

21 January 1970

Dear Paul,

Again I am indebted to you for your informative letter of the 18th with its enclosures, which I greatly appreciate. I am really pleased that you share my feelings about the palmprint, which is a cardinal item in the Commission's effort to incriminate Oswald and at the same time so peculiarly dubious as to its authenticity that it could, in itself, destroy the whole case against Oswald. We need only one demonstrable act of fabrication of evidence by the Dallas police to disqualify all the evidence which depends on police authentication. A comparable item consists of the photographs of Oswald holding the rifle and wearing the revolver: I have been greatly impressed by Fred Newcomb's work and argumentation that they are composites and fraudulent, and if that is correct it is powerful evidence of a carefully planned and organized effort before 11/22/63 to incriminate Oswald in a crime of which only the assassins could have had advance knowledge.

I am even more pleased (and surprised) that you do not reject my ponderings about the Quigley interview. I remember that the first time that I met Salandria, back in 1965, we spent quite a long time chewing over this episode and that I was unable to shake his conviction that Oswald did initiate the interview and that he did so because he had an undercover connection with the FBI. Subsequently I had similar discussions with other critics, with the same result. You are the first one, I think, who has even been willing to consider other explanations. I do not insist that Oswald did not ask to see an FBI agent—I am just not convinced that he did, although I am certainly convinced that Quigley's lame "explanations" are simply nonsensical. I am glad to have CD 75 page 160, which seems to dispose of Mr. A. Heckman, as I am also grateful for your notes on Quiroga, although the "cold shoulder" he got from the FBI remains ambiguous.

In your letter to the Archives, you mention that Bringuier has just published a book "Red Friday." This is the first I have heard of it. Could you please indicate the name of the publisher, etc., so that I can order a copy?

You are quite correct about the basis on which I concluded that the FBI was reading Oswald's mail at the point of origin. I did interpret "Dallas T2" as signifying interception in Dallas. I remember having a lengthy conversation on this point with Curtis Crawford back in 1964 or early in 1965, when Crawford had not yet converted from being a critic to being an apologist, in which we explored the pro's and con's of such interception, since we shared the general assumption that mail interception and surveillance was accomplished through infiltration and informants. But it is not inconceivable that a certain amount of surveillance and/or interception is performed in local post offices, through lists of organizations or individuals to whom mail is addressed by local residents, who would then be subject to investigation by the local intelligence apparatus. But I would not press that argument very hard, since we just don't know how sophisticated and pervasive the FBI facilities may be for the violation of privacy. (An aside: J. Edgar might not agree but I would have thought it just as important for the FBI to conduct mail surveillance of the purveyors of firearms, bazookas and other weaponry as to screen mail to FPCC...but of course, 1962-63 was before the Black Panthers.)

I have a registered mail receipt for my letter to Paul Scott but no reply from him as yet. I don't really expect one. I definitely feel that the FBI planted the whole thing with Scott, for the reason you suggest, so I did my bit by sending a copy of my registered letter to Mr. Richard Helms at the CIA.

Best regards,