In about 11/66 I mande a cláose study of the actual Oswald shirt. I also obtained. color pictures of if for Jones $H_{\text {arris. I studied this shirt under natural north }}$ light and under fluorescent ifght

This is a short unlike any I can remember. It was patched as one used to darn stockings (or can't you remember that). It had pronounced defects not all of which I remember. I have a mero you can read when you ate here.

Hy impression $1 . s$ that it was the hand-axik me-down of a once expensive shirt that IHO used as a wrokshort.

It reninded me of $t$
material, like broedcloth, Nass-type wall paper. It is not a short woven of a solid terine fibre, as I recall sort of glod colored rust brown. It had a pronounced glit-

Most telling to me there was
where the shdirt on the man in the doorsor of means of holding the shirt closed etc.

I was also disturbed by the handling of the entire matter. Why, for example, did the FBI lie about Lovelady's shirt?

Impressive was the description Mrs. Liovelady gave me when she read WWII and
 phoned th: Eaturday afternoon before f.t went to rress. She was looking for $\$ 5,000$, a sum she could not hope to get via any kind of fakery.

I'm too tired to dig out the old files and notps. I have only a few moro comments.

Robert has doue no real. work on this. He has matrely reproduced a few frames from the DCA collection. In magnification, I think it inevitable they represent a considerably greater einlargement from stundard \& than the enlarging of the 35 mm Altgens reprosents. Hartin was, as I recall, wing a resular camera. No zoom. Altgens was loofys $n$ 105. The quality of tive lenses I an sure is ureatiy in Altgens favoro

If in addition the area of the Altgens film is about 12 times that of "artin's, then the greater enlargine problem is not with Altgens. Wa, he not also closer?

So, if the pattern shows as clearly as it does in inartan, why sbould we then assume it would shoe less clearly in Altgons? II astily, His

