

3/29/70.

Dear Gary,

You should change the return address on the Golden Valley Rd. envelopes.

I took your advice and didn't even read Chris' letters. You are patient with him, as I used to be with many but now feel I cannot take time for.

Thanks for worrying about our health. I guess with each of us it could easily be better. However, with the break in the weather I've been trying to restore some muscle tone and have been getting what for me is vigorous exercise. Yesterday I took down and worked up four small and four medium size trees, with all the brush trimmed out and piled up, all the branches big enough for kindling cut up and in the house, all the rest ready for the fireplace. I also planted a number of small trees and did a little gardening. However, I think I have been more anxious for the past several weeks, and I am inclined to attribute it largely to the lack of reaction to the filing of the suit plus the uncertainties, esp. medical. During this period I've cut back on smoking, rather heavily. I cut cigars out entirely and was down to but six cigarettes a day. That seemed to make me more nervous so I'm permitting myself a few more. I feel that when this anxiety has eased I'll be able to stop, though I'd not now dare try and cold turkey it again. Meanwhile, if there is a chemical reaction, the reduced consumption might ease that, when I do get to making the big shift.

Inherently, what Phil said is what you did, that the need is for a good diagnostician. I also feel that way, but it is beyond my capacity to get to Omaha or Mpls. Tuesday I see this new doctor again and perhaps I'll learn a bit more than. I feel as though I will not, that he will now not have the time he took six weeks ago, when his schedule was not yet full. He'll have at most 20 minutes, perhaps only 10.

Your reference to wanting to find a single good man in Dallas for Mary reminds me I wrote her several days ago and forgot to mail that letter. She has a rough one, and the financial cost makes it terrible. It is also outrageous. I do not know whether Phil has any experience along this line and haven't mentioned it to him. I do not know exactly what he does, but I know he works in a State psychiatric institution. He may be a social worker, or something like that. I suppose I could raise the question with him without disclosure of identity. I know nothing about this sort of thing and know enough about the scuttlebutt to know it is often wrong. What comes to mind, however, is Pike's son. Makes me shiver.

DJ has turned me down on the panel raw materials. If I can handle this properly, get it into court, I think I can accomplish much if before a fair judge. Meanwhile, they've designed the rejection in a way that, were I to proceed immediately, before a corrupt judge could be found to be deficient in my alleged not having exhausted my administrative remedies, so I'll have to proceed with more letter writing. I'll send copies. I hope you and Paul are keeping this entirely to yourselves, for there is no need for others to know what is not public and good reason for there to be no jawing about it. It would probably be rough on me, but I sort of look forward to cross examining those whores. This also is an area where a corrupt judge could do things. There has been no response on the Ray suit and almost total suppression. I did get a late small story on the AP wire, through a local reporter feeding it to Baltimore, but I've heard of only one paper carrying even that, probably because Howard phoned them to ask why they failed to cover such an important story the day that was on the wire. There was what I am certain is good radio coverage in LA, but all our "friends" there have been silent, and of all those in SF who heard my three hours on it with Dolan, only one said a word. Best,

March 22, 1970

Dear Harold,

God only knows when this will reach you with the Postal strike on as it is. Enclosed are letters from Longbottom and my reply. Please return his letters (but keep the carbon of mine) when you are through with them. In fact, if you have things to do, don't even bother to read them. I am getting a bit angry at him. He wildly theorizes and treats his opinion as fact, and is really becoming a waste of time with his persistence. Many of his ideas are really wild, or blind to known facts. I don't object to his lack of knowledge, but I do to his brazenness. In one of his letters he dismissed the testimony or advice of experts I mentioned and accepted the commissions tests, as interpreted ### by himself. Now more than ever I want you to stay out of any correspondence with him. If he gets any worse I intend to cut it off because it is wasting quite a bit of time with really no possible gain for ourselves. These longletters take forever just to read.

Ironically, Mike Masterman, who started a bit that way has relented and realized how dumb it was to work in the mainstream of the case and expect to come up with something new. He, by the way, will send me his letters from all of the British agencies, etc., from whom he tried to get the court records. I will make copies from all of us, and several sets for you, and then we can decide whether you will have any need of the originals. If so I'm sure he would trade them for xeroxes. He is very good that way. I have warned him about Joesten's irresponsibility and he agrees and says he would like to stay in touch with him but realizes that anything he personally digs up should probably be cleared with us before Joesten even hears about it, let alone gets to look at it. Quite independently he has decided not to share things with Joesten--without any comment of mine. Basically, he seems amenable to reason and interested in working hard on the case. In his last letter he said that he had ordered the volumes and feels that he will not be competent until he has done some serious study on them. I would like to keep in touch and help educate him on the case because I think he is serious about becoming a long term researcher. His giving that Davison thing to Joesten was certainly not his fault since Paul said that he mentioned it to Mike without indicating there were any secrets involved. Independent of that incident he has indicated that anything of importance which was classified would be seen by he only. And remember that he immediately agreed to the confidentiality stipulation on the Ray thing. So basically, since he will not be getting anything confidential anyway, I think that he would be a good person to help out. Chris, who I liked at first, is beginning to look like more of a waste of time. If the film "Z" comes to your area be sure to see it. Not only is it excellent but I think that there are far too many parallels to the JFK assassination to be ignored. While it applies to the Greek scene, I think that they deviated from the history of the event to bring in other parallels and make it an universal warning.

I hope that you are in good health and that Lil is OK also. I worry about you people, especially since# you don't have one medical man you have full confidence in.

I am trying to find out about a good man in Dallas for Mary's son to see, just in case she takes my advice and decided to use one man who I can vouch for (through someone up here who I trust).

I will be working at the clinic next year and earning more money, which is good since I owe Cornell \$1200.

Well, I've got to go. Take it easy.

Gay

Dear Chris:

March 22, 1970

This is in reply to your lengthy letters of March 13 and 14th for which I thank you. You may not receive this for some time given the fact that our city has been hit by a postal workers strike and there is no pickup or delivery of mail.

Let me first assure you that you have caused no one inconvenience or embarrassment and I hope that my comments have not served to dampen your enthusiasm because enthusiasm is a rare quality. A fellow researcher of yours, Mike Masterman in England, just got shot down by Sylvia Meagher for doing an elaborate piece on the timing of the first shot, something which has been worked and reworked countless times over here with the benefit of far more information than Mike had at his disposal.

On your theory, which I have not unfortunately been able to read in full yet, let me make some more comments. First of all, no cut rose stem, from all I know and have been told by anatomists, could have caused that wound. Secondly, let me caution you against something which it took me many years to learn about. It is a bad idea to accept the medical evidence at face value, or to take it as the only evidence. For example, your assumption that the only damage there was was that which you know of from the autopsy report is not a safe one. The original autopsy reported no metal in the neck, and yet we now know that there is definitely metal in the neck. There is reason to believe that the throat or shoulder wounds were more extensive than the brief description in the autopsy report would indicate. There is unconfirmed information (alleged statement of Registered nurse Henkeliffe) that indicates that there was such internal damage. But my basic point is that the pattern of injury upon which you are basing your theory may not be the actual pattern. The Justice Dept. panel moved the positions of all the wounds by centimeters and inches. I suspect that there is such more diffuse damage and that the bullet was a dum dum, and that it entered at a downward angle. Important in such considerations is the question as to when that shot came, if it was a shot from the front. When JFK was rising upward, the second and third tracheal rings may well have been exposed to a shot from above street level and the front--we won't know until accurate determinations can be made from the photos. As for my explanation of the tears, Harold Weisberg has an ingenious one, but I am not a liberty to tell you what it is since it is coming out in his book Post Mortem. Bear in mind that the direction the fibers were turned is almost irrelevant given the pulling and tearing of the clothing off the President and the fact that it was thrown all over and didn't reach the FBI lab until such clues could not be considered as valid. That piece of expert testimony is, in my limited judgment, a red herring and would have been assaulted in a courtroom. I rank it along with the allegation that the guys on the 5th floor could hear the bolt on the rifle above them--a ridiculous attempt to over-prove a case which was lacking in the more basic proofs and scarcely needed such way out stuff. Harold was one of the people who has influenced me a great deal in my thinking in this case, and one of the things he taught me which has helped me the most is not to take the commission, autopsy, etc. at face value. That is the trap which Mark Lane and some others have fallen into--replying only to the commission's facts. Furthermore, I do not question the sharpness (in terms of angle of cut) or length of those rose stems, but deny that they are capable of inflicting a bruise to the lung or go in anywhere that deeply, even if those are the only injuries. Roses, in my experience, even the type with stems tougher and stronger than those used by florists, are not capable of causing such damage. The skin is very resilient and amazingly strong, and one of the points made by the pathologists in this case is that it offers resistance even to a bullet and can deform a bullet. As for a theory which can answer all the questions, I think that we can answer most of them, but that right now we lack all the evidence necessary. In other words, until we get the truth about the President's body wounds I think we should go light on hypotheses. They are well worthwhile bringing up in discussion during correspondence as you have done, because new ideas are always helpful, but I don't think that a 100% solution should be expected until Nichols or someone else gets us closer to the original evidence.

Your theory, by the way, fails to account for all the metal in the neck that

we have previously hypothesized but now know is there from the Justice Dept. report. Secondly, I do not accept the claim that JFK's hand does not go to his throat, since it is hard to tell where it is reaching and why when it does, and the possibility that he is reaching for his throat cannot be ruled out. That whole sequence, by the way, when seen on the archives copy of the film and the slides, which are much clearer than what you have, suggest that there may be two separate motions which may represent reactions to two wounds.

I don't agree with your observations about Z frames 224-228. On our copy of the film there is too much blurring to be sure, but on the archives copy all I see (besides some blurring) is Connally turning to his left as he said he did in his testimony. ##### In frame 230 he clearly has his right hand up in the air and has not reacted to being hit. I would like to point out that when a man's lung collapses that side of the body goes down, and his didn't until later. Furthermore, your analysis cannot explain the angles across the body and through the various parts.

I often don't agree with Dick Sprague's analysis, and so I am not surprised that you do not agree with his JFK hit theory for f. 226-7. As for your final point on the metal I think that you make the same mistake here as you do with your theory of the front wound--assume that it is easy for things to pass through skin and flesh.

On your theory of the third shot, let me point out that the overwhelming body of evidence suggests a shot from the front, and in fact, probably two shots, with the result of the one from the rear being obliterated by the one from the front. The shot from the front knocked him across the car and blew fragments of skull and tissue and blood back over the car which landed in the grass and hit motorcycle patrolmen Hargis and Martin. Even FBI experts have testified that it would be impossible for a fragment from a bullet from the rear to have emerged from the head to hit the curb and wound tague. That is an impossibility on several counts. Furthermore, there was no way it could get there without going through the windshield. You make the claim that the reaction of JFK though 314-321 is a neuromuscular reaction--on what basis? I have looked at this subject extensively and with the help of experts. How does that, in any event, explain the movement of the fragments of skull and the blood--that's from the witnesses and physical evidence both.

Your letter of March 14th:

Again I think you are making a mistake of lining up the only wounds we know of and neglecting the possibility that there was, in all likelihood, much greater damage, and that it may well have come from two bullets which were both dum dums, which means no fixed pattern of damage. Note that Martin Luther King was killed by one dum dum bullet in the throat, which did not exit, and which left an unusual pattern of damage. The angle JFK was turned is therefore somewhat irrelevant because the angle through the body you are establishing may have no basis in fact. I do not feel that I can either explain for sure or be stumped by the question as to the position of the wound in the throat or whether it was exposed until more evidence is available--i.e. until someone specifically examines LIFE's slides on this point. But I absolutely disagree that a rose stem could have caused such a wound, even if it is as limited as the official autopsy states. It could have been caused by JFK hitting some more solid object while he was being pushed into the hospital but not a rose stem. I agree with the bunching of the clothing, but am not certain that it would have placed the thing in the right spot. You are using rough logic rather than precise evidence. Not to mention the question about when the first shot occurred, since this relates to whether there was bunching at that time. Try to do an experiment and get the holes in the right place and yet the wound in the base of the neck. You accept the 45-60 angle uncritically--why believe that any more than the angle of 10-11 degrees on their diagram. Furthermore, the angle still might be too steep unless the shot came from that window.

Your argument that the absence of proof that 999 had been through Connally would have been reason enough for suppression is not a good one, because an impartial proof that at least the bullet had hit JFK would have done

then a world of good--especially since there was a need to link that gun to the crime. There is no reason to believe that there was blood on that bullet or that the bullet did come, or could have come, from the President's back wound.

You are wrong in stating that the commissions tests could possibly prove that the Tague hit came from the head shot. FBI agent Frazier, under oath and on the spot at the Shaw trial said it was nonsense. So do all the other experts and we don't need experts to point out that the bullet ~~fragment~~ fragment did not and could not have done what was necessary afterwards--go through the windshield--check the angles yourself. So that theory, which the commission used, has even been shot down by their own experts.

On the head wounds, why would one expect an entrance wound when there is no skull left where it should be. Why does one need an exit wound on the other side? Many bullets enter skulls and do not exit. Furthermore, this one seems to have fragmented on impact, perhaps being either a dum dum, cor lak, or exploding shell. It is not true that the turning suggests a neurovascular movement, and my own knowledge of neurophysiology has been backed up by experts on that point too. Blasting off the right pre-central gyrus would have unknown effects--it could cause hemiparesis, or movement first and then hemiparesis. Furthermore, since the brain was severed (according to Boswell) below the cerebellum, the president might well have been decorticate almost immediately. Where did the metal go? Some on Chris, the head is full of metal and we don't even know how much yet because even the 1968 Panel would not tell. There is a large fragment in the skull which is still unidentified. And there are two different types of dispersion in the head from what we know. A dum dum doesn't leave a track but does just what was done to the right side of the brain, wipes out a diffuse area of tissue. Who says no damage to left side of brain--it was not completely described in the original autopsy and interestingly enough, although it is in a bottle somewhere in Washington, the 1968 Panel never saw it. 313 is 100% consistent with a dum dum and then some say the experts in terms of amount of explosion.

The firecracker you hypothesize was thrown over the wall--by whom? Certainly not a random accident. Your hypothesis with regard to Willis is completely inconsistent with everyone's testimony. The blurring does not indicate that a shot occurred which caused it, but simply that Willis, as he so testified, was running.

On the train, it is a water tower which is seen in the eupola in Willis 5. The train in Willis slides taken before the shots which are unpublished but which he showed me. #5 was taken several seconds before the first Nix frame and that would be a fast moving train which could not have stopped in time. The train should appear behind the entire pergola in Willis 5. Your reasoning on the Dal Tex building is not correct--there is a clear line of fire.

I would like to caution against developing theories designed to explain everything when so much data is conspicuously missing, and when you do not have access to expert opinion on a number of key subjects and are left to treating your hypotheses and analyses as fact. Expert after expert has examined much of this data, and sometimes it has been done "blind" (i.e. with the expert having no idea that it dealt with the JFK assassination). Many of their conclusions are at odds with yours, and theirs are based on not only their own expert knowledge, but access to more evidence, and better copies of what you do have. It is good to see someone as energetic as learning the case and someone who is willing to advance new ideas (although none of yours are new in that they were explored years ago and debated back a forth, despite the fact that many never made it into print), but I advise against elaborate efforts to suddenly build a hypothesis which will explain everything we now have without a great deal of further study and working through of the basic evidence in the case.

Well, I've got to go. I hope that you did well on your exams.

Lay