

June 8, 1971

Mr. L. G. Kersta
Voiceprint Laboratories
P.O. Box 835
Somerville, New Jersey 08876

Dear Mr. Kersta:

Please allow me to thank you for your detailed letter of May 6 concerning your analysis of a tape recording relating to the assassination of President Kennedy. There are certain pieces of information contained in your letter which I cannot relate to your original letter to the Warren Commission, dated July 17, 1964. In case you do not have a carbon of that letter, I have enclosed a copy for your reference.

In your letter to me of May 6, you reported that "there were three distinct, sharp, rifle shot-type noises evident on quantized spectrograms" of the tape in question. "There were also three other short duration shot-type sounds whose spectral density contents were radically different from the primary sounds, were of lower intensity and followed in exact time sequence the primary...shots." It was apparently your opinion that the latter noises were in fact echoes of the primary noises because of the "exact time lapse sections."

As you can see in your July 17, 1964 letter to Mr. Rankin, you reported that you found six non-voiced "events", the first of which was a "short duration spike" followed by three other noises of "different acoustic characteristics"-at .86, 1.035 and 1.385 seconds respectively after event #1. You seemed to feel that the only explanation for the events 2, 3 and 4 were "reverberation noises generated by event #1." You mentioned events 5 and 6 but did not explain them or their spectral characteristics, although I get the impression from that letter that 5 and 6 were not followed by the three non-voiced noises that #1 was.

Now, it seems to me that there is some disparity between these two accounts. Perhaps as an expert you could help me reconcile what I perceive (being a non-expert) as disparity.

When, in your May 6 letter to me, you say that three lower intensity noises followed the primary ones, do you mean that three such noises followed each primary noises, or was there a one-to-one correspondence? If the former is the case, as your letter to Mr. Rankin leads me to believe, were events 5 and 6 also followed by noises similar to events 2, 3 and 4? Also, if this is the case, may I ask why these events were not numbered or mentioned in your letter to Mr. Rankin?

While you describe event #1 as "a short duration spike" originally, you indicate to me that the primary noises were "distinct, sharp...noises evident on quantized spectrograms." Are the two consistent? Also, did events 5 and six as mentioned in your first letter have the same characteristics on the spectrogram as event #1? In this connection, if they were of similar characteristics, could you tell me why you seemed

not to be able to relate them to event #1 in your letter to Mr. Rankin?

Not having the original diagrams or illustrations, my analysis is somewhat inhibited. However, in reading your letter to Mr. Rankin, it is not at all obvious or apparent that three distinct shot-type noises with patterned echoes were present on the tape. This is very clearly stated in your letter to me. Since it would seem to me that such information would have been of interest to the Commission, I would be interested in knowing why your letter of July 17, 1964 did not unambiguously make this known.

Also, you seem very reluctant in your letter to Mr. Rankin to identify the noises as gunshots or even make the implication, especially since you do not state what you have told me, that your opinion was that these noises were, in fact, those of gunshots (rifle) and their echoes. Was there anything which inhibited you from expressing this opinion to the Commission or, perhaps, was there something since then which has caused you to change your opinion?

Please understand that I am aware of the fact that what you told me in your letter of May 6 was recollected from memory. I am sympathetic to the fact that you thus cannot vouch for the absolute precision of what you can report. However, please understand my position as well, namely that I cannot find the diagrams or illustrations anywhere and am forced to reconstruct the record from whatever sources of information are available. I would like to make as complete a record as I can concerning this tape, just as a matter of interest to myself and my research. I greatly appreciate your help thus far.

If you could help me resolve these inconsistencies I would be most grateful.

Sincerely,

Howard Roffman
8829 Blue Grass Rd.
Phila., Pa. 19152

enclosure