

The consequence of this situation is that all the various 26ers everywhere with just one or two others somewhere form little groups of ~~two or three~~ two or three who swap notes & commiserate with one another. And as everything remains within the small groups, for the most part, this is tantamount to flushing the effort down the nearest what-all. But then that is the state of things...

As I am not requesting a reply of you this time (but please file the letter as some do go astray), let me continue with some examples. Mrs H & I have been corresponding back & forth for several months re the 26. Every time each of us seems to have found some new distraction or clue or something, we wonder if it is indeed "new". Picking back thru a tall stack of recent letters between us, here are a few random samples:

Many questions can be asked about the page numbering of CE 2003. If this is indeed "all pages" of ~~CD~~ CD 81b, then CD 81b is missing the following pages:

70	107	173-176
71	159	255
72	160	378
104		

Judging by Bledsoe, CE 1985, dated 24 Nov, there ought never have been any question about her owing Lee 2 days rent; she didn't. But the charge was made later, presumably toward some end or another.

Hill B seems like it must have been taken with the photographer's flash mounted on the end of a fishing pole. The photo was, after all, supposed to have been taken within the theatre. Or was it taken under the marquee, just as Lee was being brought out? In the latter case, judging by Lee's lack of wanting to go along quietly, it might seem that some of the reported 150-200 spectators might have had a story to tell. Not living in Dallas, I never did hear any such stories.

Sen Ford (or was it Cooper?)(missing note) on April 22nd, during a testimony, was under the impression that Tippit was riding a motorcycle. Can you beat that?

As a 6.5 mm shell is 11 or 12 percent smaller in diameter than either a 7.5 or a .30-06, and inasmuch as the shells were photographed a number of times while lying on the floorboarding... and the flooring is still there, preserved under a new layer of plywood... well? Here is something either a pro-Commission type or anti-Commission type might make use of. So far neither has, as far as I know. But then this would be a useless thing unless it were agreed by all that the various CD photos of the shells on the floor were taken when they were said to have been taken. But the lack of expertise in everything else makes it possible to believe that the printed photos of shells-on-floor could have slipped into print accidentally.

CE 361. Nobody talks about it. Yet Belin (who said nothing else during that testimony except for this:) get out of his chair & made a point of declaring for the record just who provided that one particular exhibit, even giving the names of the persons involved. Nothing like it ever happened before or after. And CE 361 is that very confusing map, the upside down one, the one which must have been a very annoying thing for the draftsman who had to prepare it. He must have had to turn his original map upside down one or more dozen times while preparing this special copy. South up & north down, my neck, to say nothing about east & west.

(2)

Which leads to Worrell, one of those to whom the confusing map was submitted. In spite of the confusion, Worrell apparently did have a sense of direction & was not flabbergasted by the exhibit. What is wrong with Worrell's testimony is that the dotted lines he was dotting out (which were also referred to in the testimony as dotted lines after he had finished dotting on CE 361)... his dots just don't show up in the exhibit. Worrell's man, the one who came flying out of the back door, this man wasn't running north; he was running south. The line to the north parking lot is another thing, whatever it is.

Also, does the man going south coincide with the man seen (from the top of the PC bldg?) going south on Houston, East on Commerce, picking up a car or stn wagon & driving over to Houston, up to Elm & then West? And did it stop where Craig saw a stn wagon stop for a passenger?

Ruby. His note, "Brother Bear - HAI-1026" HAI-1026, my neck. 22/498. The odds against a 4 figure number falling against some other 4 figure number are 8.1 million to one, if I'm figuring it right. And unless I've lost my last marble, no W/C critic anywhere has made a point of mention this one, despite the marvelous coincidence.

And "Brother Bear" leads to another: Herbert/Bear. This thing just wasn't introduced right. Or if it is true that a 9th grade student anywhere filling in a questionnaire will have it remain on permanent file for posterity, maybe that in itself is a pretty interesting revelation. *Perhaps OK. See Crawford testimony.*

The Minox light meter, 22/196a. Minoxes, by Oswald's time, contained their built-in exposure meters. But if a separate light meter popped up somewhere, it did not pop up on any of the various inventories. At least not the ones which have been revealed to us in the 26. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the question was put to Marina as late as 18 Feb. Today we are told (Weisberg, WLCY) that the Minox was Paine property.

Cameras. The only two that were inventoried (to us) were the Minox & the Stereo Realist - both of them being rather unusual & special purpose cameras. What was that reference, somewhere, to a drawer-ful of camera equipment? The Minox & the Realist together you could conceal within a baby's hat.

My copy of 22/820 shows Lee with a mustache & beard, even if light, no matter how I look at the photo.

The "Z" on Worrell's CE 361 can't be Worrell's "Z". It is 200 ft north of where Worrell would have wanted his Z, according to his words in the testimony. Also Worrell's man ran "along the side" of the TRED. The Z should be where Worrell first saw the man - coming out the back door. The back door does not lie a half block to the north, on top of a railroad track.

Oswald's ring, or rings, and Sims, and the dresser, etc. It it all confusing. (3)
But anyway, in CE 749 Lee is wearing a ring on his third finger, right hand. In
Destiny in Dallas, p11, a ring is on 3rd finger left hand. They do not appear to
be the same ring, unless one ring is turned around backwards. The ring on the
dresser is interesting no matter how you read it, or whether you believe it.

The citizen "breaking in" on the dispatcher from 78's radio. Unless DPD chan
1 was specifically arranged to accommodate such an advantage, it could not have
happened. And this advantage, had it been a special design advantage of the DPD
radio, could not have been employed except at the expense of better advantages.
99.99% of two-way radiotelephone systems would not, by design, allow for the ability
of the citizen having "cut in". But then the radio logs in the 26 are a bunch of
nalarly anyway, I think.

Lee marks down "C" for race on his 17/199 driver's license application - & also
on his application for employment at TMD. Now he didn't really mean C for Caucasian,
did he? Mrs H attributed it to possibly a very certain kind of smug, wry, personal
"humor" - if I'm not misreading her. As of now I'm thoroughly agreeing with this.
It's easier to believe that Lee was something more than an extraordinary dumbell or
something.

Lee's vaccination certificate. The rubber stamping of his name on it.
And the rubber stamped high date. Gray. And did anybody ever notice that when
you read the Authentication Seal backwards it reads BUSH IN CAN?

Certain CE photo exhibits might have built within themselves what it would take
to thwart amateur experts with dividers. In fact why surely do have, whether by
accident or design, the thwarting coming out the same in any case. A favorite seems
to be in the simple stretching of a print in one direction or another, leaving the
right-angle plane unstretched. It allows you to arrive at less, because W/C protect-
ors can always at least call attention to one stretch & then say, quite correctly,
that the same question then has to be introduced into all claims.

Photos. See CE 733, right. This picture, showing the back border outline of
the mask within the camera, this picture could not have been produced except by a
two-step process. You can't dodge any one negative under an 8x enlarger & have it
come out this way. If you can, tell me how. Wasn't the point of it all to preserve
& exhibit the sharp border? Even if this photo were provided for the sake of con-
vincing the reader of some true & actually honest, real-to-gosh fact - I would still
insist on having the evidence presented to me in straight fashion. Truth is one
thing that can always be presented straight, without having to employ devices of one
sort or another.

Photos. Another? CE 751,2. The blackened portion of the negative is perfect-
ly square. You'd think it was a 2 1/4 X 2 1/4, pure & simple. But it came out of
the camera which measures to be & authenticated to be a non-square format camera.
But of course we are faced with this stretching bit & therefore can't put up very much
of an argument.

In the same vein of complaint, ~~Shaneyfelt~~ Shaneyfelt 23 would be another example. If it were the same rifle & scope as represented then the rifle wouldn't be 4.8 times the scope length. Here is one photo where nobody can give you an argument about photographic perspective. No splitting of hairs is necessary. Maybe the fact of it not being the same rifle is not important to the case. But I do nevertheless damn well resent any such attitude as "Well, they won't know the difference anyway, so what the hell...". This is an attitude which seems to have prevailed in the assembling of the 26. Has success in deception become so commonplace that the forthcoming success is taken for granted, there being really no need to try very hard to pull it off?

"Hey, George, Hello? Say, make up & send down some photos for us to prove this & such, willya? No, don't strain over it. But send down a selection so we'll have something to pick from. What? The rifle? Well, I dunno, but it was a yard or two long & had some kinda telescope on top of it. Don't you know? Etc..."

In Sawyer B (represented as Sawyer A), p 394,5, after the Citizen calls in the dispatcher calls Tippit three times. In the second (CE 705) version he calls him one time. And in the third (CE 1974 rendition) he calls him two times.

There appear to have been not fewer than 41 police & sheriff cars, including motorcycles, in the Greater Oak Cliff area at the time of Leek arrest, manned by not less than 57 police type people of all various sorts. Of the vehicles, not fewer than 26 of them were present at the theatre (or as close as they could get to it, considering their number) by 8 1:52 pm, bringing with them not fewer than 40 men. These are "preliminary" figures for the vehicles, which surely must have numbered more. In these figures, 28 vehicles were presumed to have contained only the driver, nothing to the contrary having been found.

C F Bentley, Jr, 24/233. Only reference to him anywhere is by DPD detective Paul Bentley, the polygraph operator who bumped into him in the theatre balcony that day. Unfortunate that so few depositions were taken from those present in the theatre, C F Bentley, Jr, et al. And not only don't we have any information from 80% of the civilian audience in the theatre at the time, but it seems that the list of names & addresses of these people got misfiled someplace, or something, after the pains that were taken to gather up the witnesses inside the doors. Too bad, ain't it? Fritz must have railed over in bed worrying about the missing list of witnesses.

Depositions from newsmen who were carried out to Oak Cliff by police & sheriff cars (four that I've counted) aren't in the 26 - I don't think.

Why did reporter Schalkef get out of the squad car at Zang & Jefferson when the car was enroute to the theatre? Maybe it was only a traffic problem, & he just got out & walked toward the theatre. But is that where he went? I dunno.

The Commission, or some of the ~~staff~~ staff, were obviously in knowledge of the Scrambled Sawyers. Vol 6 is full of hintful evidence that they were, based on question which would have been utterly stupid except in the context of wanting to establish for the record that the Sawyer exhibits existed, then, in some certain intersprinkled page sequence. This is an interesting example, typical of how so

much of the Testimony can be lost if the Questions, too, aren't considered.

Brewer, Postal, the Texas Theatre, not a bit of makes sense or adds up. It is just too much, and it is already pretty well, very well concentrated into vol
7 XE. Brewer's police car, the one Lee was seemingly trying to escape, could not possibly have been in view of Brewer. Belin, without revealing, as usual, the intent of his questions - Belin established quite well that Brewer could not logically have described the maneuvers of a police car which made a U-turn a couple of blocks down the # street, not ever having come within his view at any time. And then Postal describes Lee as whissing around the corner so fast that (by her own testimony) his shirt tail was flapping in his own breeze - while at the same time Brewer, hard on Lee's heels from the shoe store which was only 60 feet away, Brewer asks Postal if she had sold the man a ticket! And if it is ~~not~~ not confusing enough already then it gets even better when you remember that Postal, who has just seen a man with flying shirt tails duck past her, is moments later asked by Brewer if she happened to have sold a ticket to a man just now. So how does ~~she~~ she respond? She has been listening to her transistor radio, about the assassination, but does not believe she did. And Brewer, following Lee 60 feet up the street and watching him - and with the theatre box office front being in line with the other storefronts - can we believe that this man (the one in hot pursuit of a man & never beyond a 60-ft straight line unobstructed ~~his~~ view of him), can we believe that he stopped at the box office to inquire whether or not the man had paused to buy a ticket? Etc? Etc? Etc?

Why can't the expert W/C critics make even a better case for themselves than they do? Each one of the small handful seem individually adept in illuminating some aspect of one thing or another now & then, but I have the feeling that no one critic anywhere does anything like a total job in any one area. Whether by coincidence or design or whatever, it does seem that this is so. If any part of anything requires destruction, then it ought seem that the one bent on the destruction of it would provide a total destruction of it rather than some half part destruction. The Brewer-Postal comedy, for instance. All aspects of it down to Belin having chit-chatted on the record with Brewer, how nice it was that Brewer had only the day before been promoted into managership of the Big, Main, Downtown Store. What a nice chit-chat. Reminds me of Belin's chit-chat, on the record, about how CE 361 came into being, & by whom.

What were all these code 3 police cars doing flashing up & down W # Jefferson, by the way? Postal was describing them. And Brewer, too, the one he heard but could not see. We must assume that Brewer, 25 feet (15 plus ten) back inside a store with a 20 foot wide front, must have been able to tell from the sound of the sirens that his police car, ~~the~~ the one he mentioned, came down a certain street, made a U-turn at a certain intersection & then proceeded ~~up~~ back up that certain street - knowing this all from the siren he was listening to while Lee was standing outside his door. If Lee ever stood there in the first place, that is, which I gather from the W/C he must have done. And if Brewer is endowed with radar ears & has a PPI plotting scope in his head, maybe we should know it. Anyway - just what were all these police cars doing under full siren at a time when it had not been announced that any suspect anywhere was hiding in the area? And without such knowledge as that, is it conceivable that police cars searching the area for possible

suspicious pedestrians would be doing so under siren & flashing red light (and, therefore, reasonably expected to be travelling at high speed)? Is that the way police cars conduct themselves while searching out a wanted man? Do hunters make noise in the woods? And all this took place before it was ever announced that there was "a suspect in the balcony". Ugh...

What brought FBI Agent Barrett & jr DA Bill Alexander & others to the Oak Cliff area, away from the primary interest at the moment - the assassination of the President? It also seems to be a problem to discover how various people got out to Oak Cliff in the first place. For three conflicting carloads:

Car A	Car B	Car C
7/47	7/79	7/111
Gerald Hill	Calvin Owens	Capt Westbrock
Calvin Owens	Capt Westbrock	Sgt Stringer
Bill Alexander	Bill Alexander	A patrolman
Reporter Jim Howell		

The above carloads represent the first leg of the journey, not to be confused with the various switching from car to car which took place after arrival there, prior to proceeding to the theatre.

Penn Jones & the Midlothian article re Craig's 14 misquotes in the Testimony. We learn of four of them. Great that we should have Craig standing up on his hind feet & calling attention to falsified (in the printing) testimony, & ~~WISH~~ wish we could have more of it now that I can no longer trust any inch of any line of any page of the Testimonies anyway. But what of what Craig is now saying? A blue shirt? and an out of state license plate on that station wagon? If all this doesn't make me go off at a right-angle or something, I don't know what would. It is something like breaking a case & coming out with worms as a reward.

Ms. Julia Postal again. In addition to seeing Lee flit by with flying shirt tails, moments before Furrow Brewer came up behind him asking if he might have bought a ticket - Postal also testifies that Lee did his frantic spin around her corner "with a panicked look on his face", 7/10. And if I remember it right, from the same testimony, his hair was messed up too (but you couldn't tell it by looking at the Hill Exhibit photos, taken ten or fewer minutes later after a brutal shuffle). And here Brewer, the man upon whom the Commission depends for having provided the first clue to the whereabouts of the man who was caught, Brewer came up to Postal seconds later - whence the idiotic dialogue between them begins. And if not on the basis of actions by these two people, with which the Commission apparently could not quarrel, then by what other means could the DPD or the sheriff's office or anybody at all have known that there was a very much ~~s~~ wanted man hiding in the balcony of this theatre? (Not considering the fact that he wasn't in the balcony in the first place, unless he actually was except for the way it appears in the 26, I don't know). While the DPD might have costly apparatus for such things as automated alphabetizing machines for their routine record keeping (study Case 5135, interesting), I'm not convinced that telepathy plays any part of the Oswald capture. Bluntly, if it wasn't Brewer, then just who was it?

And if it isn't already crazy enough, the nearly one mile separation from

(...Cancel that one.)

1 Incomplete note, needs checking (as maybe they all do):

Mc Donald, Joyce Lee, 1/4/36, 9. Marina asked if any knowledge of her.
MacDonald, Betty Monney (hung in jail) - Marina not asked.

BUT, did Jones not say somewhere that Betty Maced attended a party at which the Oswalds & members of the Dallas Russ community were present? Where he said it, if he said it, I don't remember. Reminiscent of the Case of the Wrong Walker (ACCESSORIES, p271). This seems to be a case of the wrong Mc-MacDonald, in the same style.

2 CE 1974 (867): Library is identified as 500 block, Marcellis & Jeff. Not 800 E Jeff after all? In that case we can ask again, what is 800 E Jeff?

3 Scroggins, the Oak Cliff cabbie: Had just delivered passenger from Love Field to 321 N Ewing. 321 is some few steps, apparently, from 325 - the door of Ruby's Kathy Kay Coleman, lady friend (now wife) of the mysterious DPD Harry Olsen.

4 Ferris, 24/4/54: From the description, it must be the same Perry. But then it would seem that he was out on bail from Dallas some time during, before or after the assn.

5 HAL-1026 turns out to phone number of a Ruby musician, according to the Crawford testimony. And maybe it was.

6 A few months ago an anti-critic (Roberts or Lewis, I think) called attention to the fact that the three ladies in the Dal-Tax window were looking straight ahead at the motorcade in the Altgens photo. The best printed Altgens I have shows, it seems to me, one of the ladies looking sharply to her right. A now-forgotten thing seems to be that of Altgens having taken 3 photos, not just one. I'd presume the others have now evaporated in the usual fashion.

7 Tax returns. Among those of Ruby & Oswald, some remain classified in the archives.

8 Phone calls, records. Nothing in the 26 re 1026 N Beckley. (Crazy, aint it). At least one phone co record for Ruby (23rd & 24th) secret.

9 On the List of Basic Source materials - add that the results of an investigation concerning the possibility of Oswald having safety deposit boxes should be classified.

10. The negative, CE 752 ought not to have been square if it came out of the camera in CE 751.

11 Freudian slip? I have a street map in which Dealey Plaza is spelled Dedley Plaza.

12 7/214 is an interesting page, useful for demonstrating that the entire Commission staff were not uniformly bent on doing the same thing. Belin puts to DPD Moore a half dozen very pointed questions - the nature of the questions being the revealing thing. Hardly likely that Liebelor or Ball, say, would have asked such questions.

13 For just one clue out of many that the Commission, or some part thereof, were aware of the Scrambled Smoyers, see 6/326. Balin asks Henslee, on showing him a Smoyer log: What channel is this? Henslee looks at it and tells Balin that the words on the log say chan 1. So Balin asks what period of time that log covers. Henslee looks again and says it covers the period from 10:25 am until 1:53 pm...

So OK, now just what kind of dialog is this? I mean, is it pure nonsense, a passing of the time of day, or were the questions directed toward fulfilling some purpose? The Henslee testimony was a very short one. In fact it was very, very short considering what he might have had to say - considering that he was supervising the DPD radio office at the time of the assn. If only a small part of it appears in print, or whether Balin was restricted in just what areas he could cover, I don't know. But read these 3 short pages & see for yourself what sense you can make out of them except for establishing some certain thing about the Smoyer logs. Numerous other examples can be found in, I think, the same vol.

14 Jones says in a recent editorial that McDonald (M N) was out cold in the aisle when Lee was being herded out of the theatre. No details, unfortunately. But in view of the already impossible theatre episode it seems completely believable, whether true or not.

15 Givens, 24/210 affidavit. This is the affidavit taken after the police alarm had been given on him, & he was dragged in. In view of the reason given that he was wanted because he was believed to have info re Oswald's movements in the TSB before the shooting, the affidavit makes no sense whatever.

16 Brewer testimony, vol 7. Balin opens with a polite chit-chat (on the record) about Brewer's enviable promotion the day before. Good reading.

17 Brewer seemed anxious to declare that after McDonald was knocked down: "...and then real quick he was back up." A suspicious head might go back to the Jones editorial & figure that maybe McDonald really was knocked cold after all. Mysterious...

18 74/113. Ball asks Capt Westbrock about the list of people present in the theatre. Ball says "We have asked for names of people in the theatre and we have only come up with the name of George Applin. Do you know of any others?" (No.) And this, mind you, was April 6th! Crazy, crazy, crazy.

19. There might be a great number of examples of possible editing of the testimony. A starter for anyone interested might be in 7/12. Draw an arrow between the line "Ball: It was after?" & the following line. Carelessness becomes understandable when there is much much work to be done.

20. A neat example of FBI subterfuge?: 26/307,8. On 13 June the FBI was reporting how Earlene Roberts couldn't have been in San Antonio on 21 Nov. In fact, I doubt if anybody ever claimed she might have been. Flip the page to a 3 Dec FBI report (a juxtapositioning certainly not arranged by the FBI) and see that the charge is related to Eva Grant, not Earlene. Suggests the same sort of game as the Dual Walkers & the Dual Mac-McDonalds.

21 Ruby's diet pills. Possibly helpful in understanding his "vigor" (Vim, Vigor, Vitality?). He seemed to vibrate while standing still. See 26/329r. An understanding of this might help fill in some of the missing corners of Ruby's personality, or personalities.

22 Ruby phone calls, more: 25/241 starts looking at Ruby's RI7-2362, Carousel. It continues up until 1:51 pm 22 Nov & then abruptly ends. It seems to end just about where it might more logically start. Then, five weeks later (25/251) another FBI report (or rendition) continues beginning with the 23rd. For name collectors, 25/251 was apparently provided by C Ray Hall. Possibly useful to note also the gap of 34 hours 24 mins between these two reports. My list of Basic Source Materials is out on loan now, so can't check it, but would be interesting if the secret phone listing for Ruby concerned the same phone (RI7-2362). But it's interesting enough anyway.

23 Another interesting thing about the two Ruby phone lists (item 22, above) is the identical format of the report. You'd almost swear they were copied from the same list.

24 Possibly all kinds of things can be found "wrong" with all the various phone records by anybody who puts the time into it. (No doubt a very careful study has been made, and probably several independent ones at that, within government. But that ain't progress.) For an example of discrepancies that might be found: In a ten minute effort, a random one made for the sake of just picking out one wrong thing & then making a note of it: 25/238, an entry for one Mike Raiff, 10-19-63. In 25/259, Raiff has evaporated. Or, rather, he has popped up later. (A nasty thought: maybe by then he had been judged harmless to the case & could therefore be honestly mentioned.)

25 The Welch Candy call. It came from the IRS, this info did. It appears (from the 26) that no other govt office anywhere had any knowledge or interest in this. It is, perhaps, an example of how a thing might become conspicuous thru its being conspicuously avoided. Earl Ruby's testimony, whether honest or not, should really not have been considered the "answer" to it - which it appears to have been in view of the whole question having been apparently dropped. What prevents us from looking in all directions in this thing? It is not necessary to believe that the assn was the work of some one, single, solitary group. The evidence seems to suggest, rather, that divergent groups or individuals participated.

26 Telephones. 24 Oct, 10:27 am. Little Lynn's hubby made an apparently untraceable ~~call~~ call from Arlington Tex, charging it to a new phone number he had acquired the day before, speaking to a "Jerry Bunker" thru a Garland Tax number which the phone co, via FBI, does not believe has ever been assigned to anyone. References to the phone numbers are on p269. (This refers to 25/265, last entry on page.) End.

27 Telephones; more. But don't get bored. Little Lynn (Ruby's Little Lynn, the \$25 WU money order, etc) has her phone records exquisitely reproduced, courtesy of the # Feebees, for a generous three month period beginning at 25/264. The only thing wrong with the list (at first glance) is that it cuts off sharply (after three months) at 1:34 am 21 Nov - just about when you'd expect the record to start getting more interesting. How familiar this is becoming! (God Bless our various WR critics, for the most part, but where in hell are they sometimes?)

28 Interesting to note that the various things which are cut off short, & always in the "wrong" place, these CE's are often clipped short the the # Feebees themselves. But, of course, not that the Commission staff did not cooperate - as per innumerable examples. One tiny example might be CD 86, p278 - which is missing from the Abadie report in CE 1750. Perhaps this might be a poor example - depending on whether or not the Archivist can provide it by mail for a casually inquiring citizen, or whether it contains anything of useful interest in the first place. If it ever arrives,

I would then know.

29 Short lists; more of same. Ruby's movement's, a generous three month long chronology of the movements, day to day, of the assassinator of the "assassinator". This one stops inside the Carousel on the evening of ~~the~~ 21 Nov. What a place to stop, my aching back... Hard to tell who did the clipping on this one. You can't even tell who wrote it. After a while a guy gets to thinking that our Maximum Leaders, whoever they ~~are~~ are, aren't Leading us Maximally, or Convincingly enough. Hard for a man to remain in awe of another when he sees that they can't support themselves convincingly. This item refers to CE 2344, movements of Ruby.

30 CE 2344 (re item 29, above): more. This CE, 2344, contains within itself references to CEs following its own CE (2344) number. Possibly useful to somebody who specializes in worrying about such things.

31 25/366. The FBI has Duff (Gen Walker's Duff) saying that Ruby was a 125 lb weakling, & "very thin". One significant part of this is that the report was made several months following the assn. I'd assume Duff would have been sharp enough to tie his own shoe laces & to sign his name & read the print in newspapers, etc, or else Gen Walker would certainly not have wanted ~~of~~ him - not even for free, as seems to have been the case. Can we believe that Duff (or anybody, especially several months after the assn) really stated a belief that Ruby was any kind of thin, underweight weakling? It doesn't add up. Par.

32 Unlocatable notes on this one, plus not being able to uncover Lewis's paper-back, "All About the Various Ugly SCAVENGERS" or whatever it was. But: Lewis's case re Weisberg having put the wrong camera into the hands of the agent who was doing the re-enacting photography does not alter the basic charge (of Weisberg's) that Zapruder's film may have been operating at 24 frames/sec. Weisberg's error, in fact, actually strengthens his own case. The camera (not Zapruder's) which was used was a costly Arreflex, a camera which for the time being I'll judge to have had the feature of fairly accurate frames-per-second calibration, this is the camera which was used. Logically, the camera, this re-enactment camera, would have been set for the same frames-per-second speed as Zapruder's camera. To support this logic, refer to Shaneyfelt's numbering of the individual frames of this re-enactment film - thereby revealing the discrepancy referred to. Did it come as a surprise? Who knows...

33 Unless my figuring is wrong, Weisberg's 24 frames/sec would have reduced the time interval between the 3 alleged shots, the 1st & 3rd, to something like 3.3 to 4.0 seconds. This, of course, would have been intolerable to the WR. 6.0 seconds seemed to have been plenty bad enough as it was.

34 Radio log CE 705, p418. "Running North on Patton". More confusion. Like the "North Jefferson" thing - in the same log, I think. Hard sometimes to separate the accidental or simple mistakes from the plotted ones.

35 25/851: FBI: "Captain J W Frits, Dallas Police Department, has advised that he did not have a description of Oswald broadcast for fear that Oswald might learn he was wanted". How's that again? This is a note you can keep coming back to now & then, & from a new angle each time.

36 In 25/860, the Feebees report that Lee was reported by a squad car #, at

1:45 pm, to have been in the Texas Theatre. This seems quite late in view of Julia Postal already having telephoned in this urgent information, but it does appear in Sawyer B (the Real "B", chan 1, p397~~0~~). But then in the next rediction of the chan 1 log, as viewed from GE 705 p418, we see that one "79" calls in to the dispatcher. The dispatcher answers him, but then does not seem to want to wait for his reply. Instead, the dispatcher makes his transmission (apparently a general call, not specifically addressed) about the Thug in the Theatre. 1:45 pm, same transmission. But next, in what seems to be the third & final display of the chan 1 log, there appears the 1974 Exhibit, the second & final one routed or handled or transcribed or in one manner or another passing thru the fingers of our Feebees... there appears this: Just before the dispatcher's announcement about the Theatre Thug, 79 calls in to the announcer about something. Unfortunately, 79 is garbled so we don't know what it was he wanted to say, whether he was either heard or not heard by the dispatcher. Possibly he just wanted to chit-chat with the dispatcher, nothing important, etc. But ~~now~~ we learn (GE 1974) that immediately following the dispatcher's announcement about the Theatre Thug, immediately following this we hear 79 responding with a 10-4. In view of simply anything, what was 79 10-4ing about? Let us help our Feebees with their own case, supporting their claim about a radio car having reported Oswald in the theater (25/860r). Fine. It all helps everything fall apart at the hinges. It alerts people to looking at their hinges now & then.

37 Everything seems to lead on to something else. Re item 37, above: Sawyer # A (which is really B), 21/397, has the dispatcher saying loud & clear that the man is "...supposed to be hiding in the balcony". These words are just plain completely omitted from the later, improved transcriptions (17/418 & 23/873).

38 In the radio logs, all editions, the "time check" recordings are enough of a mystery by themselves - whether by their absence ~~or~~ or by their appearance. The unfortunate (or "unfortunate") typographical ("typographical") errors ~~seem~~ seem to assist the confusion. Examples: Decker's log, 17/375. The 1:45 entry is obviously spooky. Better it should have been 1:25. (But who can mistake a 2 for a 4, whether it is written or spoken or typed or mistyped?). And 17/408, DPD chan 1. Two time checks on this page seem to have been overheard by the person or persons doing the transcribing, and each of them adds up to less than zero. No, I haven't figured any specific significance of these specific ~~or~~ mistakes, and maybe there is nothing significant at all. If somebody else can, great!

39 The radio logs. Chapter 2. This is spooky too. After over four years of it all now, since the appearance of the 26, where is that little old retired lady with the longcarriagtypewriter, the really indignant one who could really do a job on the radio logs because she has nothing else to do, is indignant about WR things & owns a longcarriagtypewriter. What the hell, I mean. In a ~~wealthy~~ wealthy country of some 200,000,000 do not net some of them own such machines? Maybe some day one of them will ~~copy~~ copy off onto a long ~~wide~~ wide roll of wrapping paper the various versions of all the logs, both channels, all three versions, together with the Sheriff's log, placing each entry side by side with all corresponding ones. No doubt, I think, that this has not already been done time & again within our government. Or, maybe, by persons employed within our government. There ~~does~~ seem to be a difference. But whatever the case, what can the man on the street do if he wants such a thing for himself? Yes, I know. He is always free to dash out & buy himself a 36" typewriter. Ironies bug me.

40 McDonald again, the DPD McDonald, M N. In his testimony, unless I'm crazy, he was saying that he ran off toward Oak Cliff ~~after~~ after hearing word via police radio that JFK had died at Parkland. Yes - it's in 3/297. At the moment, am too blurry-eyed to locate this DPD announcement in the DPD radio logs, if it appears at all. But there is such an announcement in the sheriff's log, 17/379, at 1:40 pm or later.

The time of this announcement seems all out of accord with everything else I seem to think I thought I remembered having read, if you follow me.

41 Oswald's description during the long & exhausting chase. Oh, to hell with that...

42 Does not anyone share in the opinion that Shaneyfelt 23 provides a mystery? The technical faults ought seem too ~~obvious~~ obvious to require comment.

43 If I remember it right, the Commission for some unfathomable reason wanted to believe that no motorcycle ever tried to run up the grassy knoll following the shots. For four witnesses who thought they did see a motorcycle doing this, see 22/833,4. Why should this simple event be denied, if it was? Is there some concealment here?

44 22/485. Ochus Campbell had never seen Oswald, yet identified his photo. The two Feebees who performed this fast-finding mission were apparently not impressed with, or cognizant of, the error. They did, after all, write their own report - didn't they? Or didn't they? Either possibility is equally interesting, very equally so.

45 22/276. Hemlick, Ralph Paul's waitress who overheard the "What, a gun? Are you crazy?" words. The Feebee report includes the interesting words: "Mrs Hemlick stated that since November 24, 1963, she has probably told every9ne she knows about this conversation of PAUL's that she overheard." Just a thing to mull over...

46 If Weatherford was on top of the bldg when his affidavit (19/502) shows him to have been down on the sidewalk, then what is this thing that prevents any Dallas citizen, anybody, from lodging some kind of minor legal complaint in the matter?

47 19/518-20, Buddy Walthers. Seems that Buddy must have been a composite of a giraffe & a gazelle in order to peek down onto the floor beneath the balcony & then sprint down to the main floor faster than sound, ready for an event which wasn't supposed to have happened yet. How's that again?

48 It's always hard knowing when to reject "coincidences" as being simply coincidences. A true & harmless coincidence might be in finding that one Patricia Taylor (CE 1452) knew Ruby for 1 1/2 yrs but did not know until after the assn that she was living in the same tiny motel-like building with him.

49 Gangle Exhibit 1 vs affidavit in 11/478, para 4. The word "Over" is translated into "See Back" in referring to an application blank of Oswald's. Unimportant maybe unless you are looking for every little clue in "re-arranged" documents. When you are reading & quoting something, how do you read "See Back" as "Over"?

50 22/741, a Feebee report listing 47 photos shown to Marina on or prior to 6 Dec. "Oswald with rifle" shows up as the last item on the list, the 47th. It appears to have been added later, inasmuch as it is shifted about a quarter space to the left. Also, the words appear to have been added with a more heavily inked ribbon than the previous 46 items. Moreover, "Oswald" appears throughout the report with the W and the A very close together. In the 47th item these letters are, instead, rather too far apart. The number "47" appears to have been typed in earlier, at the time of the other items.

51 Lee, who seems to have spent half his waking hours filling in application blanks, leaves a trail of errors or lies everywhere. In Hoffman 1, he lives at

3610 N Beckley. In Holmes 3-A Marina is living at 3519 Fairmore. In Helen 8 he checks into the Y on 3 Oct, having just arrived from Toro, Calif. Etc...

52 Earlene Roberts, CE 1125, a handwritten note. Seems to show that Lee was already outside & waiting at the bus stop when the mysterious police car came up & beeped.

53 Oswald oscillates vertically throughout the 26 volumes, especially in the Exhibits. One day he is 71" tall & the next he is 69", back & forth one or two dozen times. Example: In 33/736 he was 69", 9 May. On 25 June he was back to 71".

54 21/436, Senator, last sentence: "Senator stated that it was ridiculous to think that Ruby had any connection with subversive organizations or with Oswald." But then read the scribbled note just beneath that, seemingly in Burt Griffin's hand: "They were on Ruby's person. See 639 this series." (Maybe this is what the man meant, generally, when he said "If we made a mistake, perhaps it was in rushing to print too fast.")

55 No speculation has been written concerning non-conventional bullets, with the exception of Garrison's case for frangible bullets. The gunsmoke smell with permeated parts of Dealey Plaza, which lingered while enroute to Parkland, and which even on arrival at Parkland was still so strong that it was immediately noticed when the parade entered the hallway... this ought to perhaps be given some attention. Bits of lead & copper don't give off a gunpowder smell when they hit something. But lead packed with an explosive, or bits of lead encased within an explosive, such a thing would not seem too much like science fiction. After all, the JFK assassination was a rather important event. Even the use of "ordinary" rifles is hard enough to buy.

56 In this same connection, didn't at least one Dealey Plaza witness (Worrell?) testify concerning a flash of fire coming out of the barrel? Might seem that in propelling a missile containing its own built-in explosive it would be prudent to consider the use of a propelling explosive with carefully chosen burning characteristics - in order to prevent the missile from exploding while still in the barrel, due to too rapid an acceleration.

57 The best support for items 55 & 56 is that the other possibilities seem even more implausible.

58 CE 1950. It appears that Oswald himself, 6 weeks before the 22 Nov event, declared on his TSB job application that DeM was his "closest friend".

59 Clues to fraud, anyone? 24/247, right side. The "11-24-63", handwritten, had first been "11-24-~~63~~-62". Now it is perfectly human for one to continue writing the wrong year down for the first few days following any New Year's Day. Some people even do it for weeks, as I do. But is there someone ~~on~~ on the DPD staff who still does this come late November? It can't happen. Or, rather, it could happen only if, shortly after the turn of the year, a man was falsifying a document retroactive to the previous year. Think about it.

60 Another one in the same category: See the inside cover of Ruth Paine's address book, in which "RSS" (Stovall?) has written "11-22-63", corrected from "11-22-62". This is in 17/63.

61 24/247 again (item 59). Look on the other side of the page, Lee's arrest

report ... (Sorry, my error. Skip this one.) (But if you are there already, note the prematureness of the words.)

62 24/249-53 refers to 57 affidavits. Actually, there are about 64 at first count. See also page 1 para 3 of this list.

63 24/277. DPD microfilming. The list is obviously very incomplete, in the standard fashion.

64 CE 798, a side lighted photo of the A J Hidell draft card. Giving attention to the name "James" it is apparent that the name had been typed in five times. This makes the Secret Service expert in 4/383 sound pretty ridiculous. Or fraudulent.

65 CE 630, top. Apparently Lee was fingerprinted on the day of his funeral, Monday, on which day he understandably might have "refused to sign." Well, that's how the document reads.

66 CE 3097, an FBI report which describes the vaccination certificate in CE 813. No hint that everything doesn't seem perfectly OK. Presumably this particular Feebee could have applied for his own vac cert & not have been fazed one iota if he got it back with his own name & date of birth etc rubber stamped upon it. (See page 3 para 4 this letter).

67 And the BRUSH IN CAN authentication seal seemed not to shake him up either.

68 Zapruder frames 283 & 284 are the same frame.