

7/8/70

Mr. Richard S. Kleinman, Deputy Atty. Gen.
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20540

Dear Mr. Kleinman,

In writing you June 24, I suggested I could explain something in
the photograph that might be troublesome in the future and might be susceptible
of innocent explanation. Thanks to the two photos enclosed with your letter
of July 6, I believe I can now do this with fair certainty.

My examination of FBI exhibit 68, with even the limited magnification
provided by the photoreproducing camera, discloses that the upper left-hand insert
of the enlarged hole in the back of the shirt does not coincide with the en-
larged hole in the shirt itself, the of the most obvious discontinuity in the
in the enlargement the change not just the left-hand edge of the vertical
stripe of the shirt pattern, shown in the unenlarged view of the shirt top
is seen. That this was undetected and unreported by the competent and
technical experts, the FBI, which made the exhibit, would give you an hint
of view of the investigation and the case with which evidence was prepared
and presented.

In comparing the enlargement you were kind enough to send me with
the unenlarged shirt pattern, I am particularly confident that we found you
related upside down, but if it is necessary to bring you to a technical
discussion, the photo you sent me shows more than the insert in FBI exhibit
68. If you have a duplicate print of that you sent me, you will see it is
upside down. The legend above partly obscures the meaning,
and that is the bottom of the picture.

The question I still have about this evidence are far from answered.
However, I am satisfied that this is a manufactured, if immediately dis-
crepancy. I am asking you a pointed question, one to which it would be unwise
to ask or expect any answer, for you are not in your present position at the
time of this writing, but what might have been the impact of this discrepancy
if presented by the defense, to your court, before a jury, without the explanation
I offer you? Again, I expect no answer of you, but what does this little thing
tell you of the character and dependability of that evidence and its investigation?

Let me again profess respect to the remainder of your letter of 6
the explanation I see you have no personal knowledge of that of which you
write, that you have to get your information from others. Without any such
explanation from you, I believe you accurately reflect what you have been told.
As I intend to return the attorney General as soon as he has office, on this
subject his sources of information (misinformation) are essentially the same
as his predecessors had. In preparing you to respond to my questions about the
photographic analysis they referred you to the least definitive of the only

indefinitive statements that are available in the Warren Commission evidence. When Mr. Swank testified that the elements of spectrography "except as were then met" "the various items 'were found to be similar in metallic composition'" he was saying exactly what I told you, only that they were all of lead, not a bit more. Spectrography is a very precise science. It gives the finest readings of compositions, including of the added elements. If it shows only similarity it shows the samples are not of common origin. His testimony would cover most of the bullets ever made, various plumbing materials, type-lead and a wide assortment of other objects.

If you doubt my word on this, why not get someone to supply you with a definition or description of the science, from almost any standard source, and get through your usual channels, for by now you should have a position in London how well you are being informed.

Your paragraph dealing with the documents relating to the late David Harris is a rather tricky formulation. Because I intend to carry this forward, as you should know, I cannot respond with the forthrightness and completeness my earlier correspondence offered. However, I will tell you it is not consistent with the reality, as which I have repeatedly written, and you should look forward to facing in court what you do not describe, what your Department does have - and what I will produce, for I do have it. These things do not meet the preferred or any other standards for withholding. For in the matter slight use of the Commission being what your last sentence says - and that, too, was not done. You might want to consider what the obstacle for the Commission and then withhold from it, by your Department, believe as, I do have the proof. For as I referring to a single case only. However, I am trying to help you to help yourself, for as I have repeatedly tried to let the government know, my purpose is the pursuit of fact and truth, not scandal. If you doubt me on this, I will prove it to you in all the cases involving the possibility of any withholding under either the law or the guidelines, if on my proving both the withholding and the character I attribute to it you will provide me with copies. Again, I am trying to be open with you, so I tell you that when I see I will be filing 87-118 forms in both cases. These two instances are not of immediate priority with me, but they surely will illustrate my point, without jeopardy to the actions I plan.

I do accept your statements in your final paragraph only, for as your Department is concerned, will let this matter rest there. However, I tell you candidly that if your penultimate paragraph, dealing with the "misdeed", is correct, that is even worse than if it is not. I do believe you are telling me here exactly what you were told. I regret you have been inadequately informed and that you will not be adequately informed because those in your Department who should know the truth dare not tell you. I hesitate to carry this further at this point. However, because I do not desire that you personally be hurt by the fact that you occupy the position you do, I will assure you that Exhibit 843 does not account for the lead in the President's head, my proof is beyond question or refutation, so, I regret, you will I see in the form to which the government forces me.

You may read me as you will. Mr. Tolson and I last week I offered to try and be helpful in speaking to you. If this letter does not persuade you I am a fool, surely it not suggest my motives might be what I represent them to be?

Sincerely,

Harold Weinstock