

Copies by air to: 9/5/67

Faul Hoch  
John Christian  
Maggie Field  
Bill O'Connell  
Hal Verb

*Dick Gallen*

- A) A non-sequitur: a "package" is not a "rifle"
- B) "fired previously"... No. Hoover says that they had been loaded (i.e., chambered) previously.
- C) I think that the markings that you refer to are on CE 543, not on CE 141 (the loaded shell). See testimony of Joseph Nicol (3H ).
- D) True, but bound to be regarded as nit-picking. This is true of most shells that are found at the scene of a shooting. If the chain of evidence is secure, it is fair to assume that shells found at the scene were fired at the time of the crime. It is good to attack this point, but not in this way.
- E) I know of no evidence that the bullet was "wired off". The only info on this comes from Frazier who says only that the bullet was "clean" (not "cleaned") when he received it. Nothing in the record indicated that the bullet ever was tainted by any human residue. Frazier say "material" or something like that, but there is no indication of cleaning anywhere.
- F) Stress immateriality. "Could have" has no bearing on "did", does not mean "did".
- G) I agree with Hoch; too strong. Perhaps: "FBI and B-H calculated that the camera did not run slower than...."
- H) A CBS defender (a producer, I think) says (in True mag.) that the target was orange figure against dark (blue?) background. This is // a perfect set-up for scope. Remind me to send you the reference.
- I) No. The change was in the camera, not in Zapruder. The same fuzziness occurs about 20 times in the course of the film. As the film skips in front of the lens, its distance from the lens varies. Xix This is what causes variation in clarity.
- J) Many more than a half dozen.
- K) You destroy your own analysis by these remarks-- rightly, I think; for the argument is based on blurs as an emotional response is untenable.
- L) Re Hoch's #4: The obvious comparison is between Nix/Muchmore and Zapruder. I fail to see what bearing Weigman has on this.
- M) The Dillard was taken after the last shot. Sprague told me it was 5 seconds after the last shot. Considering Dillard's position on Houston, I am satisfied with 3 Second after. (But I am not sure)
- N) I would revise this way: "The only ones who describe the wound in front" or "the only ones who saw the wound in front before Dr Perry elongated it", or something like that.

- O) Say "went backward after Z313.
- F) Lsné also discusses the backward movement.
- Q) I have seen debris fly backward in the shooting of some objects (glass bottles, lightbulbs, tomatoes, apples, etc). But in these cases the debris went in all directions. I doubt strongly that a head would do this under conditions that the IC alleges-- or under any conditions.
- R) "virtually"? To my knowledge all either said an entry wound or that it looked like entry. You weaken with "virtually".
- S) The Clark panel saw a side photo that shows the upper half of the front wound. They describe it as small and round.
- T) In addition to those mentioned in Hoch's note, I believe that Salandria summarizes the FBI Report at the end of one of his early articles.
- U) Both Humes and Kellerman saw an X-ray of the head soon after (or during?) the autopsy.
- V) I believe Finck was the only one with forensic experience. Humes had minimal training and no experience.
- W) I don't see how you can say "no evidence" without explanation. The evidence may be false, defective, inconclusive, etc., but surely there is evidence.
- X) I think they had only one rifle ( they complained about how much it cost them).
- Y) The article in True discusses "accuracy". It was abominable.
- Z) "introduce" Whaley? Whaley was dead at the time of CBS show.
- AA) I can't remember the reference, but am pretty sure that Brennan did not report his info until about 20 min. after the shooting.
- BB) Ferrie was arrested after the assassination (Sunday, I think--maybe Monday)
- CC) Check this with an authority; I think it is false.
- DD) This is what would impede its acceptance as evidence, not the fact that it was pocketed.

Bernabei

(See also comments written on the 73-pp. text. The numbered comments below go with the numbers in the text.)

- (1) The WC's request was indeed too restrictive, but I would mention that Truly's reply was not: "he is certain no curtain rods were found in the TSEB building following the assassination." (CE 2640)
- (2) A bit too strong, I think. According to Sprague, the Hughes film ends 5.7 sec before the first shot, and the Dillard picture was 16.2 sec later. When did the WC say the Dillard pix were taken? (Ref.) (Monograph, # 20)
- (3) The answer to this is that CBS did not use the full analysis made by Alvarez, in which a ~~blurr~~ single blur does not mean 1 shot.
- (4) I have never understood your argument ~~on~~ this point. CBS should not have attributed the 24 fps figure to you rather than to your FBI report. Dick Sprague tells me that he has verified the 18.3 speed by comparison with the Weigman film. (This is the obvious sort of test of the speed; CBS should have thought of it.)
- (5) I don't think "puncture" means "entrance," although it is suggestive of it.
- (6) This weakens the arguments - implies that you discovered it, hence it is not evident. The FBI probably had it in writing first, (from the Mix film), CD 298.
- (7) This ~~probably~~ comes from Lifton's claim that the forward motion of matter from the head in 313 is consistent with a bullet from the front; he suggests that he has experimental evidence that when a tomato or melon is struck there is a tendency for matter to emerge from the entrance hole. (Personal communication; don't quote me.) An interesting point.
- (8) 9 frames for which there were slides, maybe - certainly many more in all.
- (9) I think the reference here is to the Sibert-O'Neill Report, first published (to my knowledge) in Epstein (paperback edition) and Popkin.
- (10) Obviously this is an important point. But I am still not convinced that any notes other than those published (17E45-46) were made during the autopsy. It sounds implausible, but I need ~~convincing~~ some more evidence.
- (11) I think Boswell's statement, as cited by Dr. Nichols, is quite relevant here - it ~~indicates~~ <sup>suggests</sup> that the Kennedy family had something to do with what was published (perhaps in the autopsy report itself.)
- (12) Such as the FBI, who apparently believed this: ~~xxxx~~ <sup>at first</sup> But CBS wasn't about to say so.
- (13) 3 bullets were removed at the Tippit autopsy; 1 was removed earlier at Methodist Hospital (24H415).
- (14) I think CBS is ~~xy~~ right here. See 7H4.
- (15) I would ~~xxxx~~ like to know exactly how the FBI described the first (and incomplete) list of the contents of Oswald's notebook. Do you have this?
- (16) A quibble. "You" seems to me to have meant "you out there in television land."
- (17) I think a relevant rebuff to Sevaraid is the story of the decision to escalate in Vietnam, apparently made within days (Roston) or weeks (Hilsman) of the assassination; Hilsman's resignation, &c. Sevaraid should know better.

a different field view  
 Dillard. My records  
 should be  
 checked.

Harold -

These are mostly hasty comments. Many of them I would not insist on. Hope they are of some use.

I would like to have this (or another) copy of the 73pp. for my records.

Paul

9/4/67

Dear Friend,

Enclosed is a rough draft of an unread commentary on the CBS specials on the Warren Report, typed by me for a friend. If you have the time, I'd appreciate your reading it and either making suggestions or annotating and returning it. Should you desire, I can then send it back to you.

My own relations with CBS dictate the personal approach, for I suggested to them (save for its doctrine) exactly what they did, in the winter of 1935-6. At that time, at the request of his then superior, Leslie Midgley read the limited edition of WHITENASH. He and others at CBS thereafter had the book and used it.

I believe that, within the meaning of the law, there is a case of plagiarism. The offhand opinion of a lawyer working in publishing is to this effect.

While I do not anticipate favorable response to my continuing correspondence with CBS, until it is clear that this can accomplish nothing, I will not carry this further. However, when that time comes, despite the unfavorable response to the Citizens' Committee of Inquiry, I plan to go to the FCC. Should it decide negatively, as it did with CCI, I plan an appeal, particularly if I have support. If this is granted, I shall present a case, where the enclosed will serve additional purpose. If the hearing is denied, or if it is decided against me, I should then like to go to court on the issue. One way or the other, I should have an official forum for the presentation of fact about the assassination and its official investigation.

Simultaneously, I have made similar requests under the fairness doctrine to other organizations and individual stations, including AP and UPI, with the intent of broadening the interpretation and meaning of this doctrine to include dishonest and slanted presentations in the guise of news. With each of these agencies, again for personal reasons, I believe I have opportunities others do not.

Thus, your suggestions can be valuable. Because I wrote this between other work and in haste and will not have the time to go over it before mailing it out, I'd appreciate it if you include even minor, typographical corrections, as well as suggestions for additions or deletions. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg