Dear Fred,

Apologies for not sending these re-enactment shots earlier. I had loemed them to garrison and on their return, forgot I had them until you nudgad me.

Wish I could do soemthing about the cost of prints. I can't.

Jim has a copy of the film but carmot let outsiders see it. What Mark wrote about it is up to his usual stendard of accuracy. It is not a print from the original, is not good and clear, is not even complete.

When I can get to the Archibes againo if by then you still consider it necessary, I'll check that Zap thing on the sign. I do not see the point, since I have already established WWII) that it was moved, was not put back in the same place, same relationship to anything, maybe even a different elevation. What will you be adding that is worth the work. The surveyors' plats prove this.

More pres to you if you can really prove your suspicion about the altering of the picture through the sign. I'll be the first to dedare myself a former skeptic. But for Christ sake don't send enything along this line to Jim until it is thoroughly examine by everyone possible. You have no idea how much then helf-cocked it takes to detonate, under the prevalent corcumstences.

Can you please end me the MYTimes sources, both a xerom of the sketch with caption and of the FEI disclaimer. Send it c o Louis Ivon, Office of the DA, N.O. I'M going down there for more work, with two stops en route. Please, as soon as possible so I can use thom.

Best to you all.

S, ncerely,

ADVERTIGING AGENCY / 505 EAST GREEN STREET / PAGADENA, CALIFORNIA / SYCAMORE 5-5655.

4640 NOBLE AVENUE SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91403

Undated (see postmark)

Dear Harold,

I wrote Sprague and he's given me a list of photo sources which I've contacted. The only trouble is I haven't the money to order prints at \$15 or \$25 a crack, so I'm stymied there.

Saw Rush to Judgement the other night at Maggie's house and thought the series of interviews were important, but that the film lacked expert editing and direction.

The Nix interview was great. Nix says that his film was lost during processing for a week and that when he viewed his copy later that frames were missing here and there !!!!!!

Glad you liked the Galt-Ray-King thing. I don't mind credit - I just feel that this is a very weak clue, however, something may develope to prove interesting here. By all means use my name... I'm not parnoid anymore!

Am still working in Stemmond sign area - so any photos of sign taken just after shotzing would be interesting to me.

What I suspect, re the sign, seems to be true and I'me almost to the point of mailing it down.

Understand Jim has copy of Zap in the office to work with till the trial is completed. Great! Have you seen it? MAIL A COPY TO ME IN A PLAIN BROWN WRAPPER.

Check something for me if you get a chance to see it, will you? Around December 1st the sign is attached to the post with bolts. In the Zap film it appears to be attached with straps.

Also still need glossy of secret service re-enactment which you had at one time.

Sincerely,

SOURCE OF SKETCH: NEW YORK TIMES APR 11
PAGE 35 U.P.I.

SAME ISSUE F. B.I. DISCLAMES SKETCH - SAYS DID NOT AUTITORIZE SKETCH. SKETCH WAS CIRCULATED IN MEXICO