Dear Mr. Weisberg:
My wife and I saw you the other evoning on TV, and are very much interested in your work on the Warren Report. Yesterday, we saw your book for sale and purchased a copy. I looked thru the book casually a few minutes ago, and especially at one of the photographs, and in respect to this would like to call your attention to several things that led me to believe that this picture has been 'doctored".

The picture I refer to is the one on page 201. The portion that I believe has been tampered with is the figure of the man walking just behind the car. There are several points relative to this figure:
l-The size of this man is out of proportion to those in the car. He is considerably larger, to have been viewed from approximately the same distance. 2-In the close-up, his hand appears to be too small for the rest of his size, however, this could be attributed to the manner of lighting. 3-Under a glass (magnifying), the full view figure (A), has his right arm bent at the elbow, with his hand about the height of a man's belt, and using the white line of the street as a yard-stick, the hand seems to be just above (or to the left) of the line. In the closs-up (B), the elbow is not bent as it appears to be in A; the white hand is BELOW or to the right of the white line, and at an elevation close to the crotch, which is below the belt height. In all faimess, picture B showstwo whiet spots; one the hand the other the light between the body and the front of the fore arm, while only one white spot is seen in $A$; however, the white hand in $B$ is much more pronounced than is the spot along the forearm, so I an assuming that the white spot in A IS the HaND. In the right foreground of A there is a call box of some kind on the curb, which clearly shows its shouow. It would be interesting to know the height of this fixture and the length of its shadow compared to that of the man. 4-Also looking at the shodow cast along the LEFT side of the car; there scems be no shadow; looking at the motorcycle (under glass) there seems to considerable shadow along its left side, and of the same density of shadow as its shadow on its right side. The density of shadow on left side is not noticable without glass, due to oil drippings along street, but beneath glass, this shadow is considerably darker than the oil drippings.
5-In picture B, I assume from mans shadow and shadow of car, that the man is supposed to be tow or three feet behind the rear of the car. If this is true, it would seem that the light between his legs (indicating roug'ly the height of his crotch), would not be as hith as it is shown, compared to the read of the car fender. In other words, the inseam of a mans trousers is around 30-32 inches, which is the maximum height when he is standing straight on both feet. Now (try this yourself); take a long step and hold both feet where they would fall, place a yardstick on the flocr between the legs, so that the stick will be at the apex of the light that can be seen between the legs. You will find that this height is roughly 22,24 inches. Since the picture was tiken on a downward angle, this dimension would be less, and it is inconceivable that the rear fenders of the type of car used would co-incide so far as height is concerned with the measurements mentioned above, showing a mans crotch at the height of the rear of the rear fenders, IF the man were even with the rear of the car. But he isn't even, he is SEHIND the car (so to speak), which means this measurement vould $b$ : decreased even more.

