

7 August 1969

Harold Weisberg
Frederick, Md.

Harold;

It just occurred to me that their might be one circumstance under which the pictures in CEs 562 and 564 might after all have been taken through a comparison microscope. I can't say for sure, since this goes far beyond my capabilities, but I do want to raise it as a possibility on the chance that you and others who get copies of this may be able to check it. If true, this would vitiate my ~~xxx~~ assertion that Frazier used an antiquated method of preparing his exhibits.

Suppose this is what happened: For CE562 Frazier put his test case on the ~~right~~ right and his evidence case (CE 544) on the left, then snapped the picture that came into evidence as CE 562. He then replaced the first evidence case with the other (CE 544) without moving his test case or changing the lighting. He aligned the new test case with the evidence case that was already in place, and snapped the picture that came into evidence as CE 564. For the second picture he increased the degree of enlargement.

Under such conditions, it might be possible, I think, to get an exact correspondence between the right-hand sections of each exhibit. The degree of correspondence is so remarkably close that I tend to think they are prints from the same negative (I can see no difference whatever in the two), but we should consider the ~~poss~~ possibility that I am wrong in supposing that Frazier used a defunct method of preparing the exhibits.

This is something that can only be checked with somebody who has used the comparison microscope and camera, and who knows much more than I about these things. But if possible, it should be checked, lest I send you off half-cocked with notions that are wrong.

Even if I am wrong about Frazier using a defunct method, this would not seriously affect what Nichols wants out of these exhibits, for the fact still remains that Frazier misidentified them. Innocently or not, he falsified the public record, and that will be useful to Nicholâ,

Still,

Dick

Bernabei

cc. Nichols
Schoener

8/11/69

Dear Dick,

Thanks for your 8/7 with the tenger and rifle enclosure, both of which are welcome and useful.

It has been so long since I've thought of the Frazier stuff, I'll file this with the rest for when I return to it. What you say is possible.

All the time I've felt I should work lately, and I am taking time off just to rest and relax, I've be on the addition to Coup. I'm more than halfway through the last and a long chapter on the Ray part. There are not not fewer than 120,000 word in it alone. It will be at least 125,000. As soon as I finish this chapter I'll read and correct the entire thing so Lil can start typing it. Then I'll make the brief addition I plan on the Sirhan case.

This last chapter deals with the question of conspiracies. I've broken it in two, taking up what I haven't used elsewhere on the evidences of a conspiracy to murder. This is the part I've just finished roughing. Now I get to one of the more fascinating things that, to the best of my knowledge, has not been touched on. That is, whether or not his lawyers and Hue conspired against him. Here I am not talking about their writings, Foreman's legal performance, etc., which I've handled elsewhere. I do now want to communicate the new and exciting original material I have by an undependable medium until after it is in context, all written. I think it is close to enough for action against them, but, of course, expect none. It makes them lookverybad, anyway.

Nothing else new.

Best,