

3/27/71

Dear (HF),

I'm over overloaded and over overtired, si, with your 3/24 coming today and fresh in mind, I make hasty response before I forget and have to read again, I've that much to do a week ago.

On 2: I feel that the reading given me on Willis has to be wrong and I still adhere to my own analysis, that he is gone in about 205. I think what you say is logical but unfactual about the spray, but I cannot say I can explain it, either. When you can see these new prints and frames, perhaps you may understand what I do not. I can't argue the piece, but it does seem visible in the new work we've had done with a better print of Muchmore. Howard's argument is rational, but I think this is where it can't be reflection or dirt, as I recall through too much fuzziness. As you say, there are other reasons to believe that such a fragment did behave in this fashion, and I early believed and used what you do not here mention, Hill, and what I have never mentioned, what Phil Willis told me his wife saw.

Frame-Up is supposed to be on the way to me, and the cost to me, including postage and tracking both ways, will be about \$6.50 To date, I have no copies and had to buy two press copies to use in DC last week! I'll send as soon as they come.

What Gary refers to you have already seen in COUP, it is your really great help with the rifle/ammo/ballistics. I do not know if it was changed in any way. I may have but do not remember. You have COBP II.

I have been able to get some really significant King pictures, but what they cost (for me, that is, about \$90.00)! and I've made two pitches for access to other pix, one on JFK and one on King. We'll see.

I have turned part of the black underestablishment on. We'll see if they can do what they say they want to. If they can, we can move ahead.

The guy who wrote the PW review has been raving all over NYC. He has been asked to do a piece ofr a literary publication, on the three best books he has read or reviewed in the past year. This is one of the three. What better reason can a publisher have for not placing a single ad?

As you can see, I have too many to fight, as well as too many fights to fight, and this, I think, is now the real cause for the great fatigue. But I'll pick up when I get onto Kleindienst again! He invigorates me! My good friend!

I hope HR got the message I gave a girl on the train to phone to his folks yesterday p.m., and that he was able to find a set that can get Ch 5 in North Philadelphia, in parts of which it is received.

I've been hearing from PH and I encourage leaving him alone.

Good that you hope to come! Best,

24 March 71

Harold (Paul):

I write this after reading your 3 March confidential letter to Paul re Zapruder. I have a few suggestions and comments you may wish to consider.

(Please excuse my recent laxity in writing. Nothing serious has gotten in my way-- just extra work which I cannot put aside, and a general sense of "blah".)

On the location of the bloody spray in front of the face. Consider that Z313 was taken after a bullet struck the head, and that the head is at this point already moving backward at this point-- that it has been farther forward than it appears in 313. The forward movement apparent between Z312 and 313 might indeed have been much more pronounced than is apparent in the pictures themselves. Had 313 been taken an instant earlier, it might show, for example, the debris erupting upward from the head, not forward of the head as it presently appears in 313. I don't want to make much of this guess, and don't know where it might lead, but hopefully it might somehow help you in your thinking about the problem.

Thompson in Six Seconds says that the piece of skull rolled backward off the trunk of the car. He bases this assertion on examination of Nix film. Zapruder refutes him, however. As I recall, the trunk is visible throughout that sequence and is in sharp focus. When I saw Z at Archives I remember looking for the piece, and failing to see it. I do not dispute that a piece flew backward, but the assertion that it rolled off the trunk is patently false. If such a piece were visible in Nix it would surely be visible in Z-- it is not. Not apparently is there anything suggesting that a piece rolled off the trunk -- i.e. blood stains on the trunk. Some of the Z frames after 313 are very clear and no stains appear on the trunk (I looked for them).

I reiterate that I think the bruising of the supra-sternal notch very convincing for the argument that JFK was hit in the back of the head between 312 and 213 (This is in Thompson, and I think the argument good). It is only between those frames that the head seems to be driven forward with sufficient force to cause the bruising.

I recall Howard saying that the "piece of skull" Thompson saw in Nix was just reflection of light. That makes sense.

The piece of skull going upward and backward ties in with statements by Brehm and Altgens (others, too?).

I do want a copy of Frame-up. Send it whenever you can, ~~and I'll send you \$10 soon, after I get to the bank for U.S. cash.~~ I'll send you \$10 soon, after I get to the bank for U.S. cash. Gary, in a recent letter, says: "Harold used your stuff well in Frame-Up." I do not know what "stuff" he means, and am-- fo that and other reasons-- most anxious to read the book.

I'll write again soon, answering other things in your letter. I'm very busy now-- so are you, so perhaps it's not a bad thing that I have been slow on correspondence lately. I hope that I can get down to see you sometime within the next couple of months. I'll let you know.

Still,

Harold