

9/22/70

Howard's 9/13,20 and emc. carbon dated 9/13
Dick's 9/17

The carbon is a pretty good letter, I think perhaps somewhat counter-productive in being too gently and understated. Any further comment might tend to influence Dick's thinking. I'll be enclosing mine, since you have already formulated your opinions. I've had no response.

Re speeches: I've found similar reaction, although I've made no recent appearances. I approach in terms of integrity of society, which includes poss. coup and functioning and integrity of government, etc.

While I have no urgent need for it, the Minutemen book might be interesting. A fellow named Smith is supposed to have written a definitive one. He is a reporter on a Kansas newspaper.

Let you (both) know when I get blowups. No rush shirt negatives. Apparently Dick never got prints, Teddy file, for he's made no comment. It was insured.

I did consider possibility Alvarez was pressuring Koch but have no substantiation.

I am very interested in Govt response to Nichols suit, esp. affidavits. Unless I indicate otherwise before mailing this, Bud doesn't have it. I have call in.

Check on shirt analyses. Also comments on poss. washing, which would have been crazy. But is there anything that could "fix" or deodorize stains other than washing?

1963 history book/ coup/CIA not mil- those pages would be very interesting.

Dick, apparently Archives sent similar letters (Exkhoff's 8/20) to all who had asked. Glad to get. I have separate file such things, for use in court, if necessary...Donnis Olson...Mayhew, nothing new. He says he is coming and would like nothing more than to get my materials...Z- prints not yet delivered. Will be by hand. I'd wait before making slides of my 35 print until I am certain I'll not have a better set. It is possible. I have a very good 16, good as or better than any I've seen anywhere....Brown, right. Thanks. Will read Operation Phoenix piece soon as can. I've heard from a possibly mentally ill woman who claims her former husband was part of that that end of "Highlift"...HR-Bud does not have Nichols stuff....Pullout. There is and I've long had much more. What you cite is true but very understated. I suggest that by this time JFK was not completely briefing as many as he had begun to on taking office, ~~xxxxxx~~ hadn't been since late 1962. O'Donnell either held back or was not fully informed. But he is right...JG's book retitled, from "A heritage of Stone". If I knew new title, forget. Not scheduled October. I have no word of it from him. Or of anything else...Shirt front: when you get pictures (and if you haven't, tell me so I can go after F.O., for this and clips were insured), I think you'll be convinced not only that there is no bullet hole but that it is in fact impossible for there to have been one in garments...Clip: somewhere I have print of Day carrying, some from Alyea. Can't find Day. Palmer has Alyea 16. One of my Alyea prints may confirm. Taken at downward angle, trigger is visible but no projections for clip. Checking tabs for you leads to rather interesting observations. CE 139 as used in 1303 (inc WR82) is not the same as CE139 164512. And, the position of remounted scope may be enough to explain FBI disinterest in Alyea: the scope as rifle was found is perhaps several inches forward of any subsequent representation. With my eyes, this would preclude use! If interesting to you, let me know and I'll get best possible prints/enlargements made. I will sure use this in Agent Oswald!

If not in court first. You may remember, mine works. You used it, as did Chuck Rodak. Now, mine was mounted as per the printed pictures, by an expert. If this scope is like that on my 22, then the distance, certainly more than one inch, is enough for scope on rifle as found to be out of focus. In any event, it is irrefutable proof of conscious invalidity of mounting in DC. Understand, what I have is the earliest possible picture, even if staged after the first were taken, with Fritz holding. I think it unlikely any change was then made. We should compare Curry 54 also. Sprague should have good prints. My God, if this is right, then we have the suppressed proof that rifle couldn't have been used! and the FBI's guilty knowledge! Or, can it be compensated for by moving the eye? But, of course, the eye cannot be moved forward if the bolt is in the way. In this Alyea print, the back end of the scope is approximately where the back end of the pulled-back bolt is. You'll have to check this, for I may be all wrong.

Sincerely,

17 Sept 70

to Weisberg (cc *Roffman*)

Dear Harold:

A few things have kept me from writing, not the least significant of which is that I have not really had an awful lot to say-- nor anything of great importance. Also I've been busy, previously finishing up my Ph.D. and now preparing for the beginning of classes. Much of it has to do simply with being done with the PhD and the sort of deflation of spirit that followed the frantic last few weeks of it. I had had it up to here, and just wanted to be off things that tangled my mind. Sorry for delays; you didn't miss much.

The address of the publishers of Physics Today is:
American Institute of Physics
335 East 45th St.
N.Y., N.Y. 10017

We have the mag somewhere on campus-- the physics library, I think. I'll take a look at recent issues and see if I can find what interests you.

Hoch/Alvarez: I have written to Hoch for the study you refer to. I do not know anything about it. In your letter of 2 Sept to Schoener you refer to ~~W&O~~ "Don", who I suppose means Don Olson. Last year, at Gary's request, Olson sent me a piece dealing with the timing of the first shot. I don't think that is the piece you refer to, but if it is, I know it. I sent comments to Olson after the thing was written. It contained mostly stuff that I had worked out for myself previously, and had ~~be~~ used in lectures, but Don wrote it without knowledge of me and I do not consider that any of it depends on what I thought. As with Olson's piece, my own thinking was heavily influenced by others. Olson's piece has some disagreeable faults, but basically is good and proves the first shot before Z 210. I think, though, that he missed the significance of that knowledge, what it implies.

When (if?) I get material from Hoch, I'll scrutinize and comment as you indicate.

Mayhew: I do not know the details of your dealings with him. His letters to me are no more than I expect or need: abrupt but adequate.

I have just about finished preparing a set of slides for him. I am waiting for the last batch from the processor. He has not indicated that he wants any more than these, and I'll not inquire further. If he wants a bigger collection, with things that I do not now have, it will cost him somewhat more than he has paid for what I have.

Z frames: I would like to borrow these for a while; long enough to make slides, if it seems ~~worth~~ worth it. No rush. Send them any time. I'll make slides for you, and others if you wish.

Bob Brown: I'll continue sending anything of his that I find, even though you are getting stuff from him. It's no great bother for me.

CIA-Vietnam: If it is not included with this, I'll soon send you a True article concerning CIA's ~~RESEARCH~~ Operation Phoenix in Vietnam.

JFK/Vietnam: I notice LIFE's recent article by Kenny O'Donnel (spelling?) confirms a memo Gary wrote a year or so ago. Gary interviewed David Schoenbrun who said he learned from Gen Gavin that JFK had issued the pullout order shortly before he was killed in Dallas. I had no reason to doubt that, but having confirmation from O'D is good. I recall that one (Newsweek?) columnist poo-pooed the notion in comments re O'D's article-- "improbable", "nonsensical", or something like that.

Your 13 Sept with advice to Howard is gently masterful. A pleasure to read, and a benefit.

Garrison book: I know nothing of it, but want it when it's ready. What's the title? "How to make crow taste like pheasant under glass"? If only he would think less of the good that he can do, and more of the harm that he has done.

I visited Howard at his home for a day when I was in his area. I did not have a chance to get down to Frederick, since I traveled to N.J. with my family and had to rejoin them. I shall not be free again for some time, and must therefore be satisfied with letters.

Shirt front: at Howard's I saw a small but clear photo. I am now more than ever convinced that no bullet passed through there. I would like a copy of the picture so that I can examine it more closely.

Rifle clip: Harold showed me a few faded prints showing Lt. Day with the rifle in the TSBDD shortly after it was found. The clip is not in the rifle as Day is handling. I'm sure these photos were taken after the cartridge had been ejected.

For various reasons which I'll explain later, I would like to see all pictures that show the rifle between the time that it was found and the time that it left the building. With the right pictures, it might be possible to prove-- or perhaps at least strongly to indicate-- that the clip was not in the rifle when it was found.

I can't be sure of anything right now, so I don't want to guess what we would find. But I want to see as many pictures as I can. If you have any, please send them to me for a while.

Echoff re 399 pix: His letter to me is enclosed.

Neck fragments: Howard evidently indicated to you that I was toying with the idea of sending a phoney letter to the Panel doc(s) re the fragments. It is still just a notion, and not one that greatly appeals to me. If I go ahead and do something like that, I'll have you read the thing before I send it.

Computers and Automation: I have not seen anything they printed after Sprague's article. Sprague said there was something-- or would be. I'll try to get hold of it and see.

Enough for now. I'll enclose, or will soon send, carbon of a letter which I shall soon write to Howard.

Good luck with suits and publication.

Still,

Dick