

12/13/69

Dear Dick (cc Gary),

Relet 9: Xeroxing: you'll find that rate is for each sheet. It is not the total number of sheets but the copies of each. I learned this in D.C., where there is something similar (but not quite as cheap). There also also a new machine that automatically reduced legal to letter size, at slightly lower rate.

I'm reasonably certain the Curry book is in error in labelling the fragment from the wrist, but I'm not going to assume it. Right now I'm trying to get the original picture, with caption.

399: By now you have letter s and explanation, This is quite consistent with what I've discovered, another "loss" of metal at this point, after my picture was made and before Howard's. And mine was after Link's, because they offered me his. I didn't even look at them.

Q's 543, 562 and 564: Strange how the three of us reached similar conclusions by different means. That would be helpful if would be if you wrote me a memo, sending copy to Howard for his comment, addition, etc., to support my claim for these and use in court (for Bud's understanding) I think I detected enough to support Howard with the naked eye and wrote you about it. When this is all in hand I'll make the right inquiry, in writing. Nether, I'll have it for the brief and court. If you sent me the text excerpt we discussed on which samples go on which sides in comp. misco. studies, I have it, but I do not recall it. I believe I do have John's pix.

Frazier and spectro: first thing I said on subject, in Whitewash. All he said is they are lead alloys, nothing more. And the list of them is infinite. I believe I also pointed out variations in batches of the same manufacture.

As an example of the tricks the mind plays, which I addressed briefly last night: I believe I have no reference in PM III to the 6.3 mm diameter ~~frag~~ frag in the rear of the head. Somehow, seems to me I knew it. Yet I asked Howard to make a note of it for me when he was here, and I've just found it, in his handwriting, so it is possible everyone except I did miss this. Thus the importance of recording the obvious.

Please watch the radical-right press for me on Bringuier's book. Send clips. I'll have to get it (perhaps Gary will find his sources) and read, because we cannot write a whole book without babbling. I want him to. I already have perjury on him. The only story I have thus far is Walter Trohan's (WaTrib). Hargis will surely play it, possibly also Allen-Scott column. And, of course, if the so-called responsible press reviews. They'll not know he is a nut unless it is glaring.

Sincerely,

9 Dec 1969

Harold:

I have your letters of 4 Dec, to me and to Roffman.

Coup addition: I'll write to Hoch for a copy.

Xeroxing: I learned that there is a company here in Kingston that does copying cheaper than Hoch can get it. They charge 5¢ for the first 10 pages and 2¢ for each additional page. I have not used them yet, so I can't say about quality. If it is good, I'll let you know, so that perhaps we can get our stuff done cheaper.

Curry book: Re fragment "from Connally's arm": Roffman indicates that this is in error. I'll check what he says when I get the book, and will comment more later. It's hard for me to follow this without reference to the book itself.

Dempsey: I plan to stay in touch, so I'll pursue more things with him later. Brown and others.

Your 399 base picture: How can I think that Archives "loss" of this picture is anything but shenanigans? This makes it all the worse for them is comparison of your photo with Roffman's shows something important, as you indicate.

I cannot say much more until I see your picture.

Two suits--JFK and MLK: Good; the more the merrier (and the more expensive!). Let me render whatever help I can. If you think stuff may be tampered with in the mails, tell me and I'll send you the address of a friend who will receive stuff for me.

N.O. scopesight deal: I have not yet pursued this further with Mary, but I'll take good note of your advice.

Note to Roffman re no micro marks on brass at base of CE 543: I recently called this to his attention in reply to his Frazier notes, so he'll be getting it from both sides. I am sending him stuff on the cartridge cases, so that he will know what we are doing, and what possibilities may open up if we get the required pieces of evidence in hand for examination and testing.

CEs 562 and 564 (right-side pictures): Roffman sent me a first rate analysis of these pictures in response to my question whether they were made from the same negative. ~~It's enclosed.~~ (see below) I did not tell him what I had concluded or why; he came up with the same answer for basically the same reasons-- more definite than I myself had considered, but his photo knowledge lets him exclude considerations that I had regarded as relevant, things that to me indicated I might be wrong. R asserts "beyond reasonable doubt" that the two pictures come from the same negative. I have to probe him further on some points so that we can be absolutely sure, and I'll check with another photo buff when I get the CEs back from R, but so far things look very bad for Frazier. If we can establish with certainty that these two

2

pictures (the ones on the right side of each exhibit) stem from the same negative, then we will know with equal certainty that Frazier did not use the comparison microscope in the preparation of the exhibits. The question is "why?". I can't answer that now, but I'll bet it's enough to make Frazier sweat on the stand in court-- especially if photo expert and/or firearms identification expert could be put forth to say that the pictures do stem from the same negative.

I'll pursue this more with Roffman and others and try to nail it down beyond any doubt. Keep it in mind, for it may bear importantly in your suit.

Did Nichols send you the Archives photo of these exhibits? As printed in the volumes they are not sufficient for analysis. If you don't have them, I'll send you slides when I get them.

Correction on my sending you a copy of R's memo. He says he has extras, and I'll ask him to send you one.

Frazier perjury: Roffman did not specify this to me, but I'll get the info from him

Frazier and specro: R's explanation clarifies my confusion and error about Frazier's semantics. You know it, I am sure, but he expresses it well: "He says that the metallic composition was similar but that the metallic elements were identical. Fine, this means that lead is identical to lead and antimony is identical to antimony, but what about the relationship of the two." Whew! You've got to hand it to Frazier, anyway; he's really on the ball.

My main interest now is in getting a copy of your 399 base photo. Meanwhile, I think it in your interest to bejigger the Archives and find out why the negative was "lost". Maybe Frazier's sweating over it even now. It would be a comfort to know that he is.

Still,

cc Roffman (maybe Schener, too)