

1 April 1965

302 West 12 Street  
New York City 10014

My dear Mrs. Castellano,

Thank you for your letter of March 29, 1965 and for your phone number. Perhaps I will ring up one evening and we can chat about the case.

I have already been in touch with Mr. Corson, who was kind enough to leave the file of your correspondence at my building on his way to work. His accompanying note said that he was leaving on vacation today and will be back on the job on April 17, and that I could hold on to the file as long as need be.

Your letters to the Commission were most interesting. I had already read the "Gaps" pamphlet by Joesten when it came out (I hope you have seen the sister-pamphlet from the same publisher, called I believe "Critics of the Warren Report"—a reprint of articles and broadcasts including those of Kempton, Packer, Lane, Nash, Crawford). Another reference to the storm drain, as you probably know already, is contained in the testimony of Michael Paine. As I recall, he told the Commission that a friend had taken him to Elm Street to view the manhole, shortly after the assassination, advocating the theory that it had been used by the assassin(s). Is there any specific evidence, other than the existence of the system of drains, that the shots came from such a source? I have been inclined to believe that the shots might have come from the trees at the top of the grassy knoll near the TSBD.

I was interested by your comment to Mr. Corson that the discrepancies in the Report alone, to say nothing of the 26 volumes, were staggering. I agree completely. Even on flat and seemingly factual assertions (i.e., the recency of the Western Cartridge Company 6.5 Carcano ammunition and its current manufacture, page 646 of the Report), investigation exposes the utter falseness of the claim. I have seen a letter from the Western Cartridge Company indicating, in reply to an inquiry, that they discontinued the manufacture of this ammunition in 1944. This is only one of a long series of misleading and false statements, which have in common one thing—that they appear to strengthen the case against Oswald. It seems to me that resort to so many falsehoods—as opposed to specious reasoning and evidence of inexcusable bias—must be interpreted as evidence that the Commission itself had no confidence in its own conclusions and could not have defended those conclusions if the Report had stated scrupulously and exclusively the actual facts.

As I mentioned in my previous letter, I obtained Leo Sauvage's book (in French) L'Affaire Oswald, which I recommend highly if your French is reasonably good. (An English edition may be published at the end of the year.) I spent the whole weekend reading the book and experienced the odd sensation of finding that Sauvage's treatment of six or seven major issues of evidence corresponded almost exactly with my own written drafts. It may therefore seem immodest if I say that I was most impressed with Sauvage's analysis of the Report and with his careful research. Of course, he had the added advantage of having been assigned to Dallas (he is US correspondent for Figaro) and having interviewed some of the principals (Truly, Ruth Paine, etc.).

Mark Lane has an article on Ruby in the current issue of Minority of One, as you must know already. It is shocking that he allowed such a gross error to go into print. Lane had made reference to the "CIA Report" in a radio broadcast and I had immediately contacted one of his associates to call the error to her attention and, through her, to Lane's. Unfortunately, Lane's entourage is so fanatic in defending him (even against his friends) that she merely insisted that I was mistaken and Lane was right. Consequently, what was a relatively minor misfortune when voiced on the air became a formalized blunder in print—one that I fear will be exploited by Lane's unfriendly critics as evidence of his frivolity if not villainy. This must be all for now, as I have a job to do! Kindest regards, do write again as soon as you can manage.