

Ans under HR

26 May 1970

Weisberg/ Roffman

Dear Harpld/ Howard:

I have a bit of time in which to write, but not an awful lot to write about. I have handed in the final version of my thesis and am now energetically boning up for my oral examination, which may come in June

Enclosed to Harold is a copy of Ted Kennedy's speech re Real Warren on the occasion of presentation of "Profiles in ~~Real~~ Courage" award to Warren by B'nai Brith. I gagged continuously as I read it.

National Enquireer of 31 May has two articles re assassination: One by Al Chapman, another about Skolnick's suit. I'll get another copy and will send it later to Harold. Skolnick's story gets augmented in every new public version of it.

If I can get to copier before I send this letter, I'll enclose to Howard a copy of Penn Jones' editorial re Skolnick, as Howard requested.

Howard, I forgot to add a bit about 00 buckshot. It is not ~~x2x~~ .32 caliber, as you indicate in your letter; it is .33 caliber. Not important, but I thought I would mention it anyway.

Here's a bit of news. Last night Gary Murr phoned me and explained his protracted absence from "the fore". He had serious marital problems that got in the way of everything, so he dropped out completely. I'll learn details when I see him personally in a couple of weeks. His wife apparently had possession of all of his files, books, photos, and the like-- and she was not forwarding any mail to him.

He wants to get back into action, and decided to hit me first. undoubtedly he will be contacting others later. I doubt that he has ~~done~~ done anything in the past year, and don't think he knows specifically what he wants to do, except for the vague expectation of getting involved again.

Mayhew wants a set of my pictures on slides. I'll be sending them sometime this summer when I get a chance. This is almost all published stuff, from Life and other magazines and books. Nothing new, but at least arranged in a logical sequence.

I have been in touch with Sprague regarding his article, cordially but with criticism.

Sprague named for me ^{five} ~~four~~ of the six who "admitted participation and described what happened in their own involvement": Harry Dean, Richard Nagell, Jim Hicks, Gordon Novel, and Emilio Santana. Of these, all are familiar to me except Harry Dean, whose name I never heard before. Please don't indicate to Sprague that I mentioned this to you, for I do not know whether he wants me to treat this confidentially.

I sent Sprague the information disclosed by Roffman's copy of Altgens 1-6-- the Dal-Tex window, and the man on the fire escape. He made much of that matter in the article, and I hope he will now put that matter aside. Although I think shooting originated from Dal-Tex, I do not believe that it came from that window.

I'm seeking to diminish his enthusiasm about other things, too, if not fully to delete his interest, but this correspondence is continuing.

He insists on regarding the "phony cop" as suspicious, but the more I hear his reasons, the more I think it silly. Among other things, Sprague thinks the cop's revolver is unusual. It isn't. As nearly as I can tell, it is a Smith & Wesson, Model 15, Combat Masterpiece, in .38 Sprcial; a perfectly regular piece of police equipment. It would amaze me to find a police department in any large city that didn't have numerous officers toting this particular model. It was designed largely with the police in mind, and it is widely used.

Sprague is rooting for Skolnick, too.

There are other things, too, going between us, but nothing of importance.

Nichols wrote to me recently and cordially asked permission to use in his suit the material that I sent him. Since I had previously given such permission, I reiterated that it was all right. ~~I offered~~ ~~him~~ I encouraged him, too, to tell me about the friction that has arisen between you too. It's too early for a reply, so I have nothing yet to report on that.

You may ~~not~~ be rankled that I have resumed correspondence with Nichols, and I thoroughly appreciate your concern. Understand, however, that I cannot reasonably behave toward him as though he has treated me in the same way he treated you. If he has taken stuff, it is stuff that I freely gave, virtually without restriction, at a time when I had no reason to distrust him. My letter was cordial, but it offered him nothing more than he had received from me in the past.

I'll let you know is any other correspondence develops.

I want to raise a question or two regarding Howard's suggestion that JFK was hit in the back of the head by a projectile moving at relatively low velocity. The main question stems from the presence of brain matter near the manhole cover well ~~ahead~~ ahead of JFK at Z 313. How did it get there? With a low velocity bullet, I do not think that we can reasonably assert that it flew directly from JFK's head to that spot. Excluding that possibility, I can think of only two others, one of which seems vitiated by the Zap. film after 313. (1) a piece of head was cast on the trunk of the car and rolled off at the manhole cover. Clint Hill's testimony suggests something like this, for he said he though he saw a pice of JFK's head on the back of the car. The Z film, however, seems to show nothing of this nature on the car trunk after Z313, and I think that had there been such a large piece there, it would have shown up. (2) a piece of head was cast upward and forward onto the front of the car, on or in front of the windshield, and was thereupon cast to the side near the manhole. In N.O. Frazier testified that both sides of the windshield were bloody, inside and outside, and I cannot imagine that this happened except by the car running into some descending spray that had been blown out of the head. I can't say whether that spray contained the large piece, for I ~~didn't~~ didn't look for it when I saw the Archives' Zapruder, but anyway I make the suggestion.

More later

Dick