

Yesterday you had Jim give me copies of two of the three pictures you got in response to your suit for those parts of CD 955. I presume the third was so heavily cropped it served no purpose to provide it. I glanced at these prints when we were together, looked at them again before going to bed, and have examined them briefly in daylight this a.m.

My original work on the available pictures is so far in the past I hesitate to pretend my recollections, including of my thinking, are dependable after all this time. However, after initial interest, I think I decided that this man may have been an Oswald associate, in which event any inquiry involving the CIA would be more difficult than most other things we could attempt; that the CIA had deliberately deceived the Commission and the FBI, which would not make inquiry easier; or that there was an error. I have never doubted that everyone entering those kinds of embassies and consulates was photographed. Before your day in Washington it was hardly secret that the FBI did this there. I am confident that each time I entered the Soviet Embassy as a correspondent I was photographed by the FBI from the other side of 16th St. And they were then our allies. This was World War II time. As an illumination of the workings of the intelligence-oriented mind, let me add the seemingly extraneous, that on one occasion what my editor had asked me to get the press officer refused. He took me to lunch, but he refused it. So, I went to our own Department of Commerce and they promptly loaned me exactly what I'd asked, it was then unsecret.

Returning to these pictures, whether or not you pursue the others in that CD (and if you do I think some consultation in advance, such as I have already had to a degree with Jim, might be helpful), I have a few suggestions.

First, I'd ask the CIA. now that you have the pictures, to make me a negative 4x5 from each of the original negatives of the prints they have given you. If they decline this, I'd ask for an 8x10 glossy made from the original negative. Unless the lab that duplicated these was careless, your print is, like that I got in the King materials suit, excessively dusty.

If you don't want to do this, which I think you can do by phone, I suggest that you use a procedure similar to what I did when I finally forced AP to come up with a full Altgens. I was without reluctance in using a Washington lab run by a former FBI agent. His work was excellent and he went out of his way to inform me. For example, the enlargement of the print I had was, as could not be detected by the naked eye, slightly out of focus. Anyway, of the print itself he made me a contact negative. Of the parts that particularly interested me he made me enlarged negatives. Good Ol' Jim Harrison asked to borrow these when I was there in November. After some delay and correspondence I finally got back the full 8x10 negative but the others are now gone. There are advantages in this kind of procedure if you intend to make serious study of such pictures. The more obvious is that having isolated the parts of the picture that interest you, you can then have prints or enlarged prints made with differing exposures and on paper of different characteristics, with added or diminished emphasis on varying parts.

If you do not intend doing this, then I'd recommend, if you intend carrying this further at all and desire others to study these pictures (and please, for Christ's sake, keep prints away from some of your nuts for the kinds of easily-made exaggerations and distortions of what you have can hurt our little remaining credibility too much), instead of going through a drug-store type of photography, which this post-card size print suggests, that you have a decent kind of 4x4 negative or negatives made, like those I gave you yesterday in connection with the Ray habeas corpus. Jim has a photographer friend. If he is not equipped with a Speed Graphic or Graphlex, then my local photo shop will make such a negative for either \$1 or \$1.50, I've forgotten which, if it is a straight copy of the full prints and doesn't require extra work, like masking out parts, and about the same for each 8x10. In themselves better prints of this kind and size can be more informative. For example, with a better prints you might decide, if it seems important, whether the clock-like device that seems attached to a wallet like thing is an ordinary traveller's thing. I have a friend who is a reporter in Mexico and fluent in English and Spanish who might be able to tell from this part alone if this is an ordinary item there.

the other pictures of this CD interest me more.

The sequence of numbering of these CDs may indicate a relationship with the Arnold Lewis Kessler things, one of which was classified until the recent declassification. In those early days Hal Verb had some interest and interviewed someone somehow connected with all of this. He is a friend of Paul Hoch, as he is of mine. Paul, as you probably know, had some interest in these pictures, so I'll send him a copy of this in the event he disagrees with some of it or can add more for you. My recollection of part of that story, and Hal's source may have disputed it, is that it involved Oswald with a fair sum of money and some kind of claim to more available.

I think it probable the picture you have were made with a movie camera, and not only because they show the man walking, which a still can also do. You have copies of prints that were altered before the prints were made and you have different exposures on your prints. This influences tone, etc.

It may be that the remaining parts, those not masked, also were touched up. I am not expert enough to know the cause (as lighting, exposure, etc) but detail that would show in an ordinary snapshot seems missing and not likely missing on the original. Look at the arm and shirt of the sleeve, for example, they are a mass of white from which the left arm projects. The same is true of whatever kind of bag is being carried. No detail is visible under magnification. I wonder if it was thought by the Commission staff to be the one they so pursued Mrs. Hledsoe about.

The airbrush work, especially on the walking shot, seems to have impinged on the shirt and not other parts. I can't be certain but I think so. This need not be given sinister interpretation, for the spooks like the pretense that what they do is not known and they'd have done this in hiding the background, which could have been for the sole purpose in this or similar cases of disguising the point from which the picture was taken.

These pictures were taken close to midday from the lighting, in broad daylight, and under these conditions I find it hard to believe anyone but a zany would have been engaged in anything clandestine. ~~mm~~

If you can get Hal interested, he used to have the kinds of contacts who could have a reasonable chance of saying if the man was a known pro-Castroite.

If he was of any real interest, I don't doubt he has been identified. But either way, I think the likely response to an inquiry for identification would be invocation of the exemptions in a way that would be difficult to contest.

I'll give this to Jim when he is here Monday.