

8 November 1969

Dear Paul,

Your work on Alexis Davison has been publicized, to my surprise, in the latest "Truth Letter" by Joachim Joesten, under the title "Reader's Forum," attributed to one M.B. (Mike) Masterman, Lymington, Hants, England. Is Masterman one of your contacts, or did he stumble on this independently?

I don't know if you get Joesten's bi-weekly ravings @ \$48.00 a year, but it is a sad and often dismaying spectacle of a once-keen mind in progressive degeneration and miasma. Joesten's self-portrayal goes like this: "In this corner: One battered typewriter, one broken-down duplicating machine, one shoestring, one old man. In the Opposite corner: The White(wash) House, the Congress, the FBI, the CIA, the Press, Radio & TV, the publishers etc. Some fight, isn't it?" (And all this time I thought it was Weisberg fighting the Forces of Evil single-handed!)

In a moment of ~~sentimentality~~ sentimentality or something of that sort, I sent Joesten a xerox of CE 5 page 400, since Joesten was the first one to challenge the alleged arraignment and I thought it would give him great satisfaction to know that his charges were vindicated by this document. Well, he was so excited that he published the page in entirety (which is okay, since I did not attach any conditions) but he then proceeded to discuss "A Strange Arraignment" (from Accessories), which he cited to show that I had accepted the WR account of the arraignment at 1:35 a.m. etc. I was simply infuriated, because even if he somehow managed to misunderstand my chapter despite its explicit attack on the WR fable of the arraignment, he had a personal letter from me saying that my study of the testimony and documents in the 26 volumes had completely convinced me that he was right in charging that the arraignment had never taken place. I am awaiting a retraction; but whether or not it is forthcoming, it is clear that Joesten simply cannot be trusted to weigh documentary evidence in a logical or rational manner.

Many thanks for your letter of the 4th with its enclosure (CD 81b page 104), and your notes on the unmistakable erasure and insertion of a new date and time. It is possible that the first version of the arraignment for JFK was to be on 11/22/63 at 11 something p.m. but ~~then~~ they realized that this would not be consistent with the midnight press conference, when Oswald said that he had not been charged with killing JFK. The timing had to be changed to a time after midnight. Apparently Oswald was checked out of his cell from 12:35 to 1:10 a.m. I don't know why they did not use that as the time of arraignment, rather than 1:35 to 1:45 a.m., for which there was no record of Oswald's absence from his cell. Since the arraignment is a formal legal hearing, it is simply incredible that no record was made--no question in this case of a badly overcrowded room into which a stenographer simply could not be squeezed. Why no verbatim record? Now, it is significant that there is no transcript either of the arraignment for the Tippit murder on 11/22/63 at 7:10 p.m. (note on page 104 of CD 81b that the ":10 pm" may also have been inserted after the typing of this part of the page) and no transcript for the arraignment of Ruby. This may, of course, mean that the Dallas authorities customarily did not make a record of arraignments, but it could mean that the transcripts of the Tippit and Ruby arraignments have been suppressed so that the lack of a transcript of the JFK arraignment would not be so glaring. I will send out an inquiry right away to see if we can find out what the current and past practice is in Dallas when a suspect is arraigned for homicide--do they customarily make a transcript or not, and if not, what is the legal evidence that the arraignment took place?

I do think that CD 5 page 400 is an important find because if there was no arraignment for the JFK assassination, as this and other evidence in the H & E strongly suggests, then there is a distinct undeniable case of collusion and perjury involving the Dallas police and others.

I have put some inquiries out already about the press photos of the top part of the Affidavit published in XX page 323, which appeared in cropped version in the NY Times on 11/24/63, showing only the top third of the affidavit, and appeared elsewhere held by Wm. Alexander, showing only the top half of the affidavit. Did the original photograph include the whole of the Affidavit? If so, was the bottom of the page filled in and notarized as in XX page 323? Or was it blank? Did the photographer aim his camera so that only the top half of the affidavit was within camera range, and the photo of Wm. Alexander as reprinted in Joesten's "Oswald: Assassin or Fall-Guy?" an uncropped photo? If so, did the photographer omit the lower part of the affidavit because it was blank?

If we can get information on some of these matters, we will be closer to a conclusive case, one way or the other.

Let me thank you also for the thick file of notes and documents on 544 Camp Street, which I am putting aside to read very carefully in a quieter hour.

Best regards,

P.S. About following up relevant documents which were not published, as cited in Accessories, that has been a main frame of reference for me in working with your invaluable indices to the CDs and with the tables of contents and summaries of the Gemberling reports; in fact, that is how I came to order CD 5 page 400, as well as various other documents related to other points in Accessories. By the way, I never heard of Virginia Valle, or at least I don't recall her name. Should I know of her? She is not mentioned in your two-page "Notes" on the material Pauline Bates typed for Oswald.