

4/5/68

Dear Dick,

Welcome to the "gully". As a scholar, you at first feel awkward in the role of "communicator", that is per. I think that in time you will come to understand that what you have just done is the end product of the work we do. In addition, it offers its own kind of exhilaration, the meaning of which is, in turn, its own kind of gratification.

I recall that I felt funny, out of place, almost embarrassed. Then, as I came to realize what an audio and TV I can carry information to people more readily than in books, I also came to understand that lectures and other appearances are a vital part of the whole thing.

As you have learned, it is also a catharsis. You will soon be at a point where you do not prepare for these things and, for the first one you face when you cannot prepare, let me assure you that you are a nut. In fact, from the point of view of its effectiveness, I think you will conclude as I have that, because you know what you talk about and will not talk about things of which you are not reasonably certain, that you are more effective when it is more spontaneous, and it is fresher, more vital, to your audience.

I go off on brief but very intensive tours. I now require one in advance, save for asking a selection of documents with me. I never rehearse or discuss one with the moderator.... Also, you can get preparation time to better use. ...And you can feel from your audience that they want you to go into it. I think, in time, as you do more of these things, you will make a shorter initial presentation and spend more time answering questions, for you cannot cover the subject adequately anyway, but you can satisfy the audience better in answering their questions.

Now, too, perhaps you feel more a part of something.

Your surprise at the reaction is very exceptional. Everyone underestimates the silent understanding people all over the world have. I rarely ever hear anyone repeat the viewpoint on this experience. I think to begin with some that half did not believe what they had been told.

Speak up, I think, has been a characteristic employment, perhaps has been a fact that has been his. He had this return address: The Webster Hotel Apt. #2, Thornbury Road, White Plains, N.Y. He told me he had heard from you and intended writing. I think about it is in the confusion of saying that he had failed to. Let me make this suggestion: is what you can do now, your idea about the tapes film. Ask him to lend you the latest exists in his of those things you need, for you can work better from prints. He says he will be able to accommodate you. His thinking is much like mine: neither the Commission nor Manchester has a monopoly on being wrong, and to the degree possible each thing should be checked out.

On Similes: if you haven't been in touch with Gary Murr, RR #1, Wolfert, Ontario, you should be, before you do anything. He has done excellent work there (and on other things, too). He has seen Similes and others.

Your British Columbia lead sounds exciting. Please keep me posted in as much detail as possible. That sort of thing can be very exciting. You may recall that Sgt. Patrick Day had some story about a man who phoned and never delivered. Recall about Day that he was, in the description of the Commission lawyer who deposed him, a perjurer, so as you read these things in the hearings and exhibits, you may better be able to evaluate what he says if it turns out to be the same man. If he is unwilling to let you have the file, try and get a description, including above all,

as closely as he recalls, exactly when he took the pictures, where he was standing, which way he shot, etc. If he is unwilling to lend you the original, ask him to have it copied. If he is willing to lend it to you and you cannot get it copied, ask him to send it to me and I'll have it done. Also, there is a photographer in Michigan working with me. He is Joel Palmer. I met him once and liked him. His address is 1961 Havens Ave., S.E. Wyoming, Mich., 49509. His phone is 616/249-0051.

He phoned me yesterday, when I was in Washington conferring with Dr. Joan Nichols, the pathologist who did the adrenal work. He was to have phoned me again last night and didn't. If he phones me today or tonight, I'll tell him about this. He may be able to help, and if he does it, possibly at the same time he can have slices made from a parent film, which he hates. Don't send the original.

There is another film in that same general area that I discovered a long time ago. Some fine young friends of mine in California have been in touch with the people who have it. They have made it available. They seem not to have gotten around to it. If necessary, they may be able to fly out and try and get that picture at the same time. I'll let you know how I can handle it. Please keep me posted, so I can know.

Carlinson has asked me to return to New Orleans again. I'll be there from 8 a.m. Tuesday 4/3 until early a.m. Monday 4/15. I think you may have enough interest in the two films to find a way of being helpful, so, if you think I should approach him, please let me know. You can address me c/o him at his office, Tulane and Broad, New Orleans. I'll perhaps have a chance to see you by reference anyway.

Keep after the fellow you know who knows Thompson, but do not expect much. I think you'll learn that Thompson is not a good person to do business with, and that most of those who associated with him are still in jail. If you have the book, you know it is but a skilled blend of thievery and growing error, designed to suit the market at best and to provide an escape route at worst. It is anything but scholarship. You may, eventually, hear something. I doubt if he'll want to help.

I missed the Newsweek thing. If you have the extra copy, I'd appreciate it.

In shipping film that cannot be replaced, I would urge you to use registered mail, always. It is not costly, is more troublesome, but it also must be kept under lock and key. It is the safest way.

Harold

Harold

29 March 1968

Mr Weisberg:

Thanks for your letter of 24 March. The picture of Lovelady in his checkered shirt was not necessary-- it would have been impressive, but I learned that he had acknowledged in public ( on CBS-TV, I think) that he was wearing that shirt on 22 Nov., and that was reference enough.

I have not ~~xxx~~ seen Similas, though I would like to. But I just wrote to a man in British Columbia who took movies on Dealey Plaza at the time of the assassination. I asked him to send me his film ~~his~~ and a letter describing what he remembers. The man offered his film to the Commission, but they refused to see it. I will let you know what comes of this.

I wrote to Sprague a few months ago, but have not received a reply.

My lecture was a sensation. I had planned it to last about two hours, but I fielded questions for two hours beyond that. I was exhausted, but gratified because all went away asking the logical question: how in Hell did they suppose that they could get away with such a blatant fraud? Some people approached me afterward and confided that I had truly terrified them. Good! There is reason for feeling terror.

Most of all, I was glad to be able to do something. I have been sitting here for a year wringing my hands, furious with a sense of impotence. Now at least I have company in my alarm, and a good many more people are concerned than were concerned before.

The timing of the lecture was good for the audience, not so good for me. We are approaching the end of the school year, and people will have time during the summer to read the Report in the light of what they now know, and probably also get some of the critics' books. But it was a bad time for my outburst, since I am busy with exams, term papers, and the like. What the Hell; one can't dictate the timing of his catharsis-- that's exactly what it was for me. It wasn't all that bad, in any case; I know the subject well enough so that I can speak extemporaneously about it for as long as the occasion requires-- and I can field questions indefinitely.

I entitled the lecture "The Assassination of the Warren Report: Justifiable Homicide?" The lecture hall seated 300, but was jammed even in all the standing room areas-- including the aisles. I was amazed at the amount of interest-- amazed and glad that people are not as indifferent as we think they are.

sometimes

I have appeared on radio five times since my speech; once on an interview show, three times fielding questions from listeners who phone in, and once talking with a person who pretended that he knew something, but knew nothing. Our station covers 100,000 bodies and minds.

~~xxxxx~~

2

I was briefly on TV once, but have been invited to be interviewed again later for a longer period. Moreover, I have three speaking engagements before smaller groups of 30 to 50 people at a time. More will come, I am sure.

I am hoping that word will spread that there is an "assassination buff" in Canada, and that I will get a chance to speak elsewhere than Kingston.

In spite of your assurance that the Hughes film pictured in Life (24 Nov 67) was not doctored, I am more than ever convinced that it was. I was willing to let the matter rest because the blue-shirted figure appears in all the frames of the film, but I got Josiah Thompson's book some time after you wrote, and I noted something that renewed my conviction.

In the chapter entitled "A Reconstruction" Thompson prints a few frames of the Hughes film before the TSBG comes into view. The pictures are remarkably clear. The last picture of Hughes' movie before the TSBG comes into view is on p.184; it shows the south wall of the Dal-Tex Building (same distance from Hughes as the TSBG) with such clarity that you can distinguish individual bricks on the wall. When the TSBG comes into view, the picture seems to have no focus at all, either near or far.

You report in PW that Hughes turned over his undeveloped film to the FBI, that they developed it and "studied" it before Hughes ever saw it. It is my notion that the FBI inserted the blue-shirted figure to cover up a picture of Oswald in the doorway, and then made successive copies of that part of the film until it became so blurry that the evidence of their doctoring is not apparent (also, they may have wished to obscure the second figure on the sixth floor, in the closed window just west of "Oswald's window").

I cannot believe that the blue-shirted figure is on anyone's shoulders near the northwest corner of Houston and Main, as you suggest; if she is there, then she must be standing on those shoulders, for she is far above others standing on the pavement in that area. That's quite a feat of acrobatics, just to watch the motorcade. The movie by F.M. Bell (in Thompson p.185, and in Life) may show all of the west side of Houston Street as the motorcade passed, and it undoubtedly shows all of the high part of the concrete structure as JFK's car turned the corner at Elm. I would love to see if the blue-shirted figure is in that movie.

I went to Cornell with a fellow who works with Thompson at Haverford College. I wrote and told him what I thought about the Hughes film being doctored, but have not yet had a reply.

If the picture was doctored, it can only have been the FBI who did it, for they developed it and were its sole possessors until they returned it to Hughes. And, if it was doctored, they did it specifically because they knew that Oswald was standing in the doorway.

Or is the blue-shirted figure just another one of those strange "coincidences" that haunt this case?

Here is another bit of fakery that I noticed recently. You remember, of course, that the Commission misnumbered and transposed Zapruder 314 and 315, and thereby created the impression that the President's head moved forward after the last shot, instead of backward. In his book Thompson prints two diagrams showing the double movement of the President's head; he placed the diagrams side by side and clearly illustrated the violent backward motion of the head. Well, Newsweek reviewed the book and printed Thompson's two diagrams in reverse order! The switch creates the same impression as the reversal of 314 and 315 in the Exhibits. ~~TheyXXXXXX~~ Newsweek wrote the caption straight, noting Thompsons' "backward movement theory" (or something like that). The juxtaposition of a proper caption and transposed diagrams makes Thompson look like a fool, for anybody can see that the President's head moves forward!

Another "printer's error", no doubt.

Don't be concerned about not being able to answer my letters; I know that you are travelling and busy, and I do not wish to crowd your time.

Please let me know if I can do anything for you.

Still,

*Dick*

Dick Bernabei