

10 25 69

Dear Sylvia,

Just came home from the library to fetch my more late model typewriter and bring it up there, and got your letter of Oct 22. The following information I had already inserted in the draft of a letter that mainly concerns my ABNP index, and your master list which, by the way, I was delighted to receive. I was just about to ask you whether such an entity existed and, if so, could you send it.

(I have just xerox'd what you sent, by the way, and it will be returned to you as soon as I get near my larger, manila envelopes, and ~~XXXXXX~~ go through the inevitable "sort" process that follows any of my xeroxing.)

Now, re the Finck transcript.

~~IXXXX~~ already have it. I just received it last Saturday, I believe. And, as you know, I already have Frazier.

I have been in constant contact with Paul. Only last night, Paul reiterated to me on the phone that he obtained that transcript solely through the good offices of Dr. Nichols. Paul specifically asked Nichols, quite specifically and in writing I believe, whether there were any restrictions on that. As I understand it, Nichols did not specify any restrictions. However, ~~XXXXXX~~ Paul added that "you know how Harold is" and went on to add that Weisberg usually doesn't like anything to get into anybody's hands until he can "make proper use of it".

So, probably out of deference to ~~XXXX~~ Harold, you don't find Paul making a major mailing of the thing, and you, I, and I believe one or two other people are the only ones he happen to have notified.

I had called Paul to tell him that I had made two extra copies of both the Finck and Frazier transcripts last weekend, and did he know of anyone who might want one and obtain it from me, because I have numerous little expenses that tend to add up--- everything from commercial tape duplicating, to large xerox orders on material which I can't take out of the library and hence must pay 10¢/page for etc. (If you know of anyone, by the way, feel free to send them my way. The material is already packaged and in jiffy bags, ready to go.)

Incidentally, I have great respect for Paul's wish to stay out of intramural arguments of any type; for that reason, I think it would be wise not to mention to Harold anything about my relationship with Paul. Whether or not he has any right to do so (and I'm sure Harold has no such right, for I feel certain that not a dime of his money paid for the originals of Dr. Nichols' transcripts,) I feel certain that he might well try to ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ raise a fuss with Nichols re Paul's actions, none of which will serve any good purpose.

Incidentally, all Dr. N had was Finck, Frazier, and his own. (I'm not interested in that one). Next on the priority list would be to somehow get Zapruder's and Shaneyfelt. Quotes from Shaneyfelt would be most useful for handling the topic of the FBI's handling of and use of (ie: non-use) of that film as a piece

of evidence which raised serious questions re the autopsy conclusions. Secondly, as a pair, both Shaneyfelt and Z's testimony (plus many fine documents Tink sent me re Z's contract) will be used for a most and intriguing and enlightening discussion regarding the authenticity of the Z film itself. (Fred's splice discoveries etc.) What makes me so interested in the transcript, although I have the Times-Pic stories on all these appearances, is that the Finck one turned out to have so much that never made the papers that is relevant. I was astonished to find Finck providing answers to such questions as "how come your clinical summary says '3 shots' " etc. I don't remember anything like that being in the papers. It's obvious that a serious student of the case, and certainly anyone drafting a manuscript, needs the transcripts, and would be foolish ~~not~~ to forego getting them. Rather, I am assuming that this sort of problem will be solved, given a little time.

I am writing the court reporter re Shaneyfelt and Z just to get the price.

And oh yes, another reason I am so enthused over Z etc. Remember all those questions you raised as to when could the splicing have been done? Well, I have found out some new facts. In the summer of 1967----almost the entire summer---was spent in front of a microfilm reader going through papers from Austin, Ft. Worth, San Antonio, Dallas, and Houston---all five cities JFK was to visit (with the 10--get that, 10!!--- motorcades.) I did all my notetaking then. A few months ago, I spent considerable time putting the proper file classification on all pages, sometimes multiple ones, when necessary, and then, as time permitted, started xeroxing all pages for eventual subject-filing.

Well, I was just recently subject filing one of the last remaining piles, and what drops out of that sort process but a story in the FWST (Ft. Worth Star Telegram), Saturday morning, Nov 23, based on interviews with Zapruder's wife late Friday night, to the effect that he was still not home, because he was closeted with FBI agents with his film.

Now tell me, besides the brief time spent with Sorrells that afternoon, and the interviews with Z we all know about---had you known or seen mentioned anywhere that Zapruder was closeted with the FBI (or, more exactly, what his wife reports is the FBI) Friday night?? The point being, that the splices by themselves raised questions. And, naturally, next came the logical question: "But when could this have been done"? I fully realize, of course, that I don't have evidence that the film was monkeyed with Friday night, certainly not direct evidence. What I do have is brand new information of the whereabouts of that film before it was sold to Life, information that is far more incriminating than, let's say, if Z spent the entire evening home watching Walter Cronkite, while his film was safely stored in the family refrigerator. I feel I now have what may be the basis for an interview with Z someday (and assuming my ms. gets finished and properly placed---after that event, when, hopefully, someone else can help pay for the trip). And, what I'd like to do, is confront him with that story, his spliced frames, and a photocopy of his contract, and tell him I fully intend to publish it (its a public document, you know, on account of Tink's suit, but shhh!) Perhaps he will be induced to say something. I know two people who have spoken to Z, and one actually is a friend of a personal friend. So we'll see. Well, this letter has gotten very long.

I just wanted to say hello, assure you I have the transcripts, and tell you that I hope your friend's problem gets worked out.

And I reiterate....Paul's relationship with Dr. Nichols is bi-lateral. It is Paul who arranged, by mail, with Dr. Nichols (who once met him, by the way, when on a trip to Berkeley for some type of conference) to get those transcripts.

Of course, I don't care a whit if Harold has the last word on this particular matter of fact. I'm just delighted to have the transcripts.

And further, should you ever desire to have yours copied and sent to anyone, I am sure you would get the same answer from Paul that I got: that there are no restrictions upon it as far as Nichols was concerned.

Thanks for your concern. Alls well that ends well, and you shall be hearing from me more...

All the best

David



P.S. And I can't resist adding this...that in my most angry moment, and no matter how I feel personally towards someone, I could not conceive of myself withholding permission or standing in the way of ~~XXX~~ another person's acquiring basic source materials, if they are working on something authentic and have the chance of it getting published, and it did not interfere with my own work.

I don't care if my covering letter would read: "Here, you son of a \_\_\_\_\_, enclosed find item X Y Z for which I acknowledge receipt of your check # 123.etc.". I would still make it available.

I just wouldn't do a thing like that. Look what's happened in 3 short years, with Ray Marcus refusing to share the best copy of the Z film around; Harold, who if he had his wish, would dictate who has access to Frazier and Binck transcripts. I have learned so much re the politics and personalities of cliques in "movements" from being involved and associated with this thing.