

Kent Courtney's as to Reissman's. There still is no evidence Oswald was a member of any kind of group of anything.

(14) I think you're correct on the spectro. This is my feeling and is consistent with the technical information I got in 1964 when I checked on it. Fine to parts per million and requires only microscopic quantities.

(19) Agreed. But I seem to be the only one who felt that way. In November I was still getting the stiffest resistance in IA and look what they did with the movie????

So, many thanks.

Sincerely,

2537 Regent St., Apt. 202
Berkeley, Calif. 94704
January 20, 1969

Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harold,

I gather that interesting things have been happening in court in D.C.. I will have to await your report, or at least the N.O. papers, to find out what it is. I assume that your trip to N.O. was delayed. (I am sending a carbon of this letter, without enclosures, to N.O., just in case. C/o Ivon - is that correct?)

The news ~~stories~~ stories out here have been so bad that I don't know the most basic things about the "panel" whose review of the autopsy pictures was just released. The papers didn't say who was on it, when it met, or what ~~it~~ it saw (~~except~~ except for a mysterious triangular structure) - all we got was ~~the~~ the conclusion. I would much appreciate a reproducible copy of the ~~report~~ report that was released.

I also assume that you are busy. Most of this letter does not require a quick reply.

(1) I really do disagree with you about Lifton. I think your ~~first~~ first reaction to his analysis of ~~the~~ Jaffe and Farewell America was probably correct - that it was astute and close to the truth. I didn't see anything in it that required inside info, not just clever speculation. ~~Except~~ Except in the matter of Louisiana vs. Thornley, where he does not hide his personal involvement, I am quite sure that he is in no way on the "other side." I don't think he is any more of a nut than all of us marginal paranoids. Of course, I could be completely wrong, I admit. Please be careful not to let your dislike of Thornley, if any, affect your work improperly.

(2) I do not have NBC's "70 Hours and 30 minutes."

(3) Your chapter on Ramsey Clark's statements: very good. Page 3, line -3: needs more specific references. Page 19, par. 2: your interpretation of the Regis Kennedy - Vincent Marcello report may be correct. But it is relevant that the adjacent pages of CD 301 do relate to an allegation that Vincent Marcello was involved in the assassination. Page 21, examination by Warren of testimony with deletions may be related to informal inquiries that Bahm~~er~~ made of the Justice Department concerning procedures for release of certain Commission records. I ~~have~~ have a letter from the Asst. AG which gives the opinion that the Archives had assumed the Commission's authority over such records. This letter, dated August 17, 1966, refers to previous ~~informal~~ informal inquiries but gives no date. Page 23, line -6: wouldn't the material Guy Johnson gave ONI be legitimately withheld?

(4) I assume you have noticed that Hepburn claims to have gotten copies of the Zapruder film from two different sources. (Page 385)

(5) Oswald's CAP picture in Gun's book: the part of ~~the~~ the FBI analysis of this book which is published as CE 2580 contains no reference to this ~~picture~~ picture. The rest of CE 1218 might be worth checking.

(6) Mysterious staff meeting of 7/9/64: Epstein says that a staff colloquium with 3 psychiatrists was held in July; he gives no date.

(7) Your a.m. mailing seems to make no difference. Letters are generally received 2 or 3 days after postmark.

(8) Hal Verb will do as you asked, including the tape of Lamarre. He will also try to get ~~the~~ the impressions of the KPFA man ~~who~~ who interviewed him. I realize the importance of not giving too much away, but Lamarre may well have told him something important.

(9) Will try to compare typewriters on the Rankin memo ~~and~~ and the last ~~executive~~ executive session. I can get prints of the latter from the microfilm; I will avoid asking for a photograph of the former from the Archives as long as possible - no need to tip anyone off.

(10) Thanks for CD 1373, Kara-patnitsky. Wasn't a lot of junk withheld to protect banks, etc, who gave the Feebees information that should have been kept private? ~~I~~ I'm not sure I see the importance of this item.

(11) Your letter of ~~1/14~~ 1/14: interpretation of the initials on 75:703-4. The latter page has "jas," who I believe is James Schmidt (no kin). The first page has "jas/dmm/kch." I take this to mean that page 704 was transferred to CD 75 from ~~another~~ another report, with no changes, while the first was retyped, with omission of preceding (irrelevant) information. This explains the large blank space on the ~~first~~ first page.

(12) According to CE 3128, Riessman came to Calif. at the end of July, 1963. This is certainly late ~~enough~~ enough for him to have had contact with Oswald. At least, not an unreasonable guess by Martello.

(13) Confusion: I had gotten reverse of Garner 1 from CD 87, SS 200. It is identical to yours; I had therefore not sent a copy to you.

(14) Thanks for CD 5, pp. 159-165 (Spectrographic report, &c.) The communication quoted on pages 162-5 is photographically reproduced at 24H262-4 (CE 2003). The word "spectrographic" does not appear in what is quoted in CD 5 but is in the heading of the letter. I don't know much about spectrographic analysis, but I do know that it is next to meaningless to say that "the lead metal" of the fragments and windshield scrapings "is similar to the lead of the core" of Q2. Lead is lead. I would assume that a bullet contains a lead alloy, not pure lead; what is useful for analysis is the amounts of other metals present. What is missing in this report is a statement that at least the various fragments are consistent with having come from the same bullet. Also, note that this report does not indicate that any spectrographic analysis was done on CE 399, although Frazier later testified to such analysis (5H69). Perhaps that is because at first it seemed so ~~obvious~~ obvious that there was no place on CE 399 where the fragments from Connolly could have come from. (That's just a guess.) I do not know if you could prove that some of the fragments could not have come ~~from~~ from certain bullets. The state of the art may ~~have~~ have advanced in 5 years. One might be able to make an analysis ~~without~~ without damaging the fragments. Might they be the proper objects of a Garrison subpoena? One would need expert advice to see if that would be worthwhile. We should continue trying to get Gallagher's report from the FBI.

(15) The statement from the SS on the autopsy photos, of which you sent me a copy, is all I have on this from the SS - no correspondence.... The statement was given to me in mimeographed form when I visited the SS offices. (Correction: Xeroxed, not mimeographed.)

(16) If the picture Mr. Lansky saw in Joesten's book is the same one I saw, it is a ~~fairly~~ fairly obvious composite of the Altgens picture and a later one, as you suspected.

(17) McDermid: According to Bud, CD 735:377 is withheld. It is indexed to McDermid, Western Union, and Mr. Wilcox (~~presumably~~ presumably of WU).

(18) My 11/26/66 memo on Hoover's statement on the autopsy: nothing to add. Language stronger than mine would be justified. Basically, ~~Hoover's~~ Hoover's interpretation of his own agency's language just doesn't stand up. You have to go through the relevant ~~documents~~ documents word by word, several times; it is not that obvious. But I think it is important.

1/20/69 HW - p.3

(19) I just got my copy of "Farewell America," a.k.a. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ "Goodbye Jim Garrison." I can't see how anyone's faith in the whole Hepburn operation could survive even a hasty reading of the book. Maybe the French version is ~~more~~ more convincing - especially if you don't read French. (I am half serious - if you pick through the central chapters slowly it might not be obvious how much merde the rest of the book is.) ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Hepburn is Joesten in drag? I was particularly impressed by the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ undocumented assertion on page 36 that "a Secret Service agent whose code name was 'Dentist' was in charge of the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ President's pleasures" (i.e. women). Hepburn may have gotten this from French Intelligence but I got it from Krassner's put-on of the Manchester book. I look forward to seeing the movie.

(20) I will enclose or send under separate cover: your 1/11 letter to Gary, of which you sent me 2 copies; pages from CD 642 on McDermid; all the documentation on Ruby as FBI informant (13 pp.) This will be sent to Maryland.

Sincerely,

Paul