

12/4/69

Dear Howard,

Sorry about delays in responses. Been busy getting ready to xerox COUP add (done today) and we're both rather tired.

The picture is helpful. I'll not return it herewith because Bud is coming up Saturday. If you do not get it in the first letter postmarked thereafter, please remind me. When you can make me a copy, I'd rather have that for now. I seen no point in marching with flags in modern battle.

There are new things I cannot communicate except in person. But there is no doubt of the correctness of the beginning of your 11/26/69. I have it from a better source and quite directly. When next you are here, I'll show it to you.

Picture again: I've not spelled this out to Dick. I want his mind to blow spontaneously. I appreciate your offer, and I'd appreciate several different ones if you can vary contrast, etc.

In your 11/28 you retracted needlessly. I called this to Dick's attention some time ago in a long exchange we had on this. The essence of his testimony (which is not unequivocal) is that he didn't notice any markings outside the cap. Dick has been doing fine work on this. I'll file this with Frazier, so when I get around to typing my notes on his N.O. test (some written, some on tape) I'll be reminded to send you more. The key is semantics.

There is nothing on the wiping of 399 of which I know. Frazier's test (WC) is all there is on this. He went into also in N.O. I also do in FM, if you recall. There was no need to wipe it. It wasn't used.

One moving the eye when operating the bolt: inevitably. It is not alone Frazier and not alone that rifle. Dick can explain this better than I. We had the aid of a real expert this summer when Dick was here and he told us, in advance of firing, that he'd have to. Only the WC wasn't interested. and the master's didn't duplicated what was attributed to LHO with it.

Please excuse the haste. Inevitably when I have to concentrate on one thing (in this case Coup add) others suffer.

I'm not going to try and keep you up to date on all things because that would be piecemeal and I think you'll be here again. However, I do tell you there is no Archives original for supplementary autopsy report, no distribution records, no notes or backing of any kind. I'll be carrying this a bit further. You understand one of the things I seek aside from generalities. The Archives "original" is a photographic negative of a xerox!

I think you will be able to understand this ellipsis, and if you do, you must make no mention or use under any circumstances. You will recall some things I showed you in two versions, one public the other I smoked out. You will then recall who was the author of what appears in but one version. I have the most definitive from him now and not from our common source. It is as explicit and unequivocal as it can possibly be and is spelled out as it is on one of the pages I showed you when you were here. Here I mean as close to exactly identical as it can be, ~~in~~ it is possible others may not understand that I understand or that they may not, on their own, understand, so I never mention this. What you saw here was backed up, even if we had no prior knowledge of that.

Best,

11/28/69

Dear Harold,

I just got a reply from Mark Eckhoff on the pictures of the 399 base you wanted me to order. He says it will be \$1.25 for each 5X7 I order. That's highway robbery! I think the 8X 10's cost just as much. If I remember correctly, you told me that the 5X7's were cheaper.

Here is what I'd like to do if it's O.K. with you. I have a very good negative of the 399 base from my picture. I can make up as many prints as you want from that. I'm enclosing one print which is the only one I have and is somewhat out of focus because of the processor. Now I develop my own stuff and can get the focus sharp like it should be. I can also control the amount of contrast in the picture. If you want to get your 5X7's this way, I'd be more than happy to do it at no cost. If you still want it from the Archives, I'll write and order. Am waiting to hear from you before I do anything.

I am now writing the draft of my chapter on the first shot. In it I outline the case for perjury and its subornation against Shaneyfelt and Specter. I suppose the NO testimony of Shaneyfelt will help but the WC record is already enough. The full impact of his perjury just recently hit me but I suppose I should not be shocked. About all of them are perjurers in one way or the other and if they're not quite that, then their other insidious deeds render them tantamount to criminals in my opinion.

*I was wrong -
he did not
look for them
on the cross
the day*

My analysis of the Frazier NO testimony continues still. I think I already sent you a note about the tie nick. There is more. Whether it is actual perjury or merely contradiction, I cannot say. On page 31, he testified that he compared marks from the firing pin and the bolt face on the three cartridge cases. In his WC test., at 3H423, he implies that he did not look for the bolt face marks. Then, at 116 to 117, he says (or seems to be saying) that from his examination of the films, Connally was seated more to the left than directly in front of the Pres. This does contradict his WC testimony on 5H171-172 where he is extremely cautious to avoid saying this. He says that the films, being only two dimensional, did not reveal to him anything about the relative positions other than that JC was in front of JFK.

Is there any reference where one of the Hospital people who handled 399 wiped it clean? This keeps coming into my mind and I can't seem to find any such thing.

One of the important things to come out of the Frazier NO test. is the admission that he had to move his eye away from the telescopic sight to work the bolt. Add this to reaiming and see if the time between shots becomes any longer. The whole thing is getting so ridiculous that I don't see how even the master rifleman were able to do it for the WC.

Write soon. (Belated Happy Thanksgiving).

Still,

Edward

11/26/69

To Harold and Dick:

At page 107 (and in numerous other places) of the NO testimony, Frazier says that the white chalk mark on the back of the Pres. stand-in was made according to the autopsy measurements. I had always been under the impression that this was done according to the position of the hole in the jacket. I checked the 26 volumes and found that the NO testimony is right. At 5H166, Frazier says that the mark was made according to the autopsy measurements. This is quite a startling piece of information.

It seems from the NO test. that Frazier made a big stink about the picture of the stand-in distributed by UPI which shows the bullet hole way down on the back. Therefore, I will refer to official WC documents for my following comments. Obviously, Frazier can't dispute them.

I have photographs from some of the reconstruction pictures through the rifle scope. You can make out the ~~XXXX~~ mark on the coat in what the WC printed but it is clear as day on the actual photo. I'll refer to the photo through the scope for Frame 225. There is no doubt about it--the mark falls on the back. I would estimate that it corresponds to a position exactly above the first rib in back right up next to the spine. I doubt very much whether this would indicate a position much lower into the back which would involve hitting bone or penetrating the lung. At any rate, that mark is nowhere near the neck. It is damned close to the mark which Boswell put on the autopsy face sheet.

Obviously this does not agree with the drawings submitted to the WC by Humes for his testimony. I guess this can be explained away by the fact that the drawing was prepared without photos, ect. just like they explained away the mark on the face sheet. Well, let them explain this away! Here is an official photograph accompanying sworn testimony that this is the position of the back wound as indicated by the autopsy measurements. Conclusive proof that the Commission knew about the real position despite the obfuscation of the drawings.

There is more significance to this than what I just pointed out. Notice that a bullet entering this low on a downward angle would surely have penetrated at least into the top of the right lung if it made any substantial penetration into the upper thorax at all. Humes' testimony that the lung was not pierced is explicit. This is in my opinion stark corroboration for the theory that a bullet penetrated a very short distance into the back.

There is probably other significance which I have missed at the time being.

Howard Roffman