

Saturday A.M. 7/31/65

Dear Sylvia;

Once again I'm behind schedule with a letter to you. I marvel at your obvious organized pattern of working, having material readily at hand and available and at the dedication and promptness with which you work and react! I spend hours and hours and yet more hours - our bedroom is an utter and total shambles of notes, photographs, volumes, papers, etc., yet I never seem able to coordinate my efforts into any chronological form and I never seem to complete the research in any one phase of this multi-faceted monster! I begin to ferret out the necessary material from the volume and from my own files, in order to type up the presentation, only to fall into the trap (which has long since become an established pattern) of having my eye suddenly strike a phrase or statement of totally unrelated nature to what I had in mind to concentrate on and thus begins an entirely new area of development and search and this is the standard nemesis that interferes in my scheme and hinders my progress. When I say "entirely new area of development" I don't mean that, at this late date, I am necessarily uncovering unknowns - although that does happen;- I mean, rather, that, having begun to read the volumes almost as soon as I received them (and I believe I was among the first) late in Nov. of '64, I not only have forgotten certain major passages of those early exposures, but I am armed, by now, with a far better knowledge and understanding of the case and therefore interpret differently, in many instances, the same material in reading it now from the way I might have regarded it at the outset. So I stumble and bumble along and am terribly slow and not too well organized but, for the first time-lately, I think I can begin to feel the lovely tingle which one senses from the realization that progress is being made and the goal is, after all, achievable!

Your conversation with Mr. Shaneyfelt was even more revealing on his part than I would have expected! Incredible! And now, if there was any doubt before, one can no longer imagine that your 'phone calls will go undetected, at least in certain directions! Be that as it may! I hope you will forgive me for keeping your most excellent manuscript this long. Actually, I had wanted to have certain parts Xeroxed for my own private file but would not do so, of course, without your permission. You have been most generous in allowing me that privilege and I'm deeply grateful. I have not had any of it copied thus far but may take a few key paragraphs to be done tomorrow - I will let you know not only if I do so but also exactly what I will have done, too. In any case, whether or not I get any portion of the work copied, I shall definitely

return the first section of it on Tuesday. Many, many thanks for the second installment which arrived this morning. I haven't read it carefully, as yet - although I have perused and it, too, looks enormously impressive. What you have done is absolutely unique, in my opinion, because you have thoroughly and painstakingly researched the Report and you have reduced editorializing to a minimum and speculation to zero! That, to me, is the most necessary and valuable contribution and, as far as I know, you are the first person to do so. Others have written up one aspect or another or have perhaps combined two or three in an article (and surely I want to be among those to cheer what Vincent Salandria has done, as well as Harold Feldman and Mark Lane) but, in each case they were, somehow, unable to pare the editorializing down sufficiently to make the purely FACTUAL kind of case against the Report that is needed - and not one of them has made the kind of comprehensive study which you have done and which goes into those five or six KEY questions which are still so obscure to the public at large and even to students of the case.

Yesterday, quite inadvertently, I made what I believe is an interesting and possibly even an important discovery! (I use the word "discovery" advisedly because God knows who else or how many others have already been aware of what came as quite a surprise to me!). If you will look at the Warren Report, SUPRA, (blue paper-back, Gov't.-Print'g copy) on page 341, COMMISSION EXHIBIT #2424, containing a picture of Ruby at a jail press-conference and then turn to Vol. XXI, page 771, wherein a reproduction of Willis Slide #8 appears - and, in Slide #8, if you will examine the figure at the extreme right-hand edge of the slide, I wonder if you will arrive at the same conclusion as I did! (that is, providing, of course, that you haven't already explored the implications of that comparison). As you well know, testimony does, indeed, exist to back up this implication.

Now, going back for a moment to your excellent examination of the mystery of the ubiquitous Secret Service agents who appeared in a variety of places and positions not assigned to them by any recognized authority, I wonder if you wanted to add to your treatment of that particular question the Secret Service interview of Oswald which appears in the SUPRA on page 629, and which refers to Oswald's encounter with one of the "boys" while he was standing in front of the TSBD.

In addition, re the Tippit murder, have you noted the Police Transcript in Vol. XVII, C.E.#705, page 408, wherein the time that a citizen used Tippit's car 'phone to report his death is listed twice as 1:10 - and the "citizen" 's affidavit, which appears in Vol. XXIV, C.E.#2003, page 202? He is T.F. Bawley and he says "I looked at my watch and it said

13

1:10 P.M."!! This man is yet another of the KEY witnesses to the scene of the Tippit murder who was never called to testify before the Commission and he is not one of the ones that other investigators uncovered, by chance, -such as Aquilla Clemmons or the Wrights, etc. - he is someone whose existence the Commission recognizes to the extent of publishing his affidavit. When the Report refers to the Police Transcript in which the time of the Tippit murder is recorded, it deals with the one pinpointing the time at 1:16 and completely disregards the one to which I now have reference and which twice and very clearly fixes the time at 1:16 and which, it is superfluous to emphasize, entirely eliminates the possibility of Oswald's presence in that location at that time, to say nothing of his implication in the crime.

I am so profoundly impressed by the meticulous coverage of your work and the incredibly exacting attention to detail you have consistently exhibited that it seems almost presumptuous, on my part, to imagine that anything of which I may be aware would have escaped your keen eye - but, just in case, I have submitted the three foregoing tid-bits for whatever they may be worth and with the thought always in mind that, when dealing with such an endless web of tributaries and threads, everything has value and anyone can miss one or another of these little links.

I can't believe Geo. Thomson can have arrived at such a preposterous conclusion and it would certainly seem that he is, as you so aptly phrased it, a "battle casualty" -although, I must admit that I had sent for his "Quest for TRuth" soon after it first came out and I decided then that he was pretty well off the beam! Some of his questions and conclusions are reasonably well-drawn but his final deductions are impossible to consider seriously. Is it true that Joesten has really flipped? If so, it is a very great pity.

By the way, what did you make of the news item which appeared a few days ago, in connection with Mrs. John Kennedy's birthday observance, to the effect that Dallas policeman MacDonald's wife paid Mrs. K. a visit? (MacDonald, as you well know, was one of the main arrestors of LHO at the Texas Theatre).

Sylvia, again my most appreciative thanks for your splendid communications which I find myself looking forward to with great eagerness at mail delivery time and which I don't seem capable of responding to in kind. If you do go to Miami, I hope that you will find a measure of comfort and solace in so doing and, certainly, at least, that the trip will not be painful in the way in which you anticipate. More anon and bon voyage!

Gratefully and fondly,

Thomson