

3/26/68

Dear Dick,

Rushed. Leaving for H.O. early Fri for two wks. If necessary can be reached c/o Louis Iva, Garrison's office....You may find some interest my Nixon notes., enc., top on shirt.

If I didn't putx you in touch Paul Koch, as I think I did, 2537 Regent St., #202, Berkeley, Calif., please write him as you did me on shirt, L, Fr and Sheelley. He has stuff on Renfile, husband, that fits your theory in part. I suggest it is possible to be too suspicious. That you say of Altgen angle is that I've been saying three years. I think they can both be in anyway. If his test is accurate, he was against west side and would not show in A. Mrs. L. told us test was altered, Sheelley's had mistakes or exchanges or lies and she could never get transcript. I think it like A and F test. bag accurate, simple explanation, Curtion rods left is shed west side bldg. Dick has picture of Beakley room with curtains being put in! I have contact, cannot afford \$10. In your thoughts, remember in such unexpected great events there is always the human question and the richness of recollection. I have to be convinced that I is link. I met in Calif. Paper on Hughes fine idea. Working forward. somewhere I have other original FBI reports, where they even have wrong LIA names (Billings comes on Billingsly or something like.

That Sheppson did is to salvage as much as possible of the fairy tale. It is vital they been O as assassin. This he knowingly lied to do. Note his SFF thing, which is major, says no conspiracy, just the other nuts got same idea, same time and place. He also speaks, which is not the same as using the material of others with proper credit, and was uncorred. could have pushed him and his back-end could have-if it had doubt o'got lawyer. The only question in my mind is was he volunteering, without pay. I have since often called him back on radio and TV and he is silent.

Please make thorough record all suspicious CIA cover and send me copies, as things happen. One guy who failed recently and showed signs conversion just had mysterious, really impossible suicide, out of continental limits.

John Nichols doing excellent ballistics study that I think he'll publish.

Dallas police pix in CR31.1, undated or timed, show windows third from east sixth floor open half way in three views. Checked yesterday. Perhaps you can get accurate enough timing from Ray. Gydebocker test., or from Sprague. I can get pix for \$1.50 each if you want. In one clock seems to read 12:17, but no traffic on street.

I'd like a print of right-temple wound. No blood shows color versions in Archives. And there is a medical witness on left temple in addition to those you name. Shirley Martin had ribes on nose, back and lost or kept. I can get Frank Re. 2 by comparison archives, where missing nine I wrote of in 14 are now available. Goes to 343 now.

Excuse haste. Not much to do before I leave.

Best



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
KINGSTON, ONTARIO

21 June 68

Harold:

Don't bother to answer this letter in detail; I just got back from the States where I talked with Sprague and others, so my mind is reeling with lots of exciting thoughts, and I just want to talk. This may be a long letter.

Sprague's pictures and some of his remarks were a revelation to me. I think that I half persuaded Sprague that I am right about the doctoring of the Houghes film. He gave me a copy of Weigman #1 showing the Man in the Doorway-- I am more than ever convinced that the man is Oswald (I did not get to see the Underwood picture). More than that, it caused me to note yet another discrepancy in the doorway as viewed in the Houghes film. Houghes shows a man in a reddish shirt standing behind and above a negro in a white shirt-- both are against the west wall of the doorway. The Weigman photo shows that the area behind the negro is in deep shadow-- anyone standing behind him would not be visible either in Houghes or in Weigman. That Houghes photo bugs Hell out of me-- the more that I learn about it, the more do I think that it is dynamite; I intend to persist until all of my doubts about it are settled one way or the other. I have rendered my opinions about the film piecemeal, and I am sure that they must sound confusing. As soon as I get the opportunity I'll write up a short paper on it and explain clearly all my reasons for believing that parts of the Houghes film were faked.

Sprague caused me to suspect that Buell Wesley Frazier may be involved in framing Oswald. That bears directly on the identity of the Man in the Doorway. Until I spoke with Sprague I was willing (but reluctant) to allow that Lovelady was standing where he said he was standing-- on the top step against the west wall. I am sure, though, that if that is correct, then Lovelady is out of sight in the Altgens picture, for the angle of the photo indicates that the Man in the Doorway is standing more or less in the middle of the doorway, on the top step, to the left of Lovelady. Meagher proved that Lovelady and Shelley were in collusion and that by their lies they discredited Victoria Adams' alibi for Oswald (i.e., that he could not have run down the back stairs after the shooting). I thought that they might also have lied about Lovelady's presence in the doorway. Frazier's testimony was the only thing that caused me to believe that Lovelady and Shelley might have been telling the truth about where Lovelady was, even though they lied about the other thing. ~~Now that Frazier is under suspicion~~ I tended to trust Frazier because of his damaging testimony regarding the length of the bag, along with the testimony of Linnie Mae Randle. But hell, Randle is the one who (with Ruth Paine) got Oswald the job at the Depository-- and it is only she and Frazier who ~~not~~ indicate that Oswald carried a large bag to the TSBD. Remember that Dougherty saw Oswald enter the Depository, but saw no bag. Now that Frazier, too, is under suspicion, I wonder whether the whole lot of them-- Lovelady, Frazier, Shelley-- may not have lied in placing Lovelady in the doorway.

EISNER WORKS FOR THE "CANADIAN CURTIS PLAN" (A SUBSIDIARY OF CURTIS PUBLISHING CO. — HE WORKS OUT OF BELLEVILLE, ONT. — I BELIEVE HE IS CANADIAN, BUT I AM NOT SURE.

Sprague says that Frazier owned a rifle in .303 caliber. I sent Sprague a couple of good pictures of the Lee-Enfield rifles that are chambered for the .303 and notes on how to distinguish them from other bolt action rifles. Rifles in .303 are quite distinctive; I hope that Sprague can find it among the photos he has of rifles. You will remember that initial reports described the assassination rifle as .303.

Sprague told me that you think Josiah Thompson is a government plant. I find that very interesting. Certainly I would not have thought so without prompting, but in the light of your suspicion and of a certain curious experience of my own, I would not be quick to put you down. I was aware of some almost incredible blunders that Thompson made in his book-- especially in attributing innocent motives to the "mistakes" in the Report-- but I tended to regard them as the result of his over-zealous interest in remaining "scholarly" and "detached". The book seemed to me not a great contribution to the solution of the case; rather, I thought that Thompson had merely undertaken to reduce the obvious to statistics-- stuff that had been noticed and reported (but not measured) by others. What surprised me is that whenever Thompson approached the truth about the cover-up, he seemed to be dazzled by it and to turn his back on it. The case of O.P. Wright and his identification of the original stretcher bullet as a .30 caliber spire point is a major revelation, yet Thompson blinks in the face of it, shrugs his shoulders, and continues with his fatuous notion that the bullet was picked up as a souvenir.

Thompson's identification of Lovelady as the man in the doorway is such a dismal flop that I wondered how he could have blundered so foolishly; his failure to display a picture of the man's shirt and to compare it with Oswald's shirt is unforgivable. But it makes sense if you assume that he is tooting a government horn. In the light of my own curious experience, I don't find that at all incongruous. Let me explain.

I think that I am being "covered" by a CIA man or something of that sort. I cannot describe briefly my reasons ~~xxxxx~~ for believing that this fellow, Eisner, was put on me, ~~xxx~~ but I am sure that he is a faker, pretending to be something that he is not. In any case, in various conversations with me concerning the assassination he has tried ~~xxxxx~~ to persuade me either that I am wrong about certain issues or that I should desist from accusing the government of complicity in the cover-up. The point about which he was most adamant was my identification of Oswald as the man in the doorway. He really persisted on this point, and that is one of the things that makes me believe that those bastards know that it was Oswald in the doorway. Eisner allowed that there was a conspiracy and that the President was fired upon from more than one direction-- he seemed to go along with Thompson on all the matters that Thompson treats. But he was adamant about the Man in the Doorway.

Perhaps all this represent a new government line and they are ready officially to admit that there was a conspiracy. Eisner ~~xxxxxx~~ asserts that "businessmen" are behind it.

Here is another thing that makes me worry and wonder. A few months ago I wrote to Dan Gillis at Haverford and disclosed to him my

suspicions about the Houghes film. I had hoped that Gillis would pass the information to Thompson, who apparently had access to films that were taken on Dealey Plaza. I especially noted the movie by Mark Bell which I thought would show all of the area that I am interested in. Bell photographed JFK on Houston and through the turn at Elm, and his picture should surely show the blue-shirted figure if she is genuine. I have not yet had a reply-- that did not bother me, for I supposed that Thompson may not have had easy access to the pictures that I mentioned. But I was floored when Sprague told me that Thompson has the Bell movie and that the movie does show all of the area that I am interested in.

If I am wrong about the blue-shirted figure in Houghes, Thompson could have told me so immediately. Am I not justified in being even more suspicious now than I was before?

Of course, if Thompson is a plant, and if I am right about the Houghes film, then it's good-bye Bell movie.

I visited Sylvia Meagher for an hour or so when I was in New York. In the course of our conversation she received a call from Shelley Braverman, an ~~xx~~ exceedingly knowledgeable person on firearms and a writer for Guns magazine. He did an article a year or so ago on the 6.5mm Nitrgliada bullet-- it was interesting, but showed that he knew a lot more about ballistics than he knew about the Report. Still, he is interested, and I hope to exploit that interest by getting him to write in Guns about the ballistics evidence in the assassination. Meagher does not know about guns and was not able to answer all of his questions-- nor did she know of my knowledge of firearms, or she would have had me speak to my gun. I wrote to him recently, told him of my interest in guns, and offered myself as his "consultant" on the ballistics aspects of the Report. Except for Braverman's article, that whole area of periodical literature (gun magazines) has not touched the assassination. Too bad, because they have enormous circulation-- and the gun buffs would be the easiest to convince regarding the fallacies of the Report, for most of the evidence relating to ballistics is blatantly false.

If Braverman is interested, I'll tell him of my suspicions concerning the way the Carcano was sighted. Surely he has the equipment to run the test, and if they prove as I suspect, he might be glad to publish an article.

By the way, I got the carbon copy of the letter that you sent to Cary Murr. Thanks. I am waiting for replies concerning the man in the checkered jacket. Meagher thinks it might be FBI agent Bardwell Odum, but she is not sure. Sprague says that the picture in Four Days was taken by Jack Beers. He thinks that Beers took the picture about 12:45, which dovetails neatly with Similas' account of when he took his picture. I'll write on this again when the issue is settled.

I do not know the background of your third paragraph to Cary, so my comments may be irrelevant-- ignore them if they are. Here is what you ~~xxx~~

say: "The left-temple wound is not from him alone (includes McClelland). But the visible blood in hair is not visible in Zapruder."

Besides McClelland, Father Oscar Huber also described left-temple wound (in newspaper accounts, I believe).

I have a black and white frame of ~~xxx~~ Zapruder that shows large wound in right temple; my guess is that much blood is evident in the color version. The picture is small, but exceedingly clear. Mrs. K is violently thrusting the President ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ away from her before she climbed over the trunk of the car. This frame was published in ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Salandria's article (in Liberation, I believe; but possibly in The Minority of One). I'll send you the picture if you think it is relevant. The frame is not numbered, but it must be within a second or two of frame 313.

Enough for now. I will stay in touch.

Dick

Dick Bernabei