

Dear Hal,

4/10/96

Thanks for your 4/6 w. enclosures, of which I've read the Stewart article and the Garrison story. I'll read the rest when I rest.

I've almost caught up on two weeks of mail and orders. The mail filled a box that had held 100 file folders. We had to drive the orders to the post office this morning, those I'd packaged, and I hope to complete ten tomorrow.

And thanks to that remarkably generous and helpful man Bill Mills, I can. He had a friend reprint copies of "hitewash" for me and they will make me some 0 in NOs. Of which I'm about sold out. He kept me from running out of the WW Is.A. I hope he soon will with the 0 in NOs. I've one or two only left.

I do not know what pictures you can use but he had a fine collection of stills, too. The set he gave me I gave to Hood so the students can use them now. I'm sure he'll let you use any you can and can possibly lend you a set so you can see.

I do not recall what I wrote about the shots but am inclined to believe that there was one as I suggested in WW at about Z189. I have no doubt that silencers were used but my knowledge of them is slight only. I think it is possible that the first was with a silencer. We have no way of knowing.

I do not know how it happened but the printout of the ms. of Case Open of which he sent you a copy is not complete. Two of Dave Wrone's former students, both now professors of sociology have the full printout. Which is less than I wrote. I have a xerox I'm not up to copying now. It is almost 800 pages.

I've almost finished the stinking book by the subject-matter ignoramus the La Fontaines. They refer to their guru named as I recall Bill Adams. What kind of nut is he if you know?

I do not recall that either of the Willis daughters referred to a silencer being used. One was only 10. But I'm inclined to believe that the serious shooting, not what was intended to point to LHO, was with silencers so the source(s) could not be pinpointed.

When you get what Bill O'Neil told you on paper I'll be interested in that. I do not believe Oswald had any real right-wing contacts in NO or elsewhere. His beliefs were more Trotskyite than liberal. That stuff from Beinister's mistress was what she made up in her fight with his family over his records from what Garrison told me. She would not talk to him.

Newman's is not a good book and it does not connect Oswald with the CIA.

Please excuse the rush. Thanks and best,

R/A

-f-

HAL UERB
P.O. Box 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

APRIL 6, 1996

HAROLD WELSBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal =

Because it getting closer and closer to income tax time (April 15th), I've been working on that and getting all my records together. I had attempted to do this last month but one thing or another just got in the way. In any event this week I'm definitely going to my accountant and get the necessary papers pulled out.

Bill Mills sent me a video of the visit he made to Dealey Plaza in 1995 and I looked it over at a friend's house, since I don't have the necessary equipment to show it at my apartment. I'm not certain yet if there are scenes I can use for my book but Bill has given me permission to use anything he sends me. He seems like a real dedicated person and our conversations on the phone indicate this. I know he thinks very highly of your work.

I've told him, of course, about the specific area of the assassination I'm covering and he seemed extremely interested and offered whatever help he could.

I'm enclosing some articles of interest and one, in particular, should interest you. I had not seen it before and it was sent to me recently by one of my former S.F. State students (Bruce Lewis). Lewis had not been in touch with me for virtually more than two decades and finally has been either calling me or writing. He was an excellent student when I gave my course.

The article that Bruce sent me is from "The Lebanon Democrat" (3/30/67) and deals with the fatal head shot. I know that you mentioned him in "Post Mortem" (I believe) and I, too, have referred to Stewart in an article I did for one of the assassination issues. Gary Aguilar, in fact, called Stewart after I sent him my article referring to Stewart. Some, of course, what Stewart has to say in the article about Ruby and Oswald is pure guesswork on his part but the medical reportage is what is significant.

The other articles I've enclosed are self-explanatory so I have nothing to add to them but they are yours to keep.

Now I want to get into something you mentioned to me in your last letter (dated 3/9/96). In your letter you wrote = "You ask why so many heard the first shot. Is this the real first shot or the first they heard?"

I'm not exactly clear on what you meant in this last sentence. I do mean the "real first shot" which I believe came from the knoll area and behind Zapruder and is evidenced in the Zapruder film in frames Z-189 to Z-191. I do not buy any earlier shot prior to these frames such as proposed either by the HSCA, Groden or Posner.

My purpose in ~~saying~~ asking "why so many heard this (Z-189 to 191) shot is = if that shot were fired by

the use of a silencer why is this shot heard & heard loudly I'm not stating that this first shot was done by a silencer but it's a variant possibility I might suggest in my book. The problem I have is why - if a silencer was used - so many heard it & heard it as a loud report (I do know that many described it as having a "firecracker" sound but I'm not sure if this helps or hinders the possibility of silencers being used.

I assume that when you wrote to me (in the latter part of your second sentence that the "first they heard" may refer to a shot (or shots) fired after the first real shot (Z189 to Z191) but if I'm mistaken on this please let me know.

And speaking about silencers, I recall that somewhere I read (it may have been in one of your books) that Linda Willis thought a silencer could've been used. Am I mistaken on this but my memory is fairly accurate that one of the Willis daughters did say this?

Bill O'Neil, whom I'm sure has been in touch with you, recently returned from a trip to New Orleans. He's got some very interesting things to say about Oswald and the right-wing contacts he made while Oswald lived in that area. Bill's own analysis blows sky-high the desperate attempts of the Warren Commission to make Oswald out to be a "lefty". (How come Newman never picked up on this in his book "Oswald & the CIA" or did Newman believe the CIA's interest was only in "known" lefties?).

Hope everything is fine with you. And after my tax return I'll get back to work on my book.

Best,
Hal