

6/19/69

Dear Dick,

Got your letter at the P.O. this a.m., walked across the street to Tom's office to give him check and ascertain whether he had sent you the pix (going out today, wife says, and have a few minutes now before nurserymen come to replace tree. When I learned Tom had not sent you pic because he hadn't had darkroom time, I asked his wife to mail prints immediately and negatives when he can copy them. This is what I presume they will do. Had to hurry.

Notice of Sprague's marriage in mail today.

The points in your letter are well taken, but I think you recall what I wrote in WW incorrectly. I made the point that the bullet had been wiped clean by the time Frazier got it, as I now recall, but that residues remained, but it was clean enough so that he didn't have to cleanse it further for those tests he made. I carry this further in PM, as perhaps you have forgotten, with the durability of human residues on bullets (Vietnam case, Los Angeles civilian expert in military trial: acquittal because no test for residues). I have overlooked fragments and if I was every aware of Mills I have forgotten that, for which there is no excuse. My present recollection is that the official story is that the car was twice searched, but never until after its return to DC, that each time fragments turned up, three and two. I thought First SS, second FBI. If the second was by a Corpserman, that is an entirely different and significant thing. Your accounting make it appear that the first search was no search but an accident and that the one search was joint SS-FBI. There is also no chain possession on 390, which I am certain I have published. I think this Mill bit should be added to PM in the form of an appendix of summaries and references. As you reread the evidence, I'd appreciate it if you note references that in future I can pick up, go over and summarize/cite. That Frazier wiped evidence off is indeed chipable, worse than I had said, for I had been unaware of that. If, in your reading, you find a basic text with a definitive statement on a) durability of human residues and b) extent of traces necessary for making meaningful tests (which I presume to be microscopic in size) I'd appreciate photocopies to add to appendix PM.

On Archives pictures: I think that instead of me making a copy of mine you may want from original negative, but when I can go to photo store I'll have copy made, which give negative. However, prior to what we spent when we were there, I had a little over \$50.00 on deposit, so order what you want and charge it to me. When I'm in town I'll phone and okay it. I suggest you do two things to reduce cost and add meaning: have right-angle shot at both bases on one negative, close as they can get on large negative, with millimeter scale both ways, right angles, which eliminates problems in enlarging and gives accurate measurements regardless of enlargement. I'd like a set of print when you do. But I'd rather have you order exactly what you want than through me as intermediary. I suggest not postponing it because we do not know what we must, we do know something is wrong, and not having any one thing that we should may deny us the knowledge when it may have most meaning.

Agreed on Cleaver. But long ago I learned it is best not to avoid the obvious, which means that when possible, when the effort does not exceed in cost the value of what it might return, it is worth making. One thing that might evenuate is that we might learn why the coolness. I'd like to know. It seems to be opposed to interest.

By the time you get this Trunzo will have left Chicago for where, eventually, I do not know. Expect him here first few ~~next~~ days coming week.

Best,