## Dear "ary,

四次,二百百

## 3/7/82

Thanks for the copy of your mailing to Ransey and the note. You say that the Pronson analysis should be public any day now. Hopefully before the Ransey panel reports its conclusions.

I've lost track of what I've sent down there because when " heard nothing from anyone I assumed there was no interest in the Bowles stuff. I think I sent the most recent, save for the enclosed, to "och. I've also given it to tesar for Blakey, who is represented by Fenstervald, for whom Lesar works a half day a day.

I made an effort, some time ago, to interest ABC in the Bronson film but was not able to. Wy friend wasn't up high enough to overcome the "What, that again?" reaction.

If you can, fill as in so I can respond to any inquiries I may get. For example, did the FEI ever accept a copy? Last I heard they were still declining.

Not much new here. In the FOLA case for the Dallas and New Orleans records the FRI, on its own, is attempting to justify the withholdings by sampling one record per hundred. I get an occasional few records still, the most recent referrals, but nothing of any reall significance in them.

I just heard from the Criminal Division, from which I've gotten quite a few pages. This last letter says it covers the final records. What seemed to be of interest I've cont to Hoch.

The government managed to get away without responding to any of the allegation in the long affidavit of which Earl has a copy. The judge is a rubber-standp, as he has been. That case will now go up on appeal - again. I think some of the ndw information in it, what it surprises me "arl found no use for, might well buttress some of the possible Wromson conclusions. If <sup>E</sup>arl hadn't told me he would do a story I'd had made some efforts up here before it was too late.

2

Best to you all,

Harold,

March 2, 1982

Professor Norman Ramsey Lyman Laboratory of Physics Harvard University Room 228 Cambridge, Ma. 02138 Hope things are going well for you - the NAS panel is certainly behaving strangely, but this may answer their question. Bronson analysis results should be public any day now.

60m)

Dear Professor Ramsey.

Here is Zapruder frame 183 and two diagrams of Dealey Plaza showing the corresponding area. The frame numbers of JFK on Elm were computed by the FBI.

Every single frame, from 151 through 205, shows Houston Street at it's intersection with Elm. Within the field of view are the two microphone locations which corresponded to the Bolt, Beranek and Newman acoustic analysis of the Dallas police tapes.

The full, uncropped frames reveal the spectators on both sides of Houston, the motorcade cars moving slowly up Houston, and a motorcycle officer in the near lane moving a little bit faster. Because this area is so clear, an officer has to be visible, and he is.

HSCA Assistant Staff Counsel Gary Cornwell spotted him while reviewing the film with HSCA Photo Consultant Robert Groden in Fall 1978. Groden concurred with Cornwell's observation, and is now preparing a new print for study. You'll soon have a 16mm color, stabilized blowup for examination by your panel and/or any MAS photo scientists. Robert can be reached at (201) 324-1513.

While your panel's mandate may not include photographic evidence, I'm sure you'll agree it would be a great disservice to ignore this compelling, corroborative proof of BBN's work.

If the 4th show was the fatal head shot then, according to the HSCA, the first two shots were fired at Z-161 and Z-191; however, if shot #3 was the head shot, then the first two came at Z-170 and Z-200. All four frames show test mic positions 2(5) and 2(6) - the locations of the officer's open microphone. The question of which shot killed the President can thus be answered once and for all because the officer's position can be measured.

Perhaps this will help solve the panel's dilemma.

Sincerely,

Gary Mack

(817) 292-5656

cc: Barger, Blakey, Golz, Groden, Hoch, Stern

