DICK, HOOKER, BUD, GARY, PAUL

3/19/70

Dr. James B. Rhoads, Archivist
The NationalArchives
Washington, D.C. 20408

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

I have just received, by registered mail, a negative identified as "Photograph of base of bullet in CE #99 taken for Dr. John Nichols" and three enlargements of CEs 394 and 395, for which I thank you.

It does not require close examination of this negative to establish it is not that of a picture you took for Dr. Nichols but is identical with that which you took for me the year before, one of three taken for me.

The enlargements, unfortunately, are a complete waste, for they disclose nothing but gore and, as I tried to tell you, gore is something in which I have no interest at all. I have examined these enlargments with an engraver's lens. It is not possible to identify the slits, for example, in the collar.

I do not believe there was any technical problem involved in what I asked of you, ant enlargement of this part of the collar only and of the knot of the tie only. My interest, as I believe I explained with some care and detail in correspondence and in person, is to be able to examine this evidence in connection with the verbal evidence. I have measured the enlargments and the original prints. With the shirt, where the collar is 1 3/4" wide in the original print, it is but 3" wide in the enlargement. Magnification of the tie is approximately the same but a trifle greater.

Not only is it, as it should be, a reasonably safe presumption that the technical competence of the FBI is such that great enlargment of their photographic negatives is possible, but the fact that I can magnify this greatly with a lens supports the belief that what I asked of you is possible and presents no unusual problems.

If you cannot supply me with a picture that even shows the damage to the shirt, I fail,to see how you can refuse to take such a picture for me. And there remains the same question about the damage to the knot of the tie, we have only one view of it and there should be at least two, preferably three! one from the front, one from the side (which is what I asked), and one from the back.

When to this is added your refusal to permit visual examination of the garments, are you not inviting conspiratorial interpretations? And are you [illegible], with complete effectiveness, suppressing the best, the only really meanigful, evidence?

I will phone to arrange to see the other pictures when I am in Washington.

Sincerely,