

11/28/69

Dear Howard,

More than the usual rush because more than the usual to get done too soon, so too much haste in response to your 11/25 mailing

Frazier: Most of my notes on his N.O. testimony are on tape. I recall noting this answer, but I am not at all certain that I recalled his contrary response before the Commission. I believe you are right, that this is perjury. By the way, if you do not have an official copy of the WR, you should get one. If you cannot get one from the Government Printing Office for \$1.00, let me know and I'll try and recall where my extra copy that I got is. It is better to make references to the official copy.

I am anxious to see what you have on the panel. I have some of their letters, but in confidence, meaning I cannot use them. I also have one thing I cannot tell anyone. If they told you some of these things, that would be lovely. From what you say, they may have told you more. When you are here again you may want to read that file. There are also some things I picked up that are not in documents I will tell you about in person....There are indications Eardley was Clark's "remrod" on this, and there is no doubt Fisher also acted in a similar capacity, not only among the members of the panel.

11/23 on shirt slits: we have to wait for Gary to find time to tell us what he did get to do in Dallas. This is one of the things I asked him to check on, for it seemed obvious to me. I have been waiting a long time for the Archives to tell me whether they will make special pictures for me. I took this up with Johnson months ago, but I just haven't been in a position to press it. What you say of the existing pictures is important. Pending a decision from them, or their persistence in silence (and I'll recall this when I get back to the writing), why not make up a list of the pictures you think we should have and instead of depending on the less clear printed copies, I'll get them from the Archives (8x10 glossy) and lend to you for further study? Your noting of the picture of the JFK neck is of one. I think I have several here again I think it would be a good idea if one of us could keep a list of such pictures. If you refer further to this, I'll have it filed under PM II.

Glad you got the Curry book. I had already asked for one for you that another can now have.

There are other pictures similar to that on page 27. I think I refer to a number in WWII. But we are well past this. I suggest this is a waste of time. I am pretty confident I know exactly where that one hit. I now have more than I showed you on this. Those on 28 and 29 do make it possible to compute the height of the seat, but that also is now less essential. Now that I take a good look at the one on 31, I see the end of the Newcomb nonsense on the rr cars, as Dick, I think, will understand. Spregue may have glossy print. In my haste, I'd missed the clothes in the p. 34 picture. But as you study them, see if you can identify any other than outer garments, like topcoats, raincoats. That is Curry looking on. These may all have been in the car when the victims left it...Chaney has disappeared. I've tried to find him and my sources have no leads. He is important for other reasons (WW). If you keep looking for such pictures, I'd be interested if one shows a bucket...They sent me a print of CE740 made from the printer version. I've asked for one from the negative or a glossy, without the screen....I think both on '50 were published... Check on 100....I think Gary has Muchmore....Babushka lady: do you think she stayed there for 10 minutes? It is possible to compare her in this another other films.

Best,

11/24/69

Dear Harold,

I have reopened the envelope to include this note on the Frazier testimony. I think I have found an instance of perjury. This is it.

The following exchange took place during Frazier's WC testimony.
Mr. Specter: Does the nick in the tie provide any indication of the ~~XX~~ direction of the missile?
Mr. Frazier: The nick is elongated horizontally, indicating a possible horizontal direction but it does not indicate that the projectile which caused it was exiting or entering at that point.(5H62)

This is the way it went at the N.O. trial:

Frazier: ...These fibers were broken and that is they were slit at the knot and in the same position as the slit in the President's shirt, but they showed no other characteristics to indicate the nature of the object or the direction of the object.

Dymond: Did the fibers of the neck tie indicate anything?

Frazier: No, sir.

Dymond: They did not?

Frazier: No, sir. (N.O. testimony transcript, p. 47)

Obviously, one of these statements is perjurious since both were taken under oath and both are contradictory. There is significance to the perjury here for I am sure there is a reference in the Warren Report which uses the Frazier testimony to show that a bullet passed horizontally through the neck based on the tie nick. (I have found the reference. It is on page 95 of the Bantam paperback ed. of the W.R.)

I don't know what you've done with Frazier's NO test. so far but I hope this helps you. It would be interesting in light of this to see if Specter prepared a memorandum of his interview with Frazier before he testified.

Good luck,

Howard