While I am sure that you will not miss the import of the last part of today's
Massey story I want to correlate it with what we already have in evidence about
the disagreements in descriptions of the specimens, as I am sure we do through my
affidavits and the information I was able to get by putting Paul Cols on to stories
on this; with the essential dishonesty of Guinn's telling reporters in the private
rooms what he did testify to as an expert witness; with what Guinn did let drop, that
Q15 has disappeared entirely and his failure to make any copper tests, particularly
with Q1; and with what may have seemed extreme in what I wrote in haste after yes-
sterday's broadcast, the suggestion that the samples are not authentic and are rigged.
I now believe that the likelihood of his "Connally" sample being a piece of what
Frazier removed from Q1 must be considered, at least not discarded as a possibility.

What this makes, without any doubt at all is that there is need to identify each
specimen as well as the results relating to each. By this I mean Guinn and distin-
guished from Gallagher specimens. I think this is also powerful support for the need
to take further depositions and under stipulated conditions in which the appeals
court either directs certain things or at least authorizes them. I see in these newest
developments an affirmation of the appeals court's language in its remand and of
its wisdom. So let us crank up Wignone's engine, if I may use this relating to the
appeals court.

I think it now is urgent that you do what you have been reluctant to do, add to
legal arguments the strongest kind of political language and the strongest kind of
castigation with real indignation. This is not a situation in which quiet and
persuasive legal reasoning only is appropriate. It screams for protest, for eloquent
anger, for expressions or genuine outrage ranging from what errant government and
deleaved and complacent government counsel have done to your aging client to the
most vigorous and most forceful condemnation that all these totally intolerable
situations can exist when a President is assassinated and the Government investig-
ates that most deeply subversive of crimes.

This is what "Lincoln described a trying men's souls. It is simply incredible
that any such evidence can disappear and the FBI be silent about it when it is in
court in particular and use various devices and dodos to be able to continue to
cover up all its earlier errors and transgressions/
(What a situation for giving
Pratt justice! And all the Pratts for a long time into the future!)

You really must lay it on, with eloquence and passion.

Thinking of this inconceivable situation I am reminded of a small matter that
may look large. There was a loose piece of the base of 359. Howard learned that it
reported just fall off at the Archives. Such a piece Frazier could have pulled off
with his fingers. Instead he cut a piece out and kept this totally secret, even when
he was a Commission witness, a fact that would not have been known if I had not
perceived the first part, the cutting, when I was able to examine the bullet, and
topped it by prizing Al Gear in New Orleans for his questioning of Frazier.

If by any remote chance any part of this is innocent I don't think that any
impartial person will no-- so regard it.

What a record! What a situation to have to take as new material to an appeals
court where the new is precluded with a case as old as this one, with all its history
in all the courts in which it has been.

I think that if you do as I ask they'll all have their Prattfall.

In this connection remember also that we have always insisted that we have and
assume the obligation for undertaking to protect the independence of the judiciary
and cite this as an example of the need and what can happen to the judiciary if there
is not the likes of us to undertake such obligations.