

22 May 1970

Dear Howard (cc Weisberg)

I have the Fink N.O. testimony , your letters of 16 and 18 May, and letter to Specter.

My wife is a good computer analyst, and some stuff on computers trickles down to me, so you need not outline what computers can and cannot do. I concur with some of your criticisms of Sprague; ~~but I agree with you that the use of computers with the aid of your expertise is not~~ I think, however, that you have misinterpreted some of what he says computers can do. I shall re-read that part, but presently my impression is that he indicated use of computers only for cataloguing. Maybe I have mis-read. It is not important, anyway, so please don't get me involved in a discussion of this.

Your reference to The New Republic indicates that by now you know it is the "liberal" press that is chiefly responsible for dampening spirits about the assassination, and casting aspersions on critics. I trust so-called "liberals" less than I trust conservatives; sometimes I even hate them for their duplicity and manifold other crimes against conscience.

LBJ's "international conspiracy" comes from a part of the CBS interview that he had deleted, thereby insuring it utmost public attention. His statements about a "possible" conspiracy would not have been "leaked" inadvertently.

Buckshot: I am not the least surprised that exit wounds produced by 00-buck are small and round, like entrance. Indeed, I would be very surprised if they were not. The muzzle velocity of such pellets is very slow (less than 1200 fps., I believe); this, in combination with a light-weight pellet, account for the small wounds. Consider, too, that velocity drops very fast after the pellets leave the muzzle, so that (depending on the distance) the on-target velocity might be much lower than muzzle velocity. I would not expect through-and-through passage of such pellets beyond 50 yards, but neither would I consider it unreasonably abnormal except at ranges of 75 yards and over. Inside 50 yards, ~~the~~ whether pellets traverse depends on what sort of flesh they hit. They can easily go through.

The pellets remain virtually round after hitting soft tissue; may be deformed on hitting bone, but probably would stay more or less round except for flattened area where pellet contacted with bone.

The devastating effect of shotgun wounds that you see in some photos results from close range shooting, before the pellets have had a chance to disperse widely. By "close" I mean, say, within 10 yards from the victim.

On the small exit, consider too that the exiting pellet ~~has~~ necessarily has lost much of its velocity in the course of traversing

In short, everything about buckshot ballistics indicates that if there are exit wounds, they should be small and round.

South Knoll: I'll comment on this later. Presently I'm in a busy bind, and don't have time to go over matters as thoroughly as necessary.

I'll send Penn Jones' editorial re tireless researcher Skolnick later. It's something that can wait. It will tell

you more about Penn than about anything else. He has been hopelessly "round the bend" for some time, and there seems to be no help for him. It's very sad-- all balls and no brains. Regularly I ask myself whether one has to be a bit balmy to become involved in these matters, or whether it's the ~~work~~ involvement itself that drives one balmy. One thing is sure, though: we are all balmy

I was in Ithaca yesterday and picked up a copy of Albert H. Newman's, The Assassination of John F. Kennedy: The Reasons ~~Why~~ Why (publ. by Chas. N. Potter, N.Y.). Have not yet read it (and may never), but I skimmed it well enough to see another "Son of the Warren Report". Unlike its more modest brethren, this one claims to answer all the unresolved problems, to unlock all the mysteries.

This is among the many things that convince me, irrefutably, that I am crazy, absolutely bats, for things like this make me that way.

The basis of it is Newman's explanation of Oswald's motives. He criticizes the WR for failing properly to explain the motive, but criticizes nothing else.

Say, here's something neat: Newman applies a new term to WR critics, uses it regularly when referring to them: "revisionists". As though "scamangers" wasn't good enough. Now, where have I heard that term "revisionist" used before?

Newman, by the way, is another super-liberal. Up the bastards.

Yours, cheerily,

Dick

P.S. You may not have realized it, but during the past few minutes you have been reading an upside-down letter. My signature is the only thing here that is right-side-up.