

8/30/69

Dear Dick,

Got little reading/correcting done yesterday, so today I'm answering mail while I read it. I expect to go to town and hope to recall my need for a cleaning rod.

Re your 8/26, page 1: first par- I disagree with your failure to disagree with Frazier on the ejection pattern. There had to be violent ejection to bend the lip, which means a backward ejection pattern, plus whatever deflection ensues. There was a deviation because of the imputed downward angle of the rifle. Moreover, boxes were moved immediately and none of the police pictures show the arrangement the moment of the shooting. I go into this and your second pa. in WHITEWASH. With a stack of boxes disappearing (Day's testimony) or merely with the boxes rearranged before any photographing (Studebaker's), there is no meaning in any "testing" of ejection pattern because the second deflection is interfered with, altered.

It is my belief that with no box used as a rest, the known position of the window and the downward angle, plus the scope, precluded any of the shooting (plus the 18" wall thickness - the sill projecting even further). BBC tried to re-enact and couldn't. The Frazier picture of the re-enactment in LIFE shows him without the scope on the rifle and the window too far open, the camera-mounted pictures also show the window open too far. There is no exact duplication picture in all the Warren evidence. This can be only because it was impossible. If (second par) you concede the possibility of one shot with the boxes as a rest, how account for any time to shift to a different position or the dent on the box said to be from the rifle? It would destroy accuracy.

Par 3, other photos besides Dillard's, Example, Willis 12, etc. Also, check stack pictures under Studebaker in WHITEWASH. There are numerous one, all contradictory, all wrong by the existing pictures.

Par 4: I think I've published the relevant figures save one. Wall 18", window open 17". What I lack is the distance from either surface of the inside edge of the bottom of the window. The wall may be more than two bricks (16 inches rather than 18), if so, most likely is another brick course, of 20". I've just looked at the pictures, and they do not make possible, except by tricky measurement, the positioning of the window's ~~bottom~~ bottom, horizontally. Shadow also interferes, as does angle. However, a standard brick, plus mortar joint (one) is 8".

Par 5: I was unaware of this added testing. But Hodak is a real expert, it is his business, and he immediately went to a violent ejection to show us. This and Par 6: would one firing as rapidly as had to be done, use "normal" force in ejecting? I think the faster the more violent.... Smaller dents on CE's 544-B mean too-easy force?

Par 2, first full par: I've no time to consult panel, a second doctor's reports, but it is my recollection the vague description is "thoracic" area. One of two things must be true: if a frangible bullet (and why use it there and not in other shots), it had to strike bone. A non-frangible bullet was used and it also struck bone. The language is specific on the kinds of fragment, eliminating frangible bullets. It is lead. Wecht assured me, when I check this with him by phone as soon as I could after discovering it, this inevitably means the bullet had to have struck bone, nothing else being able to fragment it. This, of course, in the context of the military bullet. I did not go into dum-dums or soft-noses, etc., for if they were used the entire case is apart on that basis alone.

Par 2: They are not Wecht's buddies and he did try.

Par 3: I made no mention of 22s, but appreciate the tip. I referred to the .243 and similars, in comparison with the .30-06s. Are all centerfires like the Hornet?

Par 5: I've never given serious thought to mercury fulminate. I tend to ignore the unnecessary and the unnecessary risks. This may have started with Garrison. It is also possible Turner fed this and the frangible concept to him. I trust neither. Thanks for explanations and agreed on rest of page.

Page 3, par 1: Frazier disputes you. He refused to use this as proof the bullet entered in the rear, in DC and in NO. He also said that if a bullet with the imputed history of 399 had struck coarse cloth or bone they would have marked it-and didn't. What is your source? I'd be inclined to think that at that great velocity,

the blood would disappear fast. Might not the tight skin cleanse enough off?

Par 2: If that bullet entered the back, show me how it exited.

Par 3: agreed on your opinion there has to be depth to the probe for it to suggest a dependable angle.

Par 4: there is no way of knowing the character of the edges for that wound was probed by finger, which distorted everything, giving, inevitable, the character of pushing in.

Par 5: John was through this long ago. He discussed it with me two years ago.

6: thanks for explanation. I knew fact, not reason for it.

7: Your interpretation is questionable. On 12/2/23, after examinations, under "results of examinations", Hoover gives weight at 158.6 grains. Why assume this was before removal of samples for spectro? I same plural because I have now learned Rezierr also removed a piece of undisclosed size from the core? If he could account for 100% of the missing weight!

Last par; Gary and/or Bud have these slides, either of them being able to provide a cheaper copy. If not, let me know again. I'll also want them, and more, for lectures I hope to be making, offered by an agency.

P. 4: S. Arague has no photos from Hall's scrap book. This is probably a reference to pictures I got from Larry Howard and turned over to Steve Burton and Fred Newcomb. If what you get is unclear, check with Gary, who has good relations with Fred.

AP's 6/10 story from Miami gives no Simpson but does give Eugene Dernbeck. A total of 12 were initially arrested. Seven were indicted. I asked the DJ for a copy of the indictment, was promised it but never got it. Why do you not ask, of the Internal Security Div, DJ (not FB), Federal Triangle Bldg, of the US Atty in Miami? Or get someone else to.

Thanks also for tip on impossible suicides. I do not see how they do it.

I'll make a copy for Gary.

Best,