

23 April 1970

Miss Margaret Simmons
1107 Lytle Lane
Kerrville, Texas

Dear Margaret,

I don't remember that we ever corresponded about Fred Korth, but I must admit that my memory for the endless ramifications and facts of this case, including my own work and correspondence, is not what it used to be. In any event, Korth was actually the attorney for the plaintiff, Mr. Ekdahl, who initiated the divorce proceedings. Marguerite Oswald in her testimony (2H 251) stated that "Mr. Fred Korth represented Mr. Ekdahl.." This is reflected also in CE 1960-A, the legal petition for divorce, which is signed by Korth on behalf of Ekdahl (Volume XXIII, page 786).

By coincidence, I was having a late lunch today by myself. I have always found it impossible to eat alone unless I read to keep my mind as well as my jaws at work. I had not yet opened my mail but I put it aside for a paperback book, which is easier to handle while wielding (wielding?) knife and fork--Bishop's book, which I had picked up the other day, having refused to enrich him to the extent of buying the hard-cover edition. I got about ten pages into this piece of pulp, and then, having finished lunch, opened my mail to find that you too are reading this companion-piece to Manchester's diarrhea-of-the-pen. These two smart operators have really mastered the historian racket--they just make it up as they go along, and then sit counting the royalties.

I feel certain that I will detest and despise Bishop's book no less than Manchester's. I notice that he includes Accessories in his list of sources, but I am certain, sight unseen, that he will not address himself to a single argument or revelation of facts which make a liar of the Warren Commission. On a spot check, I see that he merely parrots the WR account of Givens' return to the 6th floor without any apparent acquaintance with my objections to that or the evidence I have set forth which points to perjury and collusion, by Givens and the police. (I might add that documents I obtained from the Archives last summer all but authenticated my reasoning on Givens and satisfied me that such charges are indeed warranted.)

What was on page 12 of the 4/20/70 Time? What has disappeared? What else, I should have said. I will see if I can hunt up a copy. As for Skolnick: he is not the first to sue the Government for access to everything in the Archives on the JFK assassination. Dr. John Nichols of Kansas, who has done quite serious work on the evidence, filed such a suit about six months ago or more, as the AP might know if it was on its sleepy toes. At least one more suit of this kind is being prepared, about which I am not at liberty to say anything. I was hopeful and excited when I saw the NY Times story on Skolnick, of whom I had never before heard, reasoning that if he had had the sense to steer clear of all the critics he might be doing some definitive work. But I discovered that he was in fact in touch with some of the critics, and squabbling with one of them, and also that he charges that two of the Chicago Seven (Davis and Dellinger) are really Government agents!! This was not very encouraging. The next day I had a long phone conversation with Skolnick, and this did nothing to reduce my pessimism. On the contrary. He is completely uninformed about the case, and seems to have built his entire attack on a variety of rumors and hearsay by dubious informants. I hope that he does not prove to be a "Second Garrison."

I have no contacts at Life, alas. The two contacts I did have in 1966 have long departed. Speaking of Austin: I had an article published in the Texas Observer--the 4/3/70 issue, I believe--which I have not yet even seen, although I expect copies to arrive momentarily. It is always good to hear from you, Margaret. All the best,