt-action but I'll admit I could never have got off three perfectly aimed shots in five seconds even at the ridiculous range of under one hundred yards - point-blank, pure and simple.

Sincerely,

G. Norman Albree

G. NORMAN ALBREE
7 Stratford Road
Winchester, Massachusetts

Winchester, Mass. 01890
9 February 1967.

Mr. Harold Weisberg,
Hyattsville, Maryland.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

My question of last evening - which was, I guess, your first one - could have been rephrased more simply. "Why did the motorcade not go straight across Heusten and directly onto the Expressway?" Sure, I am quite aware of the fact that the route was planned but they were a half-hour late on a very tight schedule and much time might have been saved by not having to make that 'hair-pin' left onto Elm Street.

It seems to me that the answer to this one question might be the solution of the entire problem. The thought of 'going straight onto the Expressway' must have occurred to someone. Who insisted that there be no deviation?

Since it appeared that you adhered to the Mark Lane theory of two shots having come from the area of the 'wooden fence', I phoned, a second time, to WNAO and requested the operator to bring another question (or questions) to your attention, to wit. If one or more shots did come from the 'front' how are the following accounted for:-

1. The dent (which you spoke of having been found) in the frame of the windshield - on the INSIDE.
2. The 'splashes' of lead (which must have been from a badly fragmented bullet) found on the inside of the windshield itself.
3. The two bullet 'fragments' of some 20 and 40 grains found on the floor of the President's car.
4. The small holes, manifestly 'entrance', in the BACK of the President's coat and shirt - which holes 'registered'.
5. The so-called 'stretcher-bullet' which had lost less than 1% of its original weight.
6. The fact that this bullet remained substantially intact while a like (?) bullet hit such a fragile thing as a human head and fragmented.

Moreover, Mr. Lane believes (as do you, apparently) that "powder smoke was seen and smelt" by many in the vicinity of this 'wood-fence'. Some months ago - directly after reading it in "Rush to Judgment" - I wrote to a shooting-pal about this and I'll quote his reply exactly. "NO, I've NEVER seen a muzzle flash in daylight and doubt like hell if anyone else ever did. As to smelling the powder - outside of BLACK POWDER which would sulphur-smell up everything, I've yet to notice powder-smell outdoors and not much indoors. In my mind, the 'flash and smell' disqualifies the witnesses. He, or she, felt that a rifle SHOULD have flash and smell - so, therefore, he or she, was sure of having seen one and smelt the other. NUTS."

Shall appreciate very much your reactions and comments and I believe there is ample evidence to prove that Oswald could not have been the assassin the I am of the belief that he did fire the shot which hit Governor Connally. Was certainly glad to have heard you last evening.

Sincerely, *G. Norman Albree*