

15 May 1967

*Pat sent*

Dear Ray,

On Sunday I spent some time studying the coded phone number evidence and I do have some serious problems with it. Although you were impatient when I was trying to figure out how the "P.O." became converted into "13" and then reconverted into "WH", you did help solve the problem, and I hope that you will be equally patient with the questions I am going to raise now. Like you, I feel that the critics should give all possible help and support to the Garrison investigation. But I am convinced that the best help and support we can give is to make the same critical scrutiny of evidence that we made of the Warren Report, and to acknowledge any defects found. If we merely accept without scrutiny or scepticism, it will be the spokesmen for the opposition rather than Garrison's friends who pose the challenge. As supporters of the New Orleans investigation, our best contribution may be at times to act as devil's advocate, and I think Garrison might value that more, in the last analysis, than mere applause.

Now, the first problem I have is that in Oswald's address book the symbols that precede the digits "19106" are not "P.O." but "D.D." I base this not only on the printed translation under the photocopy of the page, which is given as "D.D." but on page 26 of the address book (XVI p. 46). On that page, there is a list of German phrases with their Russian equivalents. The German "Ja" is accompanied by the Russian "Da" and the "D" appears to be the same as the symbols which precede the "19106" on page 58 of XVI. If the correct reading is "DD 19106" and not "PO 19106" the cryptogram cannot be decoded to produce the exchange "Whitehall" of Ruby's unpublished telephone number.

The second problem is that the cryptogram "PO" or "DD" "19106" appears on a page which seems to have been written during Oswald's stay in the Soviet Union. The context and nature of the entries on that page, and the similarity of the writing and the ink, strongly suggest this. Is it possible or plausible that Oswald encoded and recorded the unlisted phone number for Jack Ruby while he (Oswald) was still in the USSR, with his ultimate relocation in Dallas presumably neither known nor predictable? I do not say that it is impossible; but the probability factor is considerably reduced.

The third problem is the relative scarcity, in Oswald's address book, of other possible cryptograms "concealing phone numbers he regarded as sensitive" and which he systematically and repeatedly subjected to the decoding formula of scrambling the digits and subtracting either "1300" or "4900." Indeed, the telephone numbers for General Walker, FBI agent Hosty, and other possibly sensitive contacts are entered without any visible attempt at concealment.

Another problem that I mentioned and that you were inclined to dismiss without discussion is that Oswald frequently wrote out such simple arithmetical calculations as 20 plus 20 equals 40--which the ordinary individual calculates in his head. Is it likely that a man who has to perform such primitive mathematical exercises on paper is able to retain and apply by memorization a fairly complex formula for scrambling, converting, and decoding a seven-symbol formulation?

One might also ask (although I regard this as marginal rather than substantial) why Clay Shaw should have retained in his address book, long after the death of Oswald and ~~somehow~~ equally long after Ruby was in confinement and unreachable at his unlisted number, and even for a short time after Ruby's death, a notation which was potentially incriminating in suggesting a link between Shaw ~~and Ruby/Oswald~~ and Ruby and/or Oswald? The answer may well be, oversight, or complacency; and I would not press that point.

Having raised these points, let me reiterate that I am absolutely convinced that however strongly and ardently we support Garrison we will in the end do him great harm if we proceed on pure faith and if we withhold questions or criticisms of the evidence, or apply a less exacting standard than we all applied in evaluating the evidence put forward by the Warren Commission. Personally, I do not wish to do Garrison so great a disservice.

Since you have already met him personally and since you were present when the story of the decoding broke, perhaps you should present these problems to him. If you prefer not to do so, please let me know. I would then raise these matters personally.

I still love you, Ray; you cook a swell Chinese dinner.