

Telephone - Curtis Crawford - Friday 8:30-1:30

30 Oct 1964

Called CC to ask if any "errands" needed in Dallas as Mari Posner returning there Sunday. He could not think of any - had been off the WC for a few weeks because of other preoccupations. I said I would ask Maria to try to find out Lukey's exact address - as there were differing streets mentioned [did not get to mention the poss. 1-week overlap on Marsalis and the possible proximity on W Neely St. Mardi April 1963].

CC then asked if I had been able to find out anything more about the contents of the Nash article and the witnesses Frank Wright's wife & Aquilla Clemmons - He again questioned their failure to come forward voluntarily and offer their testimony to the WC. I again pointed out the peculiarity of their position - They had not phoned the police, their address was known, they had not been apprehended over the Amb dispatch - driver - nor helper. I suggested that in view of the misadventure of other witnesses i.e. Reynolds testimony to ~~come~~ come forward was

not entirely surprising. This led to discussion of Reynolds, Markham, et al. CC confirmed that the Wash couple were investigators for Malone. He was puzzled that WC credited Markham with full description given on spot (quoted by policeman Coe(?) - seemed to conflict with lecture statements quoting Markham as puzzled because police at scene wanted apparel only. We discussed the "white coat" description of both Markham & Mrs. Davis - agreed confession at scene possible and descr attrib Markham may have been given by the gang of witnesses as a whole. Agreed also very strange that Markham affidavit failed include detailed descr attrib to her on the scene - Both shared serious doubts value any Markham testimony.

Got into discussion Reynolds - whether FBI interview Mary Brook 21 January 64 (and presumably Reynold & 3 also) was actually their first interview. I felt certain WC would not have failed indicate prior interview if it took place. CC felt he had known of Reynolds very early in case though some of the others - Scaggins etc - were unknown to him before WC report. In any case he agreed their identifications from photo Jan. 21 absolutely valuable. Agreed also the

Earlier IDs (Mukherjee, Sengupta, Davis etc) questionable
value because 4-man lineup with LHO giving
facial bruises - bruises - Irritated with WC
bland statement lineups were fair, not hooked up.

We then got into disc LHO reasons for bus-
toss - movie - Robert's claim police car, horn -
Was the no 106 or 107 merely 10 - ie -
no of Tippet car? CC found it harder to
believe LHO unusual in conspiring with others
then acted alone - did not trust ppl - but
How possible coercion of LHO - ie - threat of
prosec for giving secret material - as he said he
intended - to USSR. led us into discussion
State Dept - LHO - Embassy behavior - CC
said ironically - You just don't understand the
kindness & concern Govt -> showing - Same as
Ernest Rosenberg had given atomic secrets put
them on plane for Moscow where they are now
alive & well." We then discussed the
peculiar language in article WC described the
applica for IT renewal and the strike-
out of the "done net." CC agreed that WC
language seems intended conceal not inform
- Discussed in detail what might be meant
by "a request copy of the applic" and

"a copy which was not a ^{carbon} copy of the copy sent to the Dept." Agreed impossible to understand and deliberate obfuscation by VC cause for suspicion.

Got into discuss LHO \$, CC startled when I raised you whether he could have paid transit Moscow - NY for the \$435. Suggested he might have had some money of his own.

Further startled when I pointed out VC reconstruct his accounts failed to include costs both LHO record dated Oct 64 - We agreed Texas would not be wishing to give financial aid to defector's non-English - SP Soviet wife.

Then I raised you of how LHO would have paid trip Havana / Moscow if he had received the visas in Mexico City. CC said he might have planned to go later - I pointed out he had no prospects of \$1000+ even later. CC said he had enough to get to Havana.

I questioned that, recalling USA citizens can get to Cuba only via EE Prague etc. Were both excited to realize report LHO transit visa Cuba en route

VSSR made even less sense if could not travel Mex City - Havana.

Not so -
as says
over was
paid for trip

(X) → Checks 1963 travel Cuba USA citizens

Were led at some pt. into discussion LHO
testimony while in custody. My list of questions
at the series interview sessions based on
Fitz's memos supplemented by Hostey, Bookbent etc.
Checking WC text, earlier part of report
CC & I elected not to discuss further series
interview sessions took place after first
lineup on 22 Nov. Not listed in reporter
Fitz's SD on FBI. Furthermore FBI agent
report covering 22 Nov. (with list contents
wallet etc) does not correspond with any other
22 Nov. reports but does correspond with
23 Nov reports of Fitz, Bookbent etc.

⊗ → was this an error or a falsification
to support Wade's statement that "A [redacted]"
alias when arrested ?? WC p181 ^{my} "On Nov 22
2 23 LHO
Report to 64"

Further checking revealed no report from
anyone on the late afternoon & evening
interview sessions 22 Nov !! Also
revealed presence of a later interview even
of some 1 opponents not asked
to submit their recollections

FAY R. Turner

Including name of a woman ^(X) number
Dallas PD — almost certainly the
police stenographer reported going into

interview room by Dallas Morning News
(per Mc Lane) 23 Nov.

(X) → Marc Posenes to check this woman's
job = Dallas PD!

[CC suggests, mentions Capt Fritz]

CC primarily concerned possible falsification
of evidence. Feels deposition etc

obtained by WC Step just as good
as testimony before WC member (5).

Very few sessions held (if any) with
all present. Slight clash earlier in

conversation re WC procedure

- CC insists must separate "for

impartiality" - Jim insists secret hearings

prohibit ^{lack of} impartiality - Clook also when

Jim said "order of witnesses suddenly"

can forward re HWC at rifle range"

CC said, don't let words tell & identities
be clouded by emotion & exaggeration etc.

After detailing sudden appearance
5-6 Ryle large witnesses - and allegation
J Soeden was not open for business
until late Oct - CC strongly felt WC
should have been acutely aware possibly
planting of card vs LHO & very strange
indeed they did not apparently
investigate this. I put out apparent
strong resemblance Lath Lovelady &
Crapford to LHO - He was startled to realize
Crapford had identified photo B Neeson
as seen in Club in Ruly and being addressed
as "Newman" altho he apparently did
not know the name of man in photo.
This would give Grossman significance to his
testimony. Document series phone calls
23 Nov. Ruly to Ralph Paul.
CC like me in thinking about pu-
planned frame had first tentatively
settled on Hosty - Fritz teaming, for
prior knowledge LHO & opportunity plant.
Also trying with idea frame after LHO
arrest. Both theories present considerable

deposition. Again, he has to agree the
qu of LHO by Fritz & Hosty so except
& magnometer as to suggest they didn't
want to find out as they already knew
what they needed.

He also agreed WC experiment on
timing LHO 6 to 2 ft not fair as
measured vs Baker instead of Tully.
And strange failure WC specify where
bullet remains found - specify even
existence of Westgren affidavit -
lack of candor which for more suspicion
than if WC acknowledged they had
investigated the details applied - found
it was wrong etc - and investigators
how Wade came to identify Trause
if he happened to meet J Westgren (?)
This way, sinister cast given to whole
affair with definite impression
WC deliberate misrep & concealment.

Earlier, at start of case, document
photo of rifle. CC did his own
calculations - he experimented
to see how many inches he could fire from his
own height by copying LHO stance in photo.

He deduced 2 inches is 68 inches. Had difficulty measuring the rifle in the photo because of tip - called CC of Inquiry - thought apparent tip was actually part of background. Also thought some apparent increase in length if held an inch or more away from the body. With those adjustments - shortening man and allowing for apparent greater length of rifle - was able to produce the same ratio between rifle = man in photo as in reality.

We then got into detailed discussion of the purchase of the rifle. CC says Mr & Mrs. Burns just discovered discrepancy about a month before WC rept. out. Mrs Burns is chief researcher for Frank Lane. The ad in Greenin Reflector

Feb. 1963 was for a 36" Carcano. The "ad" in Joesten's book is actually from Klein's Catalogue. The Catalogue advertised a 40" Carcano No. C20-750. The ad in Feb Am.R. offered a 36" " No C20-T750.

There was only a 10¢ difference in the price of the 2.

With the telescopic sight, the price was identical. Apparently, then, LHO ordered the C20-T750 36" from the Feb. ad in Am.R. The clerk in Klein's filled that order, indicating he was shipping the C20-T750 36" but apparently by error actually shipping C20-750 40"

Mrs Burns called Klein to ask about the discrepancy but he refused to talk to her, had been instructed by FBI to keep quiet. I repeated Turk home claim Klein had told him he did not have the 40" Carcano in stock for months after LHO order filled. CC violent to believe not true Klein told home this.

We also had a sharp exchange of views on IF Stone^① & Lord Russell. CC says even if it turns out Lord Russell is right, he was still not justified in saying as M here mouthpiece and charging an enquiry & a bit more without reading the WC rept. I pointed out IF Stone had reached categorical conclusions supporting WC report also without having read it. CC agreed IF Stone as irresponsible as Bertand Russell.

⊗ he was offended by
Mim's name
edit
on IF
Stone

lead to CC letter just received from
Thomas Salisbury - CC thinks H&D exaggerated
the depth & extent NY Times investigation -
- Times reporters did follow up leads
in Dallas for only 4 weeks - after which
they quit, to await the WC rept.
he photo of rifle as found before incident

CC pointed out that if a photo had been shown to
support claim Casano not Mawser found,
no way of knowing if it was in fact photo
taken by Day 1:22 pm or falsified

Earlier in the conversation I pointed out that
the WC had given no indication whatsoever of
H/O activities between about 8am when he
arrived at TSB (per W Frasier - Douglas) and
11:45 when Givens saw him —

Where was he working? did he fill any orders?
coffee break? men's room? talk to anyone?
where hide rifle? retrieve it? Why this very
obvious gap in reconstruct H/O minutes?