

14 June 1974

Dear Paul,

Thank you for your letter of the 10th, which arrived today. As you say, my over-all reaction to your ms. was positive and I am looking forward to seeing the sections which are to follow. I do feel strongly that all available information on any aspects of the Dallas assassination should be placed on the public record and preserved, even if it is ambiguous information. Some day, I hope, everything will fall into place.

I do not have any binding views on Oswald's relationships with the FBI and other USA agencies. There is evidence of a possible role of agent or double-agent; there is also evidence against that. As objective investigators, I think we must make a record of known facts, even if they seem mutually contradictory or incompatible with one's major hypotheses.

One thing that I believe I touched on in my letter of the 2nd bears reiteration: that is, that the tracing of the handling of particular documents in their several versions may be hard to follow in narrative form, and that every care needs to be taken to make each step of a sequence clear in relation to the other steps and the ultimate evaluation. I had this problem of clarity in preparing my 1971 article on Charles Givens. I believe that the format I finally adopted was a fairly good one and gave the picture as precisely as possible, within a chronological framework. Also (and this I have not always done), it is helpful to the reader to have a recapitulation of main points at the end of every major presentation. I have in mind, for example, the listing in Accessories of the series of reasons why it was not possible to accept the official version of the autopsy and medical evidence. I think I used the same technique in recapitulating the evidence on "the long and bulky package".

Personally I did not think that your conclusions were too ambiguous or tentative—as you say, the evidence is not clear-cut and definitive and it does not seem to me to permit of any categorical findings. Nor do I find any fault with your treatment of Samuel Stern. He does, in fact, illustrate the way in which a basically well-meaning person can become embroiled in what turns out ultimately to be tantamount to a conspiracy to conceal the truth.

I also agree with your comments about Jaworski, for the reasons you set forth, plus the fact that he dissuaded the grand jury from naming Nixon as an undicted co-conspirator. I do not trust him, nor even Jenner, although on the face of it Jenner seems to be doing a decent and honest job. My memory of his duplicity and malice in the LHO case is still too vivid for any confidence in him.

I see from occasional press reports that the Sirhan case is in some ferment. I have not done any work on the RPK assassination and have only such information as is available to any interested member of the public. Have you taken any interest in the Sirhan case, and if so what do you make of it?

Yours sincerely,

