

1/21/71

Dear Cyril,

Many thanks for the copies of the shirt-front picture. Because their exposure is different than mine, they are helpful....I'm deep in a response to a quite isolated government notion to wigwags. Bud read a copy night before last and told me yesterday it depressed him (to think of the work response requires). He said that had such a paper been served where he was the attorney, he'd recommend to his client that he abandon the litigation. I, of course, will not and will use a kind of intellectual judo with it to the end, I think, that what we seek may be advanced. Six of the 10 days permitted for response passed before I got and could read it! I've asked for 30 days. The fed atty tried to trap me into assuming I had them automatically!...The judge is liberal and hung up on Warren, which makes some problems, but has been willing to clobber the FBI in court.

With Collier's report you avoid mention of your own opinion. For my own understanding, I have a few questions. What is, as used here, a "slow moving bullet"? The ungaraged 1500-2000 fps? Please ask him what his professional opinion would be with these mixed conditions true, as they are:

- a) spectrographic analysis discloses no metallic traces here on the shirt or anywhere on the tie;
- b) there is no hole anywhere in the tie, there is a slight nick, as if it does no more than expose the tie lining, on the extreme left-hand (the front) edge of the knot (the FBI picture was taken to give the opposite impression, if you recall it), and there is no damage elsewhere, especially not at the point that could add to be over where these holes would overlap (and I have pictures showing the tie and shirt, not in disarray).

I believe these marks were caused by a scalpel, which fits more the tie. When the tie was cut and washed as clear from the pictures I have, I have no doubt that the anterior back wound was above the collar.

But under my own hand, restricting ourselves to just this single picture and the added facts above, is it possible for a criminalist to reach a positive conclusion as to whether the hole was or could have been caused by a bullet from any direction?

I have more than relates that I can't go into but with me, you disagree you are here. This evidence seems impossible in front exit there and is definitely on the location of the rear wound.

Collier's report on the neck also is one of the most useful. When, after this, I also want the report to be analyzed carefully. My recommendation is that which leads to comment in it and there is a definite suggestion of fraying. Could you or offer any opinion about whether the fraying test is visible in it is most as characteristic of a bullet's path? For your information, not to form his opinion, the hole in the back is clearly visible. I have a good shot of that, which the Commission has not, ever. Just popped into my mind, if I never told you, the gird and the autopsy doctors were shown the gird before the doctors testified. I have odds and ends like this from an unimpeachable source. I make and want no use, for I want the source and I want to put everything together first. And there was no damage to the e-rays then, indicating examination after that and before pencil examination. Something had to burn, remember. By the way, if I can help and they do have to take pictures for me, which will entail my presence when they are taken, would you like to be there? Collier? Would pictures of the undersides help?

Again, many thanks to you and please convey them to Collier. Gotta get back to pretending I'm a lawyer. On the fact and the law I should win this one, with what I already have and with the possibilities presented by a very dishonest Federal notion.

Sincerely,