## 9/15/70

Dear Howard (Dick),

Enclosed are copies of my today's letters to Angel and Kleindienst and Angel's to me of 9/11, with a photocopy pf the picture he enclosed.

I include the copy of the picture so you can compare it with the one you got some time ago and of which Dick wrote me. This seems to show the hole as Dick described. I have put a red dot at that point, and two arrows pointing to it.

There is little doubt that they lied to me, made this picture as I describe, by taking one that eliminates the screen and then photographing that, or both, and any alternative is pretty cheap but, as I tell him right out, will be useful in court.

What they are trying to do here, I imagine, is get around that rotten business of having no emblargeable picture of the most basic evidence, in their own small minds, in a way they may then seek to misrepresent to a judge as offering me what I asked for. But the picture is so bad that, without a glass, one cannot tell the number of stripes. I also seems to be out of focus, but this may not be the case.

It does seem, as Dick's sketch shows, not to impinge upon the righthand stripes, but it is so unclear, one cannot be certain. Above the hole, it seems Not do, below it seems to.

If they think this will be enough to get me to drop the suit, they are really nuts, and if they think it will influence an uncorrupted judge, they are equally separated from common sense. And you will notice <sup>1</sup> made no new requests, no suggestions, no questions (such as could they make it cleaver), of for so far as I am concerned, they either deliver exactly what I asked for or, what I'd rather, I go to court with the whole thing. Even if they do offer me copies of end enlargements from their clear pictures, I'll not settle until I have had a chance to study them and decide whether these answer all possible questions. If they do not, then I'll insist on pictures taken for me and if that doesn't, I'll insiston seeing the clothing. They have put me to enormous trouble and cost, all in rather open defiance of the law, and I'll not now compromise for less them all the knowledge I want.

I intend conveying the idea to them that I'm not foolinng. Thus the small touch, that when they make the pictures for me (and pretty obviously, I am therein assuming they will) they charge at the rate prevailing at that timeof the original order, which was but \$1.25. These unconscionable basterds are now making a cash frofit from the assassination.

The stuff on Ronnie Caire and the fingerprint should be clear. They are not suggested as related, nor have I any reason to believe his eddress and the place of IHO's first picketing is anymore than what I cell it, a coincidence. But I wonder if <sup>K</sup>leindienst, who presumeably knows nothing of any of this, will believe it is no more than a coincidence. I've had Caire spoken to recently, and he sticks to the 100-hours bit. This, by the way, is not the only thing on Caire the Archives has, but I'm not making an issue of it. They have the Crusade story, too, for that was my original source in 1966.

Hastily.