

Some of you will be pleased to see that this issue is not entirely about the acoustics. I'm starting to plow through a backlog of clippings, queries, and documents. As many of you know, I've gotten way behind on my correspondence; I intend to start catching up soon. Please keep your letters and information coming. Various things have kept me busy: a new batch of CIA documents (including responses to my memo to the Rockefeller Commission), for example. Thanks to ABC's program on Hoover, I have gotten back into what Castro may have said about Oswald in Mexico. But now for something completely different:

Acoustics:

I have no major new developments to report, since the release of the Ramsey Panel study. I am pursuing some aspects of their probability arguments, but I'll spare you the details. I hope to see a detailed response from the HSC experts fairly soon.

I am told that the Ramsey Report can be obtained for \$9.41 (which presumably includes postage) from the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20418.

29. (1964) 9 pages from the WC files relating to the DPD tapes. Includes correspondence with the FBI, and a May 28 letter to the Secret Service in Dallas, asking that the DPD tapes be recorded. All fairly routine, but anyone who wants to plow through the documentary record on the chain of custody of the recordings, and the various transcripts, should have these items.

30. 1 Oct 80 [DL 89-43-10553, 6 pp.] FBI interview of Capt. Bowles and other DPD personnel, with considerable technical information about the recording system, and the preparation of the transcripts. (Bowles said the FBI took the belts a few days after the assassination, but he was probably confusing the FBI and the Secret Service.)

31. 13 Feb 81 [FBI 94-1-15223-215, 6 pp.] Internal memo on the appearance of FBI technical personnel before the Ramsey Panel on 31 Jan 81. The discussion of substance is brief; you can tell that the Panel was critical, but not how critical they were or what the mood was. ("The Committee questioned the arbitrary selection of a gunshot from the GREENKILL matter....") Pages 4 and 5 consist of the addresses of Panel members. I would like to see the Panel's account of this session with the FBI experts.

32. Jan. 1982 Summary (by Chris Scally) of available information on the duplication and disposition of the DPD recordings.

* 33. 2 Feb 82 Letter from Barger to Ramsey, including the refined presentation of the correlations from the 3 non-knoll shots which I summarized in 4 EOC 1, pp. 2-3. Barger said he had not thought of any way in which an artifact could have led to these results; the Ramsey Report did not provide one. [9 pp.]

34. 22 Mar 82 (TCI) Eleven pages on the acoustics, including a 9-page wrapup by Gary Mack. Most of the material has been covered in a different form in EOC. (The time annotations for the end of each belt in the FBI transcript do not show that the FBI was working with copies; the Ramsey Panel's belts are 30 minutes each, not 15 minutes.)

35. 12 Apr 82 Letter from Barbara Jorgenson of the NAS to Todd Vaughan, describing the "public-access file" which will be prepared after the completion of the Ramsey Report. Transcripts, sub-panel reports, information from outside sources which was used, and post-publication comments will be included.

* Washington station: please be alert for the release of this file.

36. 22 Apr 82 Another letter from Jorgenson to Vaughan, claiming "no firm idea" when the report will be completed.

* 37. 14 Apr 82 (reprinted in TCI 4/22) "Doubt cast on theory that pair shot at JFK," by Earl Golz [2 pp.] Sgt. Beilharz says there is "a very, very strong possibility" it was his microphone. Ramsey first heard about Beilharz on April 13, Golz reports; Ramsey said he intended to talk to Beilharz and thought it should help a lot. (Ramsey's conversation with Beilharz is mentioned on p. 94

of the report.) Beilharz is not Bowles's prime candidate; that officer is "in very declining health." (Bowles says he hasn't been asked to identify him.)

38. 15-16 Apr 82 (in TCI 4/22, 2 pp.) Two extremely silly columns in the Dallas Times Herald, ridiculing Golz's report on the acoustics (and the Kurtz book). I am told that this nonsense is part of a circulation battle between the DTH and the DMN.

39. 13 May 82 Very short press release by BBN, noting only that the RR "raises a scientific controversy about complex technical issues," and promising a detailed statement later.

40. 14 May 82 [3 pp.] National Research Council (NAS) news release. Quotes Frank Press's cover letter to the AG, as noted in 4 EOC 2, end of p. 2.

41. The RR's executive summary, as attached to #40 (and in 4 EOC 2). [2 pp.]

42. 14 May 82 Form letter from Ramsey to "the many people who have written helpful suggestions" to his Committee. Ramsey hopes that we will agree with the major conclusions of the report, even though they may differ from our prior conclusions. "The Committee members also started with quite opposite views but they found that the evidence was so convincing that all agreed unanimously to the report." (We know from the RR that no member was convinced by the HSC analysis after the first meetings with the HSC experts; these meetings were preceded, I understand, by a very critical memo to the other members from Alvarez.)

43. 14 May 82 Statement by Rep. Stokes, expressing an intention to work for Congressional hearings.

44. 14 May 82 Transcript (prepared by PLH) of coverage by the 3 TV networks. All the reports were brief; NBC (the longest) quoted Blakey: "... and I think they have taken the easy way out, by suggesting that the evidence is not there that there was a conspiracy."

* 45. 15 May 82 (Lardner, WP) "Kennedy 2d Gunman Is Disputed" This is, I think, the only press coverage I have seen which includes anything beyond the RR itself (and the obvious background). Lardner noted what the RR said about the sirens, and pointed out that there was no mention of the HSC's explanation: a UPI photo showing McLain lagging behind in Dealey Plaza. (Barger called this aspect of the Report "disingenuous.") Lardner also pushed Ramsey into saying more than the RR did about what the HSC actually had been looking at: "'The chances of its being static or other noise are higher than previously estimated,' Ramsey said. Higher than gunshots? 'Yes, okay, higher than gunshots,' he said." You won't find a number to back up this statement in the Ramsey Report.

46. (Photo accompanying #45 - Moorman)

47. 14 May (UPI in SFX) and 15 May (AP in SFC) (Routine coverage)

48. 14 May (Reuter in Montreal Gazette) and 15 May (AP in NYT, p. 35)

Both reports note Stokes' comments (#43).

49. 15 May (Ostrow, LAT) and 24 May (Newsweek) Ostrow notes the LAT's 1979 report that the HSC staff had withheld anti-acoustics information from the members. Both reports note Press's comments (#40). "Conspiracy buffs need not despair," says Newsweek, despairingly.

50. 15 May (UPI in LA Daily News, and a version of #45 in Oakland Tribune)

51. 14 May Actual text of dispatch by Warren Leary, AP science writer

52. 14 May (AP in Orange County Daily Pilot, page one, with a full 6-column headline) "JFK tape: 'No second gunman'"

53. 14-15 May (Two AP dispatches, in the Register [San Diego?])

54. 15 May (AP in Dallas Times Herald and Detroit News)

55. 15 May (AP [?] in Detroit Free Press)

56. Biographies of all but 3 panelists, from "Who's Who"-like sources. One Nobel Prize winner (Alvarez), one former senior vice president of BBN (Elkind), and one member of the Council on Foreign Relations (Garwin).

57. June 1982 [4 pp.] Part of Bob Cutler's "Grassy Knoll Gazette" It's a bit hard to figure out what Cutler's message is (besides some gloating), but I think his best point is that the HSC's other physical/medical evidence - which "established" that only Oswald hit JFK - was not subjected to this much careful scrutiny, and should be.

58. 11 Jun 82 [4 pp.] My outline of possible further acoustics-related work. (An unpolished memo, with not much information not previously in EOC.)

Credits: Thanks to J. Barger (#39), R. Blakey (31), R. Cutler (57), M. Di Giovanni (49a, 52, 53a-b, 54a), J. Goldberg (45, 48b), G. Hollingsworth (49a-b, 50a), G. Mack (30, 34), J. Martin (49a, 53a-b), C. Scally (32), and T. Vaughan (35, 36, 51, 54b, 55).

I would like to get more clippings (other than routine AP and UPI reports). Was there anything with a local angle in the Boston papers? Anything in science journals or sleazy tabloids? The L.A. papers are being well covered, but I got only one copy of the NYT and WP clips (from a Washington reader). I'll let you know when I start getting duplicates on a regular basis. If in doubt, you can just tell me about items you have noticed (rather than sending copies).

Clippings, etc.: On the JFK case, other major assassinations, and individuals who might turn out to be relevant:

* 59. 1981 Pp. 218-9 of the paperback edition of "Music for Chameleons," by Truman Capote. In a purportedly factual account of an interview with Robert Beausoleil of the Manson gang, Capote says that he met Oswald in Moscow shortly after his defection, in the company of an Italian journalist friend. Capote says they talked to Oswald for about half an hour, and the Italian decided he wasn't worth filing a story about. Does anyone know anything about this, including the identity and affiliation of the alleged Italian?

60. 1981 [3 pp.] Excerpts from "Media-Power-Politics," by Paletz and Entman, on the accidentally released HSC transcript on dealing with the press.

61. 12 May 81 (Boston Phoenix) A favorable review of "Best Evidence" by ex-AIB'er Harvey Yazijian. "Unfortunately, it was published in a climate more concerned with domestic tranquillity than with airing out Washington's back rooms. It is easier to dismiss David Lifton as just another Warren Commission nut than to give up long-held political misconceptions." [3 pp.]

62. July 1981 (Hustler) Favorable review of "Best Evidence" by Theodore Sturgeon. (On the same page: illustrated review of "The Lingerie Book.")

* 63. 24 Sep 81 [2 pp.] Notes and partial transcript (by PLH) of Blakey and Cavett on "Tomorrow." Blakey mentions periodically briefing Sen. Kennedy during the investigation; he has begun to read the literature on the RFK assassination, and it bothers him; he's not personally afraid of the mob, since his book has "certified their power and immunity from the law" - but his wife starts his car in the mornings! Ironically, "what could be done is relatively simple, and would be as effective today as it would have been in '64, and I really won't tell you what it is, because I have just a little bit of hope that maybe the FBI will get off their butts and go out and do it. But it requires a certain amount of ... lack of anticipation by the other side."

64. Oct 1981 (Washingtonian) "Could RFK [and other shooting victims] have been saved?" (with today's techniques) [2 pp.] RFK, maybe; JFK and Lincoln, no.

65. Oct 1981 (Justice Assistance News) The new chairman of the Conference of State Court Administrators is Eugene J. Murret of Louisiana - LHO's first cousin and Dutz Murret's son. Larry Haapanen says that Murret was executive counsel when McKeithen was governor.

66. 15 Oct - 4 Nov 81 [6 items, 12 pages total] Commentaries by Baxter Ward of KABC-TV news, on Loran Hall's Los Angeles rifle. (See, e.g., Canfield & Weberman, p. 137.) Ward's commentary relies on the next two items only.

67. (9 Mar 77) Affidavit of Richard Hathcock, the L.A. detective who took Hall's rifle as security for a \$100 loan. (Hathcock has known Ward since about 1963.) [4 pp.]

68. (9 Mar 77) Affidavit of Roy Payne, Hathcock's partner [9 pp.]

* 69. (12 Dec 74) My writeup (in unedited draft form) of the Hall rifle incident. It's hard to summarize, but for some reason the FBI became very interested in this rifle within a day or so of the assassination, and noted quite a bit of information about Hall's anti-Castro associates.

70. 23 Nov 63 [FBI 62-109060-1042, AIB #353, 4 pp.] The initial report on the Hall rifle, for some reason with the heading "Dick Watley." A copy of this report was filed in "134-6356 (Davis)"; Howard K. Davis shared Watley's Miami address; the category "134" is said to relate to security informants. There's definitely something strange in all this; can anyone figure it all out?

71. (June 1964) The version of the previous FBI report which reached the Warren Commission months later (as CD 1179, pp. 295-8), buried with lots of miscellaneous junk reports. It concludes: "No further investigation was conducted as it is obvious that the rifle mentioned above was not used in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy."

I realize that my comments here don't explain my interest in this matter. For further details, ask for the documents, especially #69-70. HSC sources, here's a chance for you to be helpful. Was Watley CIA? Is that why the FBI lost interest in this story?

* 72. 29 Oct 81 (MH) "How the FBI spied on Dr. King" A review, by Garry Wills, of David Garrow's book. (See 3 EOC 7, #603-4.) The Garrow book is well worth reading (even though he stays away from the MLK assassination controversy). The scholarship is impressive, but the tone is a bit too scholarly for my tastes; some of his factual discoveries (the identities of Solo and Fedora, the background of Levison) deserve some speculative and journalistic attention also. Wills notes "the webs that Hoover had woven. From his file he brings a transcript of Dr. King discussing the dead President Kennedy's sex life; he shows it to Robert Kennedy, who thereby is reminded that those files already had material on the President's affairs;" when LBJ saw this, he "must have wondered what Hoover had on him."

73. 6 Nov 81 (Andrew Liddell, Hartford Courant) "Kennedy shooting critic [David Lifton] defends cover-up theory" In a speech at a Hartford college, Lifton said he was working on a sequel, for publication on the 20th anniversary.

74. 19 Nov 81 (Congressional Record) Comments by Rep. Stokes (and Fithian) on the introduction of the Violence Control Act of 1982, to implement some of the HSC's recommendations. Drafted by Blakey, the bill (summarized here) deals with "federally cognizable personal violence" and includes gun control. [6 pp.]

75. 22 Nov 81 (Liddell, Courant) "Report on shooting tape due: Probes into JFK conspiracies continue" (Includes a summary of the medical/physical evidence problems.)

76. Dec 1981 (American Photographer) "Contact: Bob Jackson" [2 pp.] Jackson (now in Colorado) talks about the circumstances of his famous photo of Ruby shooting Oswald. Contact prints of 21 photos are included; without explanation, #6 (shortly after the shooting) has been edited out. Anyone know about this?

77. Dec 1981 (Science Digest) "Assassin!" (by Richard Restak) [5 pp.] The psychiatric approach; this article is better than many, in at least noting that non-assassins (including even their targets) can be weird too. David Rothstein (consultant to the WC) suggests that LHO "may somehow have believed" that JFK had approved the murder of Diem, which was interpreted as meaning that he somehow had government permission to do the same sort of thing three weeks later! (I'm not making this up, you know.)

78. 16 Dec 81 (MN) "Hunt libel suit begins" and (MH) "Watergate burglar denies assassination role" (Hunt vs. Liberty Lobby re Marchetti article.)

79. 16 Dec 81 (AP in Montreal Gazette) "Hunt denies JFK killing involvement"

80. 18 Dec 81 (AP) "[Hunt] wins \$650,000 in libel suit...."

81. 18 Dec 81 (MN & MH) More on Hunt's libel victory. His suit against Canfield and Weberman is pending. [2 pp.] (MN, MH = Miami News, Miami Herald)

82. 23 Dec 81 (MN) "Howard Hunt enjoys 'his golden years'" [2 pp.] A fairly interesting summary of Hunt's personal and political views.

83. 19 Dec 81 (Carmichael, UPI) "The latest Kennedy theory: 'One man doesn't create a code for himself'" [wire service copy, 3 pp.] Classical pseudo-science from a family therapist in Iowa. DeMohrenschildt and Oswald are "numerically connected," and the key to the code is the "815" in the car license plate in the tourist photo of LHO in Minsk. (I'm not making this up either!)

[Clippings list continued in next issue]

ABC News Closeup on J. Edgar Hoover:

84. 20-26 Feb 82 (TV Guide) One paragraph (in the "TV Teletype" column) on the program coming "in March." The lead: "Could President Kennedy's assassination have been prevented by the FBI?" The producer promises "absolutely new information."

85. 26-27 May 82 (AP in MG and WP) "FBI reportedly learned in '64 of Oswald offer to Cubans" (WP) ABC says Hoover sent one of the Childs brothers (his "Solo" informants in the CPUSA) to find out what Castro knew about the assassination, and Castro told him about Oswald's offer (while at the Embassy in Mexico City) to kill JFK for the Cubans. This information is attributed to FBI agent Hosty.

86. 27 May 82 (Kihss, NYT) "Rosenberg case linked to breaking of Soviet code" Robert Lamphere of the FBI appears on the ABC program with this claim. (He has a book coming out in a year and a half. In 1980, a reference to intercepts damaging to the Rosenbergs appeared in Martin's "Wilderness of Mirrors.")

87. 3 Jun 72 (SFC) Ad for the June 3 ABC broadcast. "Why did he withhold information vital to the [JFK] investigation?"

I'll have more to say after I have seen the transcript, which is available for \$2 from ABC at P.O. Box 770, Ansonia Station, NY 10023. On the whole, I thought the program was very good for commercial TV. On the JFK case, it seemed to be a bit unfair to Hoover - no mean feat, although Epstein managed it in "Legend." For example, of all the culpable actions relating to the CIA's plots against Castro, Hoover not volunteering what he knew to the Warren Commission has to rank pretty far down on the list.

What particularly interests me is Hosty's claim that Solo was the source of the story that Oswald had offered to kill Kennedy for Cuba. If ABC had not alleged that someone else had confirmed this story, I would be strongly inclined to believe that Hosty had just read the Garrow book and tried to put two and two together. I would be very surprised if Hosty knew about the Solo operation, either before or after the assassination, in the course of his official duties. (He may have gotten information from HSC sources, I suppose.)

The basic facts about Oswald's alleged remarks are set out with great discretion in the Blakey-Billings book (pp. 144-8) and in the HSC report (pp. 121-2). Ultimately, the HSC did not believe this story, but Blakey did.

It is generally believed (but not conclusively established) that the confidential source involved is the one referred to in CD 1359 (#88 below). In 1976, the WP (#90) passed on the "educated guess" that the source was Rolando Cubela, a.k.a. AMLASH. A few months ago, I was told that various Angletonian types were letting it be known that the sensitive source was Fedora (Victor Lessiovski, also identified in the Garrow book), which sounds plausible enough. Also, there have been rumors of NAS bugs which might have picked up post-assassination conversations among Cuban embassy personnel.

I'm in no position to identify the confidential source, or to evaluate Hosty's latest allegation. His previous "bombshells" have been disputable, to say the least. (See, for example, 2 EOC 11, pp. 6-7.) The HSC was briefed about the Solo operation, presumably in connection with the King case, so it is conceivable that Hosty learned something at the time of his dispute with the HSC. I am told that the CPUSA says that the Childs brothers were not informants. (Does anyone have clippings?) Safire has said that they were triple agents! (#1981.604) This issue gets very complicated very fast. If the source says Fidel said it, did Fidel say it? If Fidel said it, did Oswald say it? If Oswald said it, what does that imply - premeditation, a provocation, or what?

Approaching the problem from a different angle, perhaps we can shed some light on all this secret information by checking out the alleged public confirmation - Comer Clark's 1967 article in the National Enquirer. Clark wrote about an encounter with Castro outside an Italian restaurant in Havana. (Castro and Chris-Dodd both said they didn't give interviews in a pizzeria, but that's not what Clark claimed.)

Clark asked if Cuba was involved in the assassination, and Castro replied with an account of Oswald's threat, adding that perhaps he could have saved JFK by notifying the U.S. government; however, he hadn't taken Oswald's comments seriously.

The HSC dismissed Clark's account, largely because he had written for the "sensationalist press" in England. (3 HSC 283) The Blakey book "discounts" it, "but not entirely." Such a compromise position is hard to sustain. It certainly is implausible that Castro would make these comments to a journalist whose name he did not know, and then deny it to the HSC. But it is even less plausible that Clark made the story up out of thin air. While he may have invented a meeting with Castro, how could he have come up with a story which (we are now told) had been sent to the Warren Commission in a top secret letter, and which was presumably known only in high intelligence circles? One alternative is that Clark's report is completely accurate; what are the other alternatives?

What I am wondering, of course, is whether Clark's source might have been not Castro but someone who knew of the 1964 report (from Solo, Fedora, Cubela, the NAS, or whomever).

A closer look at Clark's career and writings is called for. (Castro suggested this to the HSC in 1978 [3 HSC 208].) The HSC noted that he had written articles like "British girls as Nazi sex slaves" and "German plans to kidnap the royal family." Okay, the titles don't sound like the New York Times, but what were the articles like? Were there German plans to kidnap the royal family? How might Clark have found out about them? Is there any indication he had intelligence sources in England? Where were these articles published? What else did he write about?

I am not willing to defer to the HSC's investigation of Clark's reputation. He died in 1972, but it should be possible to talk to friends and colleagues. I would appreciate any information from my readers in the British Isles.

Several years ago I got quite involved in Oswald's Mexico trip. I talked with Daniel Schorr (who wrote about Oswald's alleged threat in the New York Review, and in his book), and put together quite a collection of documents. Relevant items are scattered through several files, but if someone wants to pursue this matter I can provide quite a bit of background information. Here are a few key items, for starters:

88. 17 Jun 64 (FBI 105-82555-4117; AIB #465; CD 1359) Top secret letter, Hoover to Rankin. [2 pp.] The good stuff is withheld, but the unclassified references to consistent information in an available Castro speech deserve scrutiny.

89. 15 Oct 67 (National Enquirer) The Comer Clark article [2 pp.] (An illegible copy was published by the HSC as JFK exhibit F-428, 3 HSC 282.)

90. 13 Nov 76 (Goshko, WP) "Oswald reportedly told Cubans of plan to kill JFK," according to a Hoover memo "discovered" by the Justice Department.

91. 14 Nov 76 (Horrock, NYT) and 17 Nov (Kempster, LAT) Two more of several relevant articles appearing about this time. Alleged HSC and Schweiker Committee interest in the Hoover memo is mentioned. Kempster's source pointed out the similarity to the 1967 Enquirer article.

Just a little more on the acoustics:

92. July 1982 (Discover) "The shot that wasn't there" (From the "Skeptical Eye" section of this Time-Life science magazine.) Alvarez is "less reticent" than the HSC experts: "This is the kind of thing that happens when people have their minds made up. It is shocking," he says, "that you can take two completely unrelated incidents, and two separate groups of people will find them identical."

Now hold on a minute. Whatever else you say about Barger, Weiss, Blakey, and their colleagues, they were not conspiracy buffs when they started this analysis. Barger did not appear on CBS network TV in 1967 to support the Warren Commission; Alvarez did. Weiss and Aschkenasy did not publish a paper in 1976 on their non-acoustical studies of the shooting; Alvarez did. Before he was named to head the HSC investigation, Blakey did not say that he was "simply amazed" that anyone

would take the Warren Commission's case for a lone gunman seriously, but Alvarez took such a position on the HSC's acoustics evidence before the NAS panel existed.

93. 15 Jun 82 Letter submitted to "Discover" by Gary Mack. Gary says that the DPD's base station and receivers did not include automatic gain control circuitry, according to engineers familiar with the system; he believes that the crosstalk was copied.

Books and videotapes:

"Best Evidence" is out in paperback. (Dell, \$4.95) There is a short epilog written for this edition (and reprinted in TCI, 3/22). A good gift for any of your friends who missed the hardcover.

New from Bantam: "Conspiracy to Kill a President," by Brian Russell and Charles Sellier, based on the research done for the Taft International documentary. "Now a startling motion picture," says the cover, but the most startling thing about the film is that it has never gone into general release. It's probably a pretty decent film; the book is rather thin (140 pages, no index or footnotes, can be read in an hour or two) but worthwhile at \$2.50. There is much from the critics, including some material I wouldn't touch, but it could have been much worse: the critics are treated with respect, and some of the furthest-out theories (Eddowes, Epstein) are not featured. The authors seem to have gotten good interviews with Kantor, Blakey, Tink Thompson, Weisberg, and Peter Scott, among others. (You may well wonder why I am quoted [p. 111] on Hoffa's arms dealings. It's only because they wanted this on film; all I know is what I was asked to read, probably in "Spooks.")

On "Crime of the Century: The Kennedy Assassination from a Historian's Perspective," by Michael L. Kurtz, a history professor at Southeastern Louisiana University:

94. 5 Feb 82 (Publishers Weekly) Brief, favorable review. "Well reasoned and thought provoking."

95. 14 May 82 (Edwin McDowell's column on publishing in the NYT) A second printing has been ordered (after the initial 2000); there have been wire-service stories and inquiries from paperback publishers. Apparently all this is unusual for a university press book. Kurtz is said to contend there was a "carefully planned crossfire of four shots."

96. Promotional mailer and order blank from University of Tennessee Press. I'm generally not inclined to pay \$17.50 (plus \$1 postage and handling) for a 272-page book. After browsing through a copy, I'm even less inclined to buy it. I didn't see any evidence of a historian's perspective in one area where it is badly needed: the Garrison affair, which gets only a brief mention. The book is mostly about the shooting itself. Kurtz dismisses Lifton very unpersuasively; I didn't notice if Kurtz can reconcile his scenario (a head shot from each direction) with the medical evidence. If you have found anything noteworthy or persuasive in this book, please let me know.

A one-hour video cassette, "The Assassination of President Kennedy," has been produced by Bob Groden, with Prof. John Gordon. The tape is now being offered to colleges for \$300; once the production costs are covered, proceeds will go towards the formation of a research center on political assassinations at Western New England College. If you want to try to negotiate a more reasonable price, I suppose you could contact Gordon at that college (Springfield, MA 01119; 413-782-3111, ext. 204).

Item #97 (3 pp.) is Gordon's summary of the videotape, and of his hopes for a research center. The first half of the tape is motorcade footage, presumably the best collection available. (The segments are not individually identified.) The second half is a presentation, by Groden, of his case for conspiracy. There is some very important footage, of course, effectively presented (including the head shot in the Zapruder and Nix films, and motion behind the wall in the Nix film). (Alleged motion, that is; I can't afford the tape, and have seen a borrowed copy just once, on a borrowed machine.) I think the argument does not adequately

deal with the evidence (from the HSC and other sources) on such matters as the single-bullet theory, the head snap, the medical evidence, and the umbrella man. But in any case, this videotape is an important effort.

More books: I strongly recommend David Garrow's book on the FBI and Martin Luther King, and "The Kennedy Imprisonment," by Garry Wills. Also of interest: "Their Trade is Treachery," by Chapman Pincher (Bantam); on KGB infiltration of British intelligence (with several references to Angleton).

Credits: Thanks to D. Carmichael (#83), T. Davis (60), M. Ewing (64, 74), M. Di Giovanni (66-8), J. Goldberg (85b, 86, 95), J. Gordon (97), L. Haapanen (65), Susan Schumacher Hoch (59), G. Hollingsworth (80, 94), A. Liddell (73, 75), G. Mack (92-3), J. Meek (84), T. Rubinstein (89), L. Sproesser (84), T. Vaughan (92), G. Winslow (72, 78, 81-2), H. Yazijian (61), and Anonymous.

New CIA release:

James McCord. G. Robert Blakey. Harold Weisberg. James Earl Ray. Paul Hoch. Mark Allen. What do these people have in common? Representation by Bud Fensterwald or his current associate Jim Lesar, of course. Jim and Bud have been working on FOIA requests for the four critics in that motley nexus. Their latest triumph is the release of some 159 CIA documents (666 pages) which I have been after for years. Amazing, how the review sped up once we actually filed suit.

Many items are re-releases or generally familiar material. Of special interest to me are about 168 pages from 1975, including the CIA response to the memo I sent to the Rockefeller Commission. (See "The Assassinations," p. 460.) Item #98 is a 2-page descriptive listing of this material, with a very brief summary of the rest of the just-released material.

There are a few interesting tidbits: McCone ordered a Dallas CIA man to go to Parkland (so, shall we believe there was no CIA presence at Bethesda?); Alexis Davison did have an intelligence role in the Penkovsky case; NPIC made "briefing boards" from the Zapruder film for the Secret Service on an unspecified night "in late 1963." There are records on mail interception; only one letter to Oswald (and none from him) was actually opened. (Did Epstein or Angleton make up those reports of additional opened letters?)

Perhaps the most interesting substantive point: the CIA purportedly tried to track down the Cubans at "3126 Hollandale" or "3128 Harlendale," where Oswald had reportedly been; the CIA came up with nothing. I had mentioned FBI documents naming (as a supposed Oswald lookalike) the Dallas branch president of the anti-Castro group which met at "3126 Hollandale." The Rockefeller Commission did not ask me for these documents, and the CIA's check did not turn them up. Whether by accident or design, the CIA and the Rockefeller Commission avoided drawing attention to that group - Alpha 66 - and therefore to Antonio Veciana.

In due course, I expect to prepare more notes on this and any future CIA release. (Quite a few documents are still withheld in full.)

* I would like to hear from anyone who is familiar with the colloquial use of "who struck John" to mean "all the details." I first heard of this expression when Angleton used it in 1974: "A mansion has many rooms.... I'm not privy to who struck John." ("The Assassinations," p. 475.) We later found another example of this usage in the testimony of a CIA officer. The CIA found it amusing that I made such a fuss about the use of that "common phrase."

Missing any issues? The last issue in Volume 3 of EOC was #8, dated December 31 but mailed in mid-February. Let me know if you didn't get it.

HI SYLVIA - HOPE ALL IS WELL WITH YOU. BEST REGARDS, Paul 7/10
ANY COMMENTS ON WHERE THE JFK CASE IS NOW? NOWHERE??