

9/4/69

Dick, it takes longer and longer for your letters to reach here. That postmarked the 29th arrived this a.m. I answer it briefly during an intermission from work, to avoid another interruption.

Is it columator or, as I was told, culmiator. Can you give me correct ~~spelling~~ spelling and source? And is it Sight-)-)-line or Line-)-)-Sight? You again use both. Shirt slits: I doubt if I'd want to add anything to III on this, but it might well make an appendix picture. I could get one from the archive and use one you might have, of your tests. They do interest me. They may also fit elsewhere.

Frazier on fibres here he was explicit. It is in WW. He said direction meant nothing. My own opinion: scalpel cut.

If you can recall which letter you refer to on Dick, could you please include a note with reference to it and a caption I can add, so I'll know its purpose some time hence? I can then pile it appropriately.

I have in at least two places published autopsy doctors' knowledge of neck entry, have it in at least one limited edition, in three different ways, from different sources. One calls, WEibert-O'Neill knew; WW II (and PM); obvious (WWIII). Your point on radio and news quotes of Perry is one I'd missed and a good one, esp. when they go to outside sources, like the newspapers, for the report. By the way, I have discovered 43 Boxes of radio tapes at the National archives for those three days. One the coverup and purpose of the calls, not what I quote Kemp Clark on about this (WW).

To a degree I handled irregularity in WW also. Here again you are right. Even the nurses reported it.

Bill's retyping of the ms has been interrupted by a small but to us important typing job she got and an audit of our books. But she is making an extra copy of the retyped version. I hope to be able in interest someone with the facilities to xerox it, perhaps several copies, so you, Gary, Paul and his boys, can all read it. The longer I continue without major error, the more the odds are against it, aside from the positive value of such reading. I'll let you know. She done about 75 pages, which may be no more than a fifth.

If you have made 2 slides and Gary hasn't, I'd like to get some from one of you. I have and use pictures of the pages. In fact, I'd like to have a duplicate set of 199-205 long enough to give an artist friend a little job I think he'll do for me with them.

Yesterday I took the legislative assistant of Gary's Senator to the Arch to see 2. I never see it without at least thinking I see something new. While I was showing the slides, in the area of 33 335--after those published, those I smoked out, I did not see either Connolly. When you look at hours again, would you please check this? By the way, there were two EVs there to audition me and watch his reaction, regardless of any purported report. I offered them all the help they'd like. They asked none!

Hurriedly,

29 August 69

Harold:

Sight-O-Line is a columator. I could not remember the technical name for the gadget when I wrote before. I saw an article in a recent gun mag re Line-O-Sight. If you want it, tell me and I'll dig it up. Better to go to gun shop and see how it works. I believe it will give accuracy within 4 inches of zero at ~~100~~ 100 yards (i.e. within an 8-inch circle surrounding zero). I am not sure of that.

Slits in JFK shirt front: Some time ago I fired bullets into shirt cloth hung from a target frame (simulating exit, where there is no fleshy substance behind the cloth) and never produced slits-- just holes. I can't remember how many shots were involved-- at least 10. I have to sight-in a rifle soon and will set up another cloth and send you results. It is possible that a tumbling bullet could cause such slits, but if that were the case, JFK's front-neck wound would be much larger, ragged edges, and not circular.

Frazier's info that the fibers were pushed outward can have no bearing on direction of missile passing through shirt front (if the slits were caused by missile, which I doubt), for ~~the~~ JFK's clothes were roughly handled when removed from Parkland. Pictures show them rolled up into a ball as they are being carried from Parkland. Correction (after reviewing one of the pictures): they may be Connally's clothes in the picture, so ignore this. Sorry. But I still think it has no bearing on the circumstances of the shooting. The wound is the important thing.

As indicated in a previous letter, I do not doubt that Humes and the others knew there was a missile wound in the front-neck, and that Humes' calls to Perry were a charade to make it possible for them to disguise their knowledge. I wish I had noticed the evidence for this before Finck got on the stand in N.O. Garrison's lawyer could have squashed him like a grape or (to use a more familiar expression) rubbed his dick in the dirt. I suggest that you re-read my letter on this and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ check with a pathologist to see whether allegations there are justified. If so, put in in one of your books. The more I think of it, the more I think it is exceedingly important-- especially considering some of Finck's N.O. testimony regarding failure to dissect neck area. I have only the account in the N.O. papers, but the hedging, military orders, and the rest all fit with my notion that the autopsy doctors knew that the tracheotomy cut across a missile wound and that it was an entrance wound. Besides, Perry was on TV announcing a bullet wound in the front neck. I believe this was before the autopsy began*. They must have known about this front-neck missile wound (a) from Perry's press conference and (b) from their own observation of the wound. They cannot have avoided knowing it. The calls to Perry make marvelous good sense in light of this-- the cover-up was not possible without without the calls.

The give-away is in the Autopsy Report where they say the wound was 6.5 cm long and had irregular edges. The only irregularity in the wound was the circular wound over which Perry cut. The word "irregular" is the keyhole that lets us look into their room of knowledge. Its implications are inescapable.

Determined they cite newspaper reports in the Autopsy, so they were aware of the wound

I doubt whether your pond will sustain big fish unless you provide food. Also, we may have a different idea of what constitutes big.

I hope Bantam comes through. When ready, send me the parts dealing with firearms (and any other parts you want). On technical matters you should be checked carefully, for a slip-up could be damaging. The press is willing to excuse even the inexcusable "blunders" of the honorable men in government and their hacks, but they will not tolerate error in us. Those bastards.

School starts soon and I'll be extra busy, but do not hesitate to use me in any way you want. If I can't do what you want, I'll say so, but don't hesitate because you think I am busy. Let me decide.

I have put most of my lecture on slides; the advantage is great. It's strange, but having Zapruder on film changes the whole thing. Issues always required explanation of details and some argument, but now all I have to do is dispassionately relate the WC's version, show a picture of CE 399 and then show Zapruder. It's not that simple, of course, but at least I can do what the WC never did-- let the people see the evidence and decide for themselves.

The fun comes when they make up their minds without help. I gave a talk to some gun buffs at my shooting club; it came off marvelously. Using Life pictures of Zapruder I coolly went through the single-bullet theory. As finale, I cast CE 399 on the screen simply with the words, "This is the bullet that did the damage". There was silence for a while as they waited for me to say something else. Finally somebody got the idea that I meant the bullet, and he gave a little cough. Another guy started to chuckle, and gradually it spread until the room was an uproar of laughter. It ~~has~~ never before caught fire like that, but this was an audience with special knowledge. Anyway, it was a gasser, and I loved it.

Still,

hkk

BERNABEI