

Dear Bill,

6/21/75

I've not caught up on the accumulation of my last trip before I have to leave again, early a.m., on another. So I can't respond fully to your 6/14/75.

My purpose in asking that you keep this to yourself when if you knew how you could easily obtain a copy is the serious possibility of misuse. There has been some. Proper use requires much work on context.

Ignore the markings on the copy from which this copy was made. Some may be inaccurate. I know some are not mine. Do your own and careful thinking and reading and this will tell you much. Very much!

I have carried it very much farther. The point to which I have carried it is one of my reasons for asking extreme caution. Please take my word for it.

Hasyily,

J W Griffith  
602 N Virginia St  
Terrell, Texas 75160  
6-14-75

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I thank you for being so candid with me in your 6-10-75 letter. I can assure that all that I know about the "critics" of the Warren Report is what I can glean from their books. I have no personal ties (or professional) with any of them. The only reason that I have taken up the study of this subject is that I have a burning desire to find out what really happened in Dealy Plaza 11-22-63. I have no plans for writing a book or making the collegiate lecture circuit. My purpose is not to make some people look good and others look like Simon Legree, I only want to know what happened.

In my studies have found that certain people have been assassinated, and in almost every case the FBI or some other agency has conspired to cover up the facts. If these agencies are innocent of any complicity with the assassinations themselves, then why cover up? Here they have a chance to shine as champions of law and order, yet they risk everything to make sure that the assassins go scott free. Why?

The day before yesterday, the Rockefeller Commission decided that Lee Harvey Oswald, alone and unaided, did murder the president of the United States. This is, at best, a cruel joke on people everywhere. You know, and I know, that they knew better. Why did they lie? Were they misled because the evidence was presented to them in an unordered fashion? I will admit that Robert Schoenman (or is it Raaph?) presented some pretty stupid information to them (He said that two of the three "bums" found in the boxcar behind the TSHD were E Howard Hunt and Frank Sturgis, Hunt and Sturgis don't even resemble those people.), but anyone making even a cursory inspection of the situation that day could not help but discern the conspiracy involved.

Right now, I have many pages of notes non of which are organized yet. I do not intend to begin the process till I have every scrap of information available. There is no one to help me with this, but I want to do it because I want to know the truth. You don't have to worry about me discussing your letters with anyone because frankly, no one that I know is really interested. Oh, there are people that when you bring up one of the more obvious points revealing a conspiracy, some of them will listen for a minute or two, and then they say, "Is'nt that interesting, do you want to go fishing this weekend?" For the most part though, nobody really cares. They can't afford to. I mean that when these people put their whole trust in mother, country, and apple pie, they just can't bring themselves to face the facts. They believe only what they want to. They don't like people making waves. Just look the other way and it will go away.

Anyway, don't worry about your information getting to any other "critics" from me, even my wife gets impatient with me when I try to discuss the subject with her. All I want is all of the info that I can get (not conclusions), and after that I will try to organize it all. In this process I hope to weed out all of the rumors and conjecture and if at all possible, come to conclusions of my own.

I found out about the FBI's interest in the book I ordered from the ~~librar~~ librarian here in Terrell. She told me that the Dallas library made the inquiries in behalf of the FBI. That is all I know. In the book there are no

recipes for making pipe bombs or anything. I personally don't know why they would be interested. Perhaps they figure that a smart crook would be able to be more succesful is he took a course in criminology, who knows?

The Account of the firearms demonstration at Ft. Detrick was found in the book by Col. I Fletcher Prouty The Secret Team (which is really worth reading). Unless my memory fails me, the reason why they chose that installation instead of another was because it was not the Air Force, but rather the CIA dressed up as the AirForce and they didn't want to attract attention. From what I understand, Ft. Detrick is more of a CIA base than military.

Once again though, you can see my weakness. I am in no position to gather my information first hand, so I must depend on books, magazines, newspapers, etc. for my information. I know that with this situation I will pick up a lot of misinformation, but I hope to purify it as I go along. I am not trying to "prove my theory", because I don't have one. I just try to reason out the best possibilities as I forge ahead. I am totally flexible, willing to go in any direction if the clues lead that way. That is why I am so interested in you, because you are in a position to determine which lines of investigation are resonable and which are not. Please do not think that I am trying to "reconcile" JFK's wounds to anything. The reason that I wrote you that letter is because at the time, it seemed like the most logical explanation that I could think of. Many of the witnesses in their testimony of what the shots sounded like and the type of wounds inflicted led me to believe that the ML6 was involved. If the evidence shows otherwise, then back to the drawing board. My problem is that I can't get enough information of the wounds to really be positive of anything. The Warren Commission was always moving the wounds around and changing the nature of them (entrance or exit). What I wrote you about was my best guess at the time. At least as I move along I can reject certain possibilities which narrows the field.

As for your asking me to not discuss our correspondence, I feel like I can give you my word on that (with perhaps the possible exception of my wife and with your permission a friend or two who have nothing to do with it in a formal wasy). Do not worry about me going off half-cocked like Schoenman and others, because I wish to remain amonymous in all respects. You are the only person (other than two letters asking questions of Penn Jones which he answered rather rudely) that I have really talked to. You have seemed to me the most logical of all the critics (if I can put you in the same class), and the hardest working. My intent is not to plagiarize your work, but rather to benefit from your knowledge, and perhaps lend a helping hand if possible. I admit to being a bit green and naive in the field of investigation, but I do have a logical mind and a conviction that if I can weed out all of the misinformation, I will be able to solve at least some of the puzzle.

It would really be helpful if somehow(I know you are extremely busy, but I truly think I might be able to shed some light in this area if I can get the truth about JFK's wound. Size, location, characteristics, etc.) you could draw a body chart and place the wounds, showing the coning, the cracks, etc. Even if crudely done, it would probably give me more insight than reading all of the contradicting material I have here. Josiah Thompson (Six Seconds in Dallas) said that a fairly large fragment was found behind JFK's right eye. Is there anything to that? Also, he said that a fragment was found at the rearmost edge of the head wound. Bonafide?

I almost bite my tongue as I tell you this, but please don't send me anything very expensive as due to my financial status I do not know when I might be able to repay you. I really desire the information, but my family must come first. If you have other manuscripts available, please write and tell me the cost so that I might be able to purchase them as I am able. I thank you for your trust however.

I do not want you to think that I am a raving paranoid. When I wrote you suggesting that you buy an ultraviolet light to test your food, I was only joking. My wife tells me I have a warped sense of humor. However, I have not yet rejected the cancer angle. These carcinogens that I wrote you about, do not necessarily have to inflict death in a day or two. All of that can depend on the type used and the dosage. These carcinogens do exist, and they do perform. Can you think of a better way to commit a murder without attracting attention? Maybe they were not employed. If not, we can add to the long list of coincidences. But if they were, it might explain why David kept all of those experimental mice in his apartment (David Ferry). About two months ago in the Dallas Times Herald, an article appeared in which scientists were trying to figure out why Washington DC has the highest cancer rate. I admit that it's pretty far out, so I am not endorsing the theory while at the same time I am not excluding its possibility. Look up nitrosamines and aflatoxins in the book Man Against Cancer by Bernard Glemser and see what you think. If there was a conspiracy to kill JFK, would the conspirators cringe at murdering a few witnesses after shooting down the President of the United States in broad daylight?

All of my information about Buddy Walthers came from Forgive My Grief Vol. IV. Since you have told me that Penn Jones is not credible, I will try to accumulate my own information, but this will have to wait because I have other items that deserve consideration first. Really, I am waist deep in bits and pieces that I must sift through, and of course, it must be done in an orderly fashion, and this takes time. I don't remember if I told you about the circumstances surrounding Roger Craig's death. He was supposed to have committed suicide with a .22 rifle, shooting himself in the chest. This I heard on WFAA channel 8 (ABC) emanating from Dallas. Rather hard for me to believe.

I was wondering if you might have any information on a character named Arthur Alexandrovich Adams? I have run across the name in a footnote in the book Witness by Whittaker Chambers. I believe he was important around the time of the Rosenbergs (shortly before) when he was picked up by the FBI on charges of spying, but his release was ordered by the State Department. Sherman Skolnick from Chicago says he has proof that Adams was the courier that delivered the A bomb secrets to the Russians. Also, he said that Adams had samples of U235 on him when he was arrested and was allowed to take them to Russia. This would go along with the missing samples from Los Alamos that never turned up in the Rosenberg trial. I read the book The Implosion Conspiracy by Louis Nizer (who wrote that ridiculous preamble to the Warren Commission Report), and it seemed to me that even though Nizer tried to railroad the Rosenbergs again, it was another case of a frameup engineered by the FBI. There were many inconsistencies in the trial that were overlooked or played down in the book. I again have passed no judgements in this area, but I thought that maybe you might have something on this mysterious character Adams.

Back to JFK. In this letter I have enclosed three photographs (if possible I wish you could return these) of Dealy Plaza. On the back of them, they are numbered. Photo number one is a shot taken from the stockade fence atop the grassy knoll showing the view an assassin would have of the motorcade as it approached on Elm St. Of course, the small tree that blocks much of the

view of the intersection of Houston and Elm Streets was not there on 11-22-63, so it shows that a gunman would have an excellent shot at the President as he approached, but the reason that I sent this Photo is because it also shows the concrete wall adjacent to the pergola where Abe Zapruder was standing. As I took the photo, I noticed that someone behind that wall would have even a better shot than someone behind the fence. You can see that a person behind this wall would be out of sight of the spectators because of the small piece of wall that turns 90° at the end. This thought sort of stayed in the back of my mind till I saw the Willis Photograph in the back of Whitewash II. This photo shows JFK just as the first shot was fired. You can see Zapruder grinding away, but also you can see someone crouched over the said cement wall. I don't know, it could be a spectator, but it looks like someone aiming a gun to me. Maybe you have already looked into this and can tell me who it was. But if you haven't, maybe you could blow it up and see what you think. A man could sure get in and out of there in a hurry, and with everyone looking at the President, without being seen. If there was a gunman there, I feel like he fired one shot and left, the head shot coming from behind the stockade fence as a backup rifle. I don't think that they intended on doing as much shooting as they did that day, do you?

Also, in the Altgens photo, there is a man with a dark hat and suit standing on the steps of the TSHD just in front of, and to the right of Lee Harvey Oswald. There is a person right in front of this man so you can't see his face, but the hat and suit ~~look~~ looks just like the one Ruby wore during the Oswald press conference (if you can call it that). Do you know anything about that? Also in the Altgens photo, what is going on in the white automobile with the doors open at the intersection of Elm and Houston?

The second photo I sent you was taken from the Commerce St. Grassy knoll. If you will intersect the green lines on the border of the photo, you will see the gutter that I alluded to in my first letter. From this picture you really can't tell much, but if you are ever in Dallas, you ought to check it out and you will see that a man inside that manhole would have an excellent shot at the limousine from very close. To those on Elm St., the shot would sound like it came from the direction of the underpass. It's just an idea, but I thought it would make a more reasonable origin of the bullet that hit the sidewalk on Elm St. than the South grassy knoll, although I am not excluding that possibility either.

Photo number three was taken from the curb on Main St. which replaced the piece taken out that bore the mark of the bullet that fragmentized and stung James Tague on the face. This picture was taken from lying down on the curb (quite embarrassing as the people in the passing cars gave me some funny looks) looking back at the corner of Elm and Houston. Assuming that this shot was aimed at JFK and didn't miss by much, the most probable point of origin would be the second floor of the Dal-Tex building, as another shot from the knoll could only have been fired after JFK was well down in the seat of the limousine. Do you agree? In Six Seconds in Dallas, Josiah Thompson showed photos (a photo) of the curb taken from Main St. He said that the FBI spectrographic analysis showed the mark to be comprised of only lead and antimony with no copper. Is this accurate? The FBI used this to prove that that mark had nothing to do with Oswalds rifle, since Oswald was supposed to have used copper jacketed bullets, but do you think this might be a slip that would give up a clue as to the type of ammunition used that day?

5

Words are cheap and anybody can say anything. I can tell you that I am honest and trustworthy, but how do you know? I wish there was some way I could prove this to you, but unfortunately I can think of nothing conclusive. I know also, that you cannot be careless. I do hope that you will deal with me openly and come to trust me. I have no conflicting interests that could be a liability to you. I am not involved in any politics, right, left, or middle of the road. I am not a member of any secret organizations or public ones. This puts me in a unique position which insures that my reasoning and conclusions will not be embellished by any outside influences. I am not a racist and do not belong to any of these conservative "christian" churches. My morality, by today's standards, is perhaps a bit old fashioned. Personally, I hold truth and honesty above all else. Maybe, this will tell you a little more about me. I hope this will allow you to be a little more open with me, but I do appreciate your position.

Recently, I read a book entitled A Study in the Abuse of Power which was a slap in the face to the Garrison probe and the critics of the Warren Report. In it, the author says that during the Clay Shaw trial, a photo was circulating around that depicted a critic participating in some sort of sexual deviation. Is this true? If it is, who was the critic involved? Once again, I will give you my word of silence if there is anything to it.

You may wonder why I read such a book, but in my research, I have found much valuable information even in books supporting (if that is possible) the Warren Report. For example, there is much relevant information in William Manchester's book The Death of A President, like the part that tells of the Washington DC communications breakdown, and certain special meetings that coincided with the assassination held by the Supreme Court Justices, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others.

Do you plan to be in Dallas in the future? If so, I am only thirty miles away and would really like to meet you. There are many things I would like to discuss.

Would you please elucidate on the subject of the "disaster" that you broke up in New Orleans? Did this have anything to do with that Boxley character? Was it government interference that sunk Garrison in the Clay Shaw trial? I wish you could find time to tell me of your involvement in that area, because that was a historical event that will never be taught in school. I have read a number of books that condemn Garrison and his methods, but I could find only one (A Heritage of Stone by Jim Garrison) that upheld his side of the story. I know that the news Media played a very subversive role from Garrison's point of view.

I know that Medger Evers was shot down with a rifle also, do you have anything on that?

About the phoney Rockefeller Commission findings. At least this time Belin admits that JFK was thrown backward by the head shot. He probably couldn't get Dan Rather to say JFK was thrown forward again, since there are too many bootleg copies of the Zapruder film floating around these days. This time the Rockefeller Commission said that JFK was hit from behind and thrown backward by the "Jet Action" of the bullet. This is a direct insult to the public's intelligence. Who do they think shot him, Buck Rodgers? Sir Isaac Newton probably rolled over in his grave. Maybe someone ought to tell them

that Oswald's rifle doesn't fire "Jet" bullets.

Will it be possible for you to obtain the suppressed CIA assassination plot chapters through the Freedom of Information Law? Even if you could, if they lied about the JFK assassination, why wouldn't they lie about the others?

Have you formulated any ideas on who was behind all of these political murders? I realize that only a very thorough large scale investigation could be conclusive, and I certainly wouldn't hold you to your surmise, but I would be very interested in which direction you feel like the finger is pointing at this juncture. Maybe different groups are responsible for different murders, but all of these lone nuts with their diaries smacks of the same modus operandi.

I now have all but one of your books (Whitewash), and I must compliment you on the amount of relevant information that you were able to uncover. As I read your books, I underline what I feel are the main points with red ink. This has really saved me much time. I hope soon to be able to tie up some loose ends when I begin the organizing process. If you would like, as I find interesting items, I can send you what I find.

Thanks again for your precious time and sage advice. I hope you can find the time to answer my letter. Please, do not worry about me publicizing what you send me, and don't take any wooden nickels or jet bullets.

Sincerely,



P.S. My friends call me Bill