

Oct. 13, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

The helter skelter nature of the activities in which I have been involved have caused me to get way behind in my correspondence; it seems like only yesterday that I received CD 5, p400 from you; and then ran off to Yosemite. My problems have subsided somewhat, and as between being loved, but unpublished or published, but unloved--- I have chosen the latter course.

Parodying a famous poet:

It's better to be published but unloved,
Than not to have published at all.

Re your letter September 10

Thanks for your information on Bethel. Bethel wrote me in July and told me about his manuscript, and about a diary he had kept. I had forgotten to mention this. I will keep mum. Am keeping an eye peeled for Brener's book.

About trial transcripts from New Orleans. It is very important to me that I soon be able to get access to Finck's transcript. Besides Finck, I am also interested in Shengyfeld, Frazier, and Zaprduer. *Finally,* Lowest priority items: "grassy knoll" witnesses who testified there. (I prefer to use earlier dated accounts, ~~even~~ if not taken under oath.)

I have excellent relations with Paul Hoch, and am in weekly (and sometimes daily) contact with him by phone through the University of California statewide tie-line system. He has been of immense help to me; and an associate of his, Jim Schmidt, has spent many months working on Archives documents. Paul's main area of help has been to comment on and discuss with me whatever he knows about archives documents.

Now, Dr. Nichols, I am told, has ordered three transcripts, or somehow has obtained access to ~~them~~, in connection with his own suit. One is his own; another is Frazier; the third I am not sure of. Paul obtained a copy of Frazier's transcript, and made one for me, (from his, I believe. It is very light.) (Its about 350 pages, I think).

The availability of this particular transcript had nothing to do with Harold Weisberg, according to Paul. Paul is under the impression that Garrison's office has access to the others.

In any event, a point will come, in time, where I will simply have to write the court reporter and ask "how much?" for Finck's transcript, and then ask my parents for financing, and try to spread the cost around by making three or four copies. It is particularly sad if Weisberg has complete access to this sort of thing and fails to make it available, even for a price. But in all of my research, I am going on the assumption that I can't get any knowledge, information or documents re any area of the case from him at all. ~~With~~ With the exception of a silly letter he wrote me this week, I have had no contact with him since Oct of 1968, by mail or phone. His work manifests ~~itself~~ *itself* in my own effort, only to the extent that I have been able to make use of his published material.

One more point: Paul and I do not discuss anything Paul knows about Weisberg's work; and he understands completely why he should do the same for me, with respect to W. (With the exception that I frequently ask him if Weisberg has got a publisher yet, for his remaining books; and the answer is always no.)

So, in conclusion, on this point----if, through any of your contacts, you seem to be able to obtain a copy of the Finck transcript (or the others I mentioned)---please let me know as soon as this firms up; so I will be able to stop worrying about how I am going to eventually obtain a copy of it.

Also: let me make this offer. To make you a free copy of the Finck transcript, if you can get your hands on a borrowed copy that will reproduce well. Remember, if you do this, to insure the one you send at the rate of 1.00 a page if, god forbid, it becomes destroyed in the mail.

Re Wecht. Thanks for all the information. It will help guide my actions; I anticipate no problems, just now.

Re defense brief. I understand what you say, and in the spirit intended, and am glad you informed me of it at this time. There is one woman out here, Pat Lambert, who has spent hundreds of hours burrowing very deeply into the record on matters which I don't have time to handle. To the extent practicable, I will try to double check any results of her work that I use; but, of course, I have to take sole responsibility for any error. The same is true for anyone who helps me in any way. I ~~XXXX~~ should also add that the precision with which you work is so high that I have little doubt about the factual content of anything you have ever published or sent me.

Thanks for your comments on "establishing a link".
Re your index: I use it quite often, and am making a xerox copy of sections of it so that I can annotate it with reference to my filing system, to make sure that, in particular areas, I at least have read, taken notes on, or copied, those documents in the 26 volumes that are revelant. (In fact, I took it to dinner last night. Can you imagine, someone so interested in his work he is reading a subject index to the 26 volumes at dinner?)

Incidentally, I have a list of about 20 "accessory books" I have read in connection with my work. For example, both Jack Bell (who was in the press car) and Hugh Sidey (Time) were in the motorcade. Both wrote books, and both have material on the assassination. Clark Mollenhoff's book "Despoilers of Democracy", Geyelin's "Lyndon Johnson and the World", Robert's "LBJ's Inner Circle", Michael Amrine "100 days" (or something like that) all offer valuable background information. And, of course, there is Manchester (whom I have spoken to twice already) and Bishop. My work is really not about the Warren Report, but about the assassination and related events. (For example, would Garrison, Marcus, Maggie Field, or even Weisberg know, much less care about, even the names of President Kennedy's three military attaches?; which one has responsibility for tapes from AF-1? etc.)

There are ~~XXXX~~ instances where I think the WC staff was deliberately dishonest; and I will not hesitate to say so (or, perhaps better, demonstrate this as a fact.) I don't think its all oversight, overwork, or deception by others. Since any moral outrage in my work is primarily addressed to forces and people who are accessories before the fact, I am going to have to draw a clear distinction between that and those who are accessories after the fact. They are at least, not responsible for conceiving and plotting the murder of JFK, "only" the crime of permitting LHO to be framed. However heinous the 2nd

type of sin is, it is certainly quite different than the first. In any event, the focus of my book is on who did it and why; not, who let them get away with it, and why. But I will have considerable amount to say on the second subject---you can be sure of that. Its just that I don't intend to let it overshadow the first.

Re your letter of September 13

Thanks for the clarification re page 47, and the recounting of your experiences in that regard. I really don't know where I got my misinformation from.

Paul Hoch has offered the hypothesis that the various misnumberings are the result of the existance of blank pages being misunderstood when the exhibit was duplicated at somewhere along theline from Dallas Field office to Washington; FBI in Washington to Commission; Commission to staff; and then to printer. *Cie: Someone throws away what he thinks is result of multifunctioning term*
So I don't think its sinister anymore.

Shortly after I mailed you my letter, I read Accessories, p211, to find it thoroughly underlined and annotated by me, from sometime before, when I had read and underlined it. Its an excellent discussion, and I obtained even more out of it reading it fresh from my intense thinking on the whole matter.

I have still not found my copy of Paul's memo. I will be asking him for it soon, if I can't locate it in one of my remaining unsorted piles of information.

Re washington addresses and phone numbers. Judith Screiber(my sister) in one of her most radical political acts ever undertaken, has uncovered the fact that the phone book in Washington reveals that these numbers are the Russian Embassy, and a residence associated with that embassy.

Re Davison. ~~THE~~ day or two after I received your letter, I was speaking to Paul Hoch re Davison. He had, independently, (or perhaps Jim Schmidt, I honestly don't remember just know)---- anyway, one of them found out that Davison is mentioned in Ross and Wise as Penkovsky's contact. Paul wrote a memo, with attached xerox pages. In a later phone call, I urged him to immediately mail you a copy, which he had not done at that time. He said he would. If you haven't received a copy yet, just let me know.

Several weeks ago, I did a bunch of xeroxing, and, on certain documents, made extra copies for you. I have not sorted out the pile yet, but hopefully, I will get to it in the next day or two. Therefore, you will be obtaining some sections of CD 385, I believe, in the mail.

On the subject of xerxing and copying (about which I have more to say later on), could you please send me:

- 1) 423-429, of CD 897, re Gandy.(can omit 423, its just title page)
- 2) pp 42-46 of CD 1518, re gouged-out hole.

In conclusion, thanks for all the answers, which were useful and illuminating.

7

Re your letter of September 16

Now we come to what I think is one of the best items of information I have ever had the pleasure of receiving in the mail: that Hosty report on Fritz interview.

But first, some background.

In writing up sections, I continually find myself faced with the problem posed by the existence of available-but-not-printed pages on a particular subject, clearly indicated by the Gemberling Reports' table of contents. This is true on almost any matter: LHO practicing with a rifle, Whitworth incidents etc.

It is very discouraging. To get curious about any of these items, in the course of writing, means to digress from the writing to the collection of Gemberling reports where, with the use of Hoch/Fensterwald lists, you find out what is or not published;--- but that takes scanning through the ~~93~~ 93 pages of synopsis and table of contents.

Index to

So, I decided to create an "Available but Not Published" (henceforth abbreviated as ABNP) pages. I have been working on it, and it is just about finished. The first step, was to take Fensterwald's list, and my notebook of Gemberling synopsis and table of contents, and---for each heading---write in blue ink the published pages; and in red ink, the abnp pages.

Then, I went through all the Gemberling reports, and in the margin, put a number with a circle around it (they go from about 1 to 33). Having done all this, I now take this multicolored annotated notebook, and start collating the information by subject. The result is a 30-odd page very useful index.

Well, I had just finished putting in the numbers on CD 5, writing carefully "400" in red ink, when the mailman comes, and delivers to my door your letter, with p400, CD 5.

If I had any doubts until that moment that it was worth indexing the abnp pages of Gemberling reports, I lost them right then and there.

for most topics (but not all)

Based on this index, I am ordering all abnp pages, grouped by topic, on one reel of microfilm (at 5¢/page). Thus, the reel will start, let us say, with 59 pp of abnp material on LHO rifle practice, then 34 pages of abnp on attempt to purchase car, etc. etc. The order is in draft form now. But, before it is sent in, I am sending a preliminary draft of the index to you and to Paul Hoch. I would like you to indicate, when receive it, any sections you have already ordered. I don't know how much will be knocked off the microfilm order through this procedure, but the order itself will run 60 - 70 dollars anyway. But at least I will now that I have the basic field investigation, and there are not things lurking around in the archives that I hadn't seen, yet which are included in the basic FBI investigation of the Oswald hypothesis. I am prepared to never have this film printed out, but simply to use it on the reader, as I write particular sections (that is the purpose of having everything grouped by topic). However, what I would really like is for those who are still doing serious research on this case, to order sections in which they are interested at 5¢/page. I can then have the commercial firm in town print out the entire film; ~~XXXX~~ if I can get three or four people interested, at about 5¢/page, I think I can get large sections printed out in multiple copies, and all I will have to do is mail them.

Anyway, you will be receiving this index, which I hope to xerox

in 1/3 or 1/4 of the pages.

(V1400P)

**from me each*

At this time, I request that this is for your use only. Too much blood and sweat has gone into it to permit it to be circulated among others, and especially those from whom I can't even get the time of day.

Back to CD 5, page 400.

It is a very exciting find. For the first day or so, I interpreted it just as you did. However, now I am leaning toward a different interpretation.

Somewhere in my files, I have a news account of a Dallas reporter (in one of the Texas papers) who ~~was interviewed~~ interviewed or spoke to someone who was present at the arraignment. He said that when Oswald ~~was~~ was read the charges, ~~he~~ ~~snapped~~ ~~back~~ ~~and~~ ~~said~~ ~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~snapped~~ ~~back~~ (...did ~~he~~ kill John F. Kennedy by shooting him with a gun...etc) he snapped back "That's ridiculous!"

So, the question I am raising is:

which of the following situations are we dealing with?

1) an arraignment which never took place; Fritz telling the truth on Monday, and then everybody getting together and collusively perjuring themselves later to fabricate an arraignment??

OR

2) An arraignment which did take place. Reactions of Oswald, and possibly a transcript, which were very embarrassing. Fritz, on Monday, ~~made~~ ~~attempts~~ attempts to get around the problem of an embarrassing ~~transcript~~ (if not dynamite laden--god only knows what Oswald said under such conditions, as ~~push~~ came to shove) transcript, by denying the existence of the arraignment; then, later, thought better of it, and come up with a story about a real arraignment, all right; but one where there was no transcript!

(I realize, of course, that ^{your} book makes the point that ~~those~~ those present where the arraignment was supposed to have taken place don't give support ^{to} its existence. This could be a decisive fact.)

Whether its suppressed transcript, or fabricated arraignment, we are dealing with quite a bit of dirty business here.

I would like to also point out to you something that you didn't mention and possibly didn't notice: the synopsis to CD 5 states; ~~in~~ regard to this section,

Oswald charged with murder of President Kennedy....

Perhaps this is, legally speaking, a literal truth. But I can't help wondering whether or not those lines are written by Shanklin, Dallas FBI head, to misrepresent in a synopsis to headquarters, what he knew very well to be an underlying damaging fact. Notice also, how synopsis says that Oswald was arrested at 2pm "and placed in Dallas City Jail". This, too, is certainly false. Oswald was taken up to Fritz' office,

I will be covering, in quite some detail, the relationship between the Dallas field office and the Washington headquarters of the FBI. The rat that I think emits the strongest smell is located not in the FBI in Washington, but rather high in the Dallas field office.

And as far as Oswald's relationship with Captain Fritz, (or, should I say, Fritz with Oswald?) goes, perhaps the following quote, wrenched out of context from Brecht~~XX~~, best explains ~~XXX~~ where it stood by Sunday AM:

"Fritz, everything is tolerable except one thing: that we're not looking each other in the eyes during the last hour that remains to us."

Brecht's Jewish Wife.

Well, back to research, writing, and filing; which I am ~~XXXXXXXX~~ am doing 16 hours a day, The library is now open to midnight, now that school has begun here. I get to campus in the morning at 9, eat breakfast, play 1 hour of squash with a friend of mine, and am seated here by 11pm. I go home when it closes. I feel I am making good progress and am quite excited by the way everything looks.

You will be receiving from me the draft of the index; also, some other pages that I xerox'd for you.

Best wishes,

David

P.S. Although I can't find it in any of the three letters in front of me just now, I know that you raised a question regarding use of your Givens material, and the Ball-Belin documentation. If you have a chance to ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ put to good public use any of this material, in any format whatsoever, please feel free to do so. If such opportunities do not come up, I would appreciate it if the existance of this documentation doesn't get on the grapevine, just now.

PFS I am mailing this letter Monday evening; it gets picked up at the mailbox tuesday monring at 5 in the morning. With an airmail stamp, it would almost definitely be delievered Wednesday monning in New York. Let me know when it arrives.

reminder of requests contained herein

copies of:

- 423-429 CD 897 re Gandy (can omit 423, its just a title page)
- 42-46 CD 1518 re gouged-out hole.

Thankyou for your communication of 9 27 69; appears to be good background information.