

HSC Schedule: Take your pick: from pro-HSC sources, "mid-July for sure, maybe early July." From anti-HSC sources, "August if they're lucky."

Clippings:

1. 6 May 79 Wash. Star [5 pp.] Belin on the HSC. Seems to be a routinely edited version of his 4/27 National Review article (4/28 list, #3; the silliest paragraph (about the acoustics) is among those removed.)
2. 2 Jun 79 AP (in Berk. Gazette) [1 p.] "Kennedy death conspiracy cited by House committee." Short, routine. Says the AP was shown the draft of the organized crime section of the report in March.
3. 3 Jun 79 AP (in NYT, p. 1-18) [1 p.] Similar to #2 supra. The primary evidence about Cubans is said to be Odio's testimony.
- * 4. 5 Jun 79 UPI (in S.F. Examiner) [1 p.] Followup to story in #5. A silly pro-conspiracy slant: "Girl tells mystery figures near JFK assassination," i.e. 'two figures' on a railroad trestle.
- ** 5. 6 Jun 79 L.A. Times (in S.F. Chronicle) [4 pp.] Mostly written by David Lui, age 19, of Beverly Hills; tells how, with great difficulty, he identified the running girl in the Z film as Rosemary Willis. (The easy way: see the map and list of witnesses in Six Seconds, pp. 252-3, 268; note Willis and his other daughter in the WC's witness list (WR 499); and read their testimony, especially 7H493, where Willis identified the running girl as his daughter.)
- ** 6. 6 Jun 79 S.F. Chronicle [1 p.] Front-page summary and headline for #5.

More on the Rosemary Willis story: Lui wouldn't pass my high school course, either on his research methods or his logic. (He thinks that Rosemary's apparent reaction to an early shot is anti-conspiracy evidence.) Still, no big deal. The question is, how does this get to be a full page in the Chronicle? UPI (clip #4) credited this story to the L.A. Times Syndicate, but as far as I can tell, the L.A. Times didn't use the story themselves - must have been a fit of good judgment! There is an epilogue (no author indicated) which tells how Lui presented his findings to the HSC, with no known reaction; it implies that they ignored his evidence in favor of the acoustics study, which "Dallas police department radio specialists have continued to dispute." Remember how the L.A. Times treated the acoustics - Weiss on one side, Pellicano and the DPD on the other, so who can say? The Chron played this as "Search for JFK Mystery Witness," and "a startling new clue that disputes the conspiracy theory...." Maybe this is someone's idea of balancing the Marcello-Trafficante-Hoffa story of the previous week. Whatever, it tells us more about the press than about the assassination.

Jaworski's book, "Confession and Avoidance," has a whole chapter on the JFK case. I just skimmed it, but was struck by a Belinesque footnote dismissing the acoustics evidence. (Anyone want to send me a copy?) And people think only the critics can be illogical! (Incidentally, a review I saw mentions that Jaworski admits suppressing evidence linking someone in the Ford White House to the Korean scandal.)

Filler: I gather that Ben Bradlee has gotten more flak for suppressing "Doonesbury" than for losing the 1967 Pearson-Anderson column with the Morgan-Roselli story. So, this is for my Washington friends. (Greetings from California!)

