

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

GOWER STREET  
LONDON WC1E 6BT

Telex 28722

18 September 1981

Telephone: 01-387 7030

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21701  
USA

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you very much for taking the time and trouble to write to me about my work on the JFK assassination. I am afraid this will be a rather long reply, but please do read on! Let me be truthful at the outset; I have been meaning to write to you for quite some time for a number of reasons. Chiefly, I wanted to ask you for whatever help you can give me in obtaining certain photographs for analysis, but also to check that some of the other ideas I have had in the past fifteen months are not previously published--thus in particular I would very much like to obtain copies of all your books, since our library does not have them. First I should let you know more about what I have been doing.

My interest in the case was re-kindled by reading A. Summers' book Conspiracy, of which you are no doubt aware. There were some odd inconsistencies in the quoted times of the acoustic impulses which I wanted to check, so I consulted the HSCA 12 volumes in the British Library and eventually (after being inexorably drawn into the complexities of the evidence) acquired my own set. It was then that I found the glossed-over acoustic impulse discussed in my letter of 15-8-80. However, only after I delved into the subject of "psychology of witnesses" was I able to verify my assertions and discover much more.

You are invited to read the enclosed letter which I sent to G. R. Blakey (File A). You will see that I found an error in the way the times of the acoustic impulses were altered in various stages of the investigation--without any justification, of course; Dr. Barger's time sequence is quite precise. Blakey was the culprit who distorted Dr. Barger's accurate timings into a meaningless mish-mash. Blakey has never replied to my letter (although you might say he has much to answer for). I also wrote to Dr. Bill Hartmann, one of the photographic "experts", about the timing problem as it pertained to the photographic evidence (File A). Note that in my letter to him I did not mention my analysis of witnesses, as the idea was still new and I did not want to confuse the issue about which I was inquiring. The reply, as you can see for yourself, is rather amazing, betrays the conditions under which the investigation was carried out, and shows sloppiness which would normally not be associated with proper scientific work. I replied to Hartmann's letter, refuting

File B contains some letters to Mr. Keuch, including the original one. I am bemused by your assertion that it was "disconcerting"! I did not let all of my "cats out of the bag". In reply to one of your questions, the Justice Department never sent me any other replies about the letter. I have never been consulted by the NAS. At my request, and with commendable promptness, the FBI sent me a copy of their report on the acoustics evidence. I was chagrined to see them use my point about the "missing" shot to denigrate the evidence without their acknowledging the far more important point that--if you put it back in--the 3-shot witnesses fully confirm the acoustics results. I'll say more about this later. I agree completely with your evaluation of Alvarez's position. In any case, my work on the 3-shot witnesses alone shows that his analysis is clearly wrong, since his ratios of pauses are the opposite of those of the vast majority of witnesses.

I must correct your impression that perhaps I am a bit ingenuous and too trusting when it comes to believing that the HSCA investigation was fair, complete, and impartial. I felt, however, that it was best not to let my skepticism show in my letters to the Justice Dept. I should also point out that my statement that the first shot missed (letter of 15-8-80) was camouflage; I think it was a palpable hit to the President. BEC was kind enough to run their copy of the Zapruder film for me and the first shot unmistakably had an effect before the car disappeared behind the sign. The best analysis of this is by Olson & Turner, J Forensic Sci 16, 399, 1971.

The "psychological" study of eyewitness testimony for the HSCA (VIII, 128) was incredibly incomplete. Dr. Green made no effort to evaluate witnesses according to the quality of their statements, but lumped them all together, and naturally enough concluded that he could not determine the origin of the shots. It never occurred to him to study the witness statements of the timing of the shots. However, as an eminent psychologist he should have been aware of the work of people like Dr. R. Buckhout, with whom I have corresponded. Dr. B. Clifford and co-workers in London have also done experiments of great importance in understanding witness behaviour and testimony.

Once my interest was really aroused, I began to look at other problems. The most important involves "Oswald's alibi". The evidence is of two kinds: a) the timed reconstructions of "Oswald's" movements after the shots, compared to those for Mr. Truly and Officer Baker, and b) photographs of the TSED just after the shots. I was amused (well, distressed would be a better word) to see a claim in the HSCA Report that the committee was satisfied that Oswald could have got downstairs in the time allowed--this is not true! The HSCA Report quoted a part of the book by Scott et al which was actually excerpted from Roffman's book Presumed Guilty. Roffman's arguments on this point were very good, and may turn out to be irrefutable. What is important is that Scott et al edited out the portion of Roffman's text dealing with the Malcolm Couch film. Thus the HSCA went to a secondary, edited

the rules of evidence. Good research is not done this way!

However, only pictures can help us get at the truth. The Dillard and Powell photographs show that whoever was in the 6th floor window moved the boxes after the shooting. (This is one of the few photographic results impossible to refute.) Since the time interval between them is unknown, other pictures might help decide exactly when the boxes were moved. I was unable to obtain the Murray picture (see Black Star letter--no reply), which seems to have boxes in the Dillard position. If the faces evident in Dillard's picture are absent, then it was taken after Dillard's and is therefore very important. I do not know how many other pictures exist but they would all be worth close examination.

Incidentally, the HSCA photographic report's claim (VI, 134) that the precise locations of the Dillard and Powell cameras can not be determined is false. Any mathematics student who has studied analytic geometry could figure out the locations of the cameras, given the height of the TSEB and a copy of the photographs. It took me about half an hour to calculate them to an accuracy of  $\pm 2$  feet, using the assumptions that Dillard was sitting in an open car and Powell (of average height?) was standing. The result is that Dillard's car must have already begun to turn into Elm Street when the photograph was taken. A thorough study of many photographs of the TSEB should allow precise determination of the location of boxes before and after they were moved.

The Malcolm Couch film is most important. I enclose File C on my unsuccessful attempt to locate it. Roffman's claims about Baker's motorcycle are absolutely vital. Baker's exact location at that instant was an important piece of evidence the WC was unable to establish, and HSCA ignored it, yet the film may contain the needed evidence. Perhaps you know where it is--this is terribly important, because I can use the same methods used to locate Dillard and Powell to locate Couch when the motorcycle came into view. If Dillard's photograph and Couch's motorcycle are simultaneous, Oswald's alibi is valid and the entire house of cards tumbles down.

Previously I indicated that the witness accounts verify the acoustics. How is this possible?

A) The WC's evidence on the Tippet case is illuminating. Nearly all the witnesses testified that they heard 3 shots; if one takes the average for all eight witnesses (one interviewed by the Nashes, 7 in the WC volumes) one also gets 3 shots (note the similarity to Dr. Green's procedure--should we conclude that Tippet was shot 3 times?). DA Wade consistently told reporters that Tippet was shot 3 times. ? Yes? From what I have gathered (the autopsy report is in the archives, but not in the WC volumes, is it?) Tippet's body yielded 4 slugs (albeit the "wrong" kind). I conclude that there is evidence that witnesses undercount multiple shots. A similar phenomenon occurred in the Reagan shooting. The first wire service reports I heard estimated 3-4 shots, presumably based on the eyewitness accounts. Only when the recordings were played back a little later did we learn there were 6 shots fired.

expected to distinguish them as separate shots, especially on the east side of Dealey Plaza. Several 4-shot witnesses were in that location.

C) When one corrects the witness accounts of the times and spacing of the first 3 shots for the exaggeration factor found in experiments (a value of 2.3x is more correct now, I find) one gets almost exactly the same timings as the first 3 correlated impulses in Barger's acoustic report--if we include the one he threw away. I think the "missing" shot, number 3, is the one that hit Connally.

I have been unable to pursue my work on the JFK evidence as much as I would like to because my regular work--teaching and doing research in astronomy--does not leave much time for other things. Also, it is difficult for me to obtain the necessary data (photographs, etc) as I can not visit the National Archives while I am in London, and some of the crucial evidence is not there anyways.

If you can help me by directing me to the sources of the evidence that I need, I would be very grateful. It is obvious that I have been sitting on these ideas too long and should really get to work on them, perhaps for a book. Can you help?

When I said at the beginning that I have been meaning to write to you, it is because this is what Ray Marcus suggested when I visited Los Angeles last December. He was also kind enough to give me a copy of the November Washingtonian with Fonzi's article in it. I met Ray many years ago and remembered him. I do not agree with his approach now, however, although I respect his opinions.

What I have found out are some of the physical facts. Identifying the real killers is much harder and may prove impossible so long afterwards.

I would be very grateful if you would oblige me by sending me copies of all your books (whichever are available). Please advise me of the prices.(incl. postage)

I hope to hear from you soon. Keep up the good work and don't get discouraged. There are many people who still care.

Sincerely,

*Michael M Dworetzky*

M. M. Dworetzky

*P.S. I am not very trusting of Post Offices these days & would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this letter and the 27-odd pages of enclosed correspondence. A post card would suffice!*