

26 March 1971

Mr Bob Smith
Committee to Investigate Assassinations
927 - 15th St NW # 409
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Bob,

I just got home from the office to find your letter of the 24th, which I read with genuine interest and a large measure of agreement with your general views and appraisal of the possibilities still open to those of us who have researched or are now working on the Dallas assassination.

Let me hasten to reassure you that on the score of rediscoveries of startling old information, I have repeatedly made a fool of myself and only a few months ago spent a lot of money on excited long-distance calls about a piece of evidence that I had completely blanked out but that has been in the literature since the first wave of critics' books. I have seen other critics experience the same mortification, and I suppose it is inevitable. So much time has passed that I no longer remember much of what is in my book; and I surely will understand any lapses of your memory.

Although I became despondent more than a year ago about the prospects of a conclusive solution to the case, or even of its being reopened officially, I would like to encourage you to pursue your working hypothesis (as to the significance of the fabrications). I agree with your assessment of the complexity of such phenomena and the variety of motivations that must be taken into account. (You are perhaps aware of my position on Garrison, whom I have regarded as evil, stupid, and thoroughly contemptible since about April 1967; he will never release any evidence, and I doubt if he would even recognize evidence if it struck him on the head.)

You make a good point about Walker--that he would have had to know a lot about Oswald and his April 1963 whereabouts and activities, to palm off that story with any confidence. The thought had not occurred to me. If Walker and Hosty were social friends, as Penn Jones has reported, it is possible, I suppose, that Hosty indiscreetly discussed Oswald and other persons under his surveillance---but that is pure conjecture.

About the ticket at the Irving Sports Shop: my view was that Dial Ryder was truthful and that he was not (as the Commission insinuated) the author of the fiction or fabrication in question. The evidence does not lead one to any clear conclusion but my impression, for what it is worth, is that there was an actual staged incident, to incriminate Oswald as a rifle-owner, in which Dial Ryder was only a dupe.

Returning to the question of the first public mention of Abt's name, your points are well-taken. I continue to harbor the distinct impression that I personally first heard the name on Friday. Since writing to you on this problem earlier, I took a look at the literature and found further corroboration for the Friday timing. See: THE OSWALD AFFAIR by Leo Sauvage, page 210; WHITEWASH by Harold Weisberg, page 68; OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY by Joachim Joesten, page 63.

Now let me turn to the alchemical transformation of the Walker bullet jacket. To the best of my knowledge, every one of the "first generation" critics including myself completely overlooked this very important metamorphosis from steel to copper, which significantly and perhaps conclusively demonstrates a deliberate, conscious framing of Oswald for the Walker shooting by the FBI. But also by Marina, if the initial description of a steel jacket is correct. (One short step takes us to framing by the FBI and Marina in collusion with each other, and with third and fourth parties.)

I sincerely and warmly congratulate you on making this vital discovery which was universally unnoticed and by-passed until now. Am I free to mention this to others? I certainly hope that eventually you will place this discovery on the public record, in an article or book on your work on the Dallas assassination. You have made a real contribution to the investigation, as I hope you realize, and I am excited about it.

On the question of CE 1006/Walker Exhibit 1, I have just taken a cursory look at the exhibits and testimony you cited. I must admit that I generally have trouble both with the interpretation of photos and with visualizing spatial relationships. This personal deficiency handicaps me (despite my on-the-spot look at the back of Walker's house last August and the eerie sensation I experienced then when I tried to reconcile the complete familiarity of that segment of the house and grounds with the absolute unfamiliarity of the house and surroundings from any other vantage point) in following your reasoning. I have no doubt that you are quite right in postulating gross error by the Dallas police or the FBI stalwarts. As for Liebeler—he is intelligent and shrewd but not, I think, any devotee of truth or justice. Perhaps I do him an injustice, but in my estimation he probably would have covered up any evidence he discerned that might have rocked the Commission's boat, going up to but not beyond some mental gamesmanship with the duller-witted.

The question of mail interception in April 1963 is discussed in my book, pages 220-221; see also, pages 312-313. You will see that I strongly link the mail interception to the firearms. Far from being offended, I am glad that you arrived at the same disquiet by your independent route.

Do feel free to write again as and when you wish. Our correspondence thus far has started me on something of a refresher course on the dimming details of the evidence, and I suspect it is good for my soul.

Sincerely yours,

302 West 12 Street
NYC NY 10014