

Access to HSCA records:

**

A resolution pertaining to the HSCA files has been introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on House Administration. The resolution (H. Res. 160) calls for the Archives to apply the same guidelines used for the Warren Commission records, and to give priority to the review of the HSCA files. (There is an exemption for records of proceedings which the HSCA voted to keep secret, or where confidentiality was guaranteed to a witness.)

Kevin Walsh of ACCESS has asked me to convey his urgent appeal for "EOC readers of all stripes to close ranks and work for this resolution. We need letters written," particularly to Rep. Augustus Hawkins, chairman of the Administration Committee. You should also write to your own Representative, if he is on that committee. (See #49.) Letters to Rep. Stokes might help also. Please let me (and ACCESS) know about any interesting responses you get.

Members of ACCESS will probably get items #48-49, and further information, in the mail soon.

48. The text of H. Res. 160, with a statement (April 12) by Rep. Edgar. "The Warren Commission has released over 90% of its records and the FBI and CIA have made thousands of pages available to the public in the interest of an informed citizenry. For Congress to stand alone in the withholding of its files can only create an aura of mistrust and skepticism as to the thoroughness and competency of the House investigation."

49. 13 Apr 83 (Congressional Record) Remarks by Rep. McKinney upon the introduction of H. Res. 160, co-sponsored by Edgar, Sawyer, Fauntroy, and Ford. "By all accounts, the Select Committee sought full public disclosure of the facts relating to its investigations, but time and money constraints at the end of its tenure prevented the necessary review and release.... What this resolution comes down to is the public's right to know about the tragic deaths of two of our finest leaders and about the procedures of the House investigation."

Included in this item: a list of the 19 members of the House Administration Committee.

50. An "issues discussion draft" [2 pp.] prepared by ACCESS, with a dozen questions and answers. For example, on Stokes' reported opposition: "His position is that in his role as Committee Chairman, he was constrained to follow advice of counsel regarding the traditional 50-year embargo. He now believes that the effort by former HSCA members to suspend the embargo should be allowed consideration by the Resolution process." ACCESS also notes that processing these records will be cheaper now than in 50 years, since some of the current Archives staff has expert knowledge of the JFK case.

There is other news, mostly good, on the FOIA front:

51. 24 Nov 82 [4 pp.] Opinion and order by Judge June Greene in Mark Allen's FOIA suit against the FBI, for records relating to the HSCA investigation. The FBI was granted summary judgment for material it received from the Committee, but not for the other categories of requested documents. The court rejected the argument that "anything Congress investigates, like King Midas' golden touch, becomes an integral part of Congress' deliberative and communicative processes."

*

52. 13 Feb 83 (Cleveland Plain Dealer) "Cry over slayings of '60s echoing" [2 pp.] A good overview of the positions of ACCESS, Stokes, and Blakey on the HSCA files. "Stokes stands alone among those members of the assassinations committee still in Congress in his opposition to opening most of the files his panel created.... [He] claimed not to be unalterably opposed to opening ... agency files compiled for the Committee and locked away in the National Archives and in vaults elsewhere.... Mark Allen ... wonders whether 'those people ... sat around and said, "we don't want our work subject to the same intensive scrutiny that the Warren Commission was. Let's not subject ourselves to embarrassment."' A former committee staff member responded, 'Hell, I think we embarrassed ourselves already in public with that stuff at the end about the second gunman. There's nothing in the files now that would do us any more harm.'"

"Blakey [said] that 'on balance there is nothing left in the (sealed) files bearing on who killed President Kennedy and Dr. King.' He conceded that had the committee had more time, its experts probably could have combed through the raw files and released more. But Blakey argues that most of the data that remains closed falls into four categories: classified, for security reasons; obtained only under promise the material would remain confidential...; grossly inaccurate and libelous; useless material of no help to anyone."

53. 4 Mar 83 [24 pp.] Opinion and order by Judge Thomas Flannery, in Allen's FOIA suit against the CIA and the Defense Department, turning down (mostly) the defendants' request for summary judgment. This case is summarized in the next item.

* 54. 3 Apr 83 (Lardner, WP) "Judge rejects CIA bar on Kennedy documents" Flannery's ruling "emphatically dismissed what he called 'the highly attenuated claim'" that the records - over 200,000 pages - could "become congressional through the mere fact of congressional review." He noted that they never left the possession of the CIA, and that some were requested by but never even reviewed by the HSCA staff. As of April 3, the CIA had not decided whether to appeal this order.

Also, Lardner notes, "the FBI has started processing more than 300,000 pages" covered by the similar decision of Judge Green, which the FBI did not appeal. I understand that Mark has started receiving some pages from the FBI.

Late word from ACCESS: Mark and Kevin suggest, first of all, that you send a "constituent inquiry" to your own Representative, asking that your concerns be conveyed to Rep. Hawkins. The letters should be concise; "opinions regarding HSCA performance and any theorizing will not be helpful in keeping the focus on releasing documents for their scientific and historical value."

The JFK assassination (and relevant individuals):

55. 21 Nov 82 (Baltimore Sun) "After 19 years, doubts still mount over that day in Dallas," by Henry Scarupa [7 pp.] A sympathetic account of the work of Harold Weisberg, Howard Donohue, Gaeton Fonzi, Tony Summers, and David Lifton. "Plainly not everything brought out on the assassination is of equal worth. What is important is the unremitting effort by people to throw light on what has been called America's crime of the century. 'Isn't it remarkable,' Harold Weisberg says, that ... everything new that's come out ... has been in spite of [the WC and the FBI] ... all through the diligent effort, under adverse conditions, of individual citizens who cared. Some were without means, some wealthy, some very wrong-headed, but all felt the responsibility of citizenship to do what they could.'"

56. Photos accompanying the previous item [6 pp., routine]

57. 7 Mar 83 (University of Maryland student newspaper) "Livingstone claims autopsy coverup" [2 pp.] In a lightly attended campus lecture, Harrison Livingstone charged that over a dozen Dallas doctors and nurses have denounced the autopsy photos as inaccurate. "I didn't see where it [the lecture] differed from Lifton's book," said James Garrison. (No, this one is a U. Md. junior.)

Harry Livingstone advises that he has provided some significant evidence to the JFK Library, where it is available for general use. There are several tapes, including interviews of the Dallas doctors by Livingstone and by Ben Bradlee Jr., and the final HSCA press conference. There is also some of the written material on which Bradlee's major article on the medical evidence (#1981.318) was based. All that material can be copied, I think. Also, a copy of Livingstone's book manuscript can be read at the Library, but not copied.

58. 12 Mar (Lardner, WP) "Former FBI agent tells court of 2 illegal break-ins in probes" Edward Tickel says he entered Marcello's hunting lodge in January 1980. He thought the entry was authorized but later learned it was not. Tickel is being tried on various criminal charges; FBI Director Webster denies Tickel's allegations about him.

59. 3 Apr 83 (SFC) "The elusive image of JFK" [2 pp.] Review of Herbert Parmet's new book on the JFK presidency. (From a quick glance, I gather that the book is useful but hardly definitive.) "[Parmet's] image of Kennedy's weakness - the polar opposite of the President's purported youth, vigor, and machismo - underscores the immense psychological and political importance of the Kennedy assassination. For in death, much more than in life, President Kennedy came to symbolize the vitality of national purpose and so transformed the political commitments of his country. That larger story remains to be told."

60. 4 Apr [7 pp.] Opinion and order in David Phillips' Maryland suit against Gaeton Fonzi and his publisher. Judge William Miller ordered "that the Demurrers to the Second Amended Declaration be and they are hereby sustained without leave to amend." What this seems to mean is that Phillips' suit has been thrown out, because the facts he alleged, even if true, were deemed insufficient to meet the required legal standard of "actual malice." ("Actual malice" is a legal concept which is sort of related to actual malice in the real world, but it's not the same thing.) This opinion is very favorable to Fonzi. (At one point, the judge even slipped and referred to Veciana encountering Bishop, rather than Phillips, at the Reston meeting.)

61. 6 Apr (Balt. Sun, plus a similar AP story) "Suit to find evidence of plot on Kennedy murder rejected" The Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld a ruling "that the FBI is not obliged to furnish ... Harold Weisberg with additional documents or tests" in connection with his 1970 suit relating to spectrographic and other physical evidence. "We find that the government has finally proven the adequacy of its search for all documents Weisberg has requested." The FBI "concedes a spectrographic plate used to test a lead smear on the curbstone once existed. But the FBI believes the plate was discarded." (We can't win them all.)

62. 9 Apr (Flora Lewis column, in SFC) "Plausibility in foreign affairs" She concedes that it wasn't in the Russians' interest to shoot the pope, but that's not conclusive: "I don't think it was in America's interest either to try to kill Fidel Castro, but we know now that President Kennedy did." (We do?) Referring primarily to Andropov, a Russian told her that "it was irreverent, dangerous, terrible to implicate leaders. 'Leaders,' he said, 'they are so crucial, they can't be talked about this way.'" (They can't?)

63. 14 Apr (Rolling Stone) Part of an interview with Joan Baez. On the JFK assassination: "I really don't care that much, you know? People have this thing about it...." Kennedy "was basically a myth, like most presidents."

64. 16 Apr (AP) "Reputed Mafia chief [Marcello] jailed - immediately" Prosecutors said he was planning to flee the country. Also, 2 brief items (20 and 26 April) on the Supreme Court's rejection of Marcello's plea for release pending appeal of his Brilab conviction. According to an AP article of April 22, reprinted in "Coverups" #9, Marcello is being guarded by a U.S. marshal in jail, because of death threats.

65. 17 Apr (LAT) This review of the Parmet book objects to the unsourced rendering of the thoughts of JFK mistress Mary Meyer.

66. 20 Apr (WP, SFC, HC) Three short accounts of Edward Kennedy's decision to turn down an offer to speak at the May UAW convention in Dallas. He's got nothing against the city, but it would be "inappropriate" this year.

67. 1 May (W. King, NYT) A profile of Dallas and its new mayor, A. Starke Taylor. Among Dallas' problems is "the question of image.... Now the city seems determined to purge itself of whatever residue of civic shame ... might remain [from the assassination].... Mayor-elect Taylor, asked if the [Republican] Presidential convention [in 1984] would rekindle memories of 'those dark days of 1963,' seemed nonplussed. 'Dark days of 1963?' he said, apparently missing the reference altogether."

For those with long memories, a museum in the TSBD (with gift shop) should be completed in 1985. "At the center of the [re-created] cafeteria will be a mannequin, life-size, of Lee Harvey Oswald." (Holding a Coke?)

68. 6 May 83 (UPI) "U.S. Attorney [John Volz] denies FBI broke into home of Louisiana Mafia boss" It was Marcello's office; at his home there was just a phone tap. (Cf. #58.)

"Blood Feud" and other TV/stage productions:

69. Feb ?, 1983 (LAHE) "The hottest controversy in the film ["Blood Feud"] deals with allegations that organized crime figures connected with Hoffa and the Teamsters also can be traced to Jack Ruby." The show is "considered explosive by everyone." Scriptwriter Bob Boris would have liked to include more on the now-defunct Allen Dorfman, but there wasn't time.

70. 5 Feb 83 (TV Guide) A brief, routine reference to BF.

* 71. 21 Apr (WP) "Kennedy protest" Ethel Kennedy has written to the producers of "Blood Feud," complaining that the film "distorts history," is "lacking in integrity," and "unfair to Bobby." A source close to RFK and to Mrs. Kennedy concedes that the scriptwriter was "a Bobby fan" and that the final script was much better than the first one, but he objects to "major mistakes in chronology" and other "serious factual flaws."

"His major complaint, however, is that the 'thrust' of 'Blood Feud' ... is that [JFK] 'was killed by the Mob' and that in a final scene, just before Robert Kennedy's own assassination, ... 'they have Bobby up in his hotel room musing that "if only we hadn't gone after organized crime" they wouldn't have killed Jack and that's just not what happened at all.'" Maybe RFK didn't say that at that time, but serious and provocative questions about what he knew and feared have been raised, notably in the books by Blakey and (especially) Harris Wofford. (See 3 EOC 3, p. 3, and 3 EOC 4, pp. 9-10.) I thought that the hotel-room scene was a reasonable way to present that part of the story.

72. 24 Apr (Detroit Free Press) "Son angered by Hoffa film" [2 pp.] James P. Hoffa says the program was too pro-RFK and "a cheap attempt to make my father look like a thug."

73. (same paper, same date) [2 pp.] The TV critic calls BF a "superficial, one-dimensional, highly melodramatic piece of pillaged history." Included: a listing of the actors playing the 19 main characters.

74. 25 Apr (Corry, NYT) The Times' TV critic does remember that the HSCA "said it had found evidence that [Ruby and Oswald] had associated with organized-crime figures." Neither the Committee nor the film, however, produced a smoking gun; the film "treats the conspiracy gingerly, by inference."

75. 28 Apr (Detroit News) "The Kennedy-Hoffa bout: power politics with no punches pulled" [2 pp.] BF is "riveting" as entertainment, with a particularly good performance by Robert Blake as Hoffa.

76. 2 May (WP) Bob Boris responds to the criticism by Ethel Kennedy and Jimmy Hoffa Jr. "Boris thinks some of the complaints arise from the fact that most biographers of RFK (notably Arthur Schlesinger Jr.) 'tended to minimize the struggle between the two men.... It [the Hoffa conflict] was the actual moment in [RFK's] life when he formed his opinions of what his role in politics was all about.... Hoffa was a good family man.... I think in balance there are things we did not say about Jimmy and things we didn't get into in Bob's life and we tried to be as fair as possible.'" (Incidentally, ratings for BF in NY were good.)

* 77. 5 May (Jack Anderson, WP) "Hoffa-Kennedy movie spares two godfathers" "The names of mobsters Santo Trafficante and Carlos Marcello were deleted [from BF] after Trafficante's lawyer [Frank Ragano] threatened 20th-Century Fox with legal action" after he "got hold of a bootleg script." Ragano, who also represented Hoffa, is preparing a movie of his own. Former Anderson associate Clark Mollenhoff, who is portrayed in BF, thinks the script is "reasonably close to what happened."

The film did not re-enact Trafficante's alleged remarks, to Jose Aleman, suggesting that JFK would be "hit." That's a rather conspicuous omission, since Aleman was dealing with Trafficante about a loan from the Teamsters' pension fund, and Trafficante allegedly complained specifically about RFK's pressure on Hoffa.

I wonder if this conversation was omitted because of Ragano's complaint.

78. 6 May 83 (OT) "RFK, Hoffa roar back to life in 'Blood Feud'" [2 pp.] A favorable review. "Boris credits Operation Prime Time, the consortium of independents that finally picked it up [after NBC had the script for 5 years and CBS also had a crack at it], with a good deal of courage."

79. 8 May (SFC) A favorable review, focusing on the actors [1 p. plus photo]

80. 8 May (LAT in SFC) "The story of Bobby's war against James Hoffa" [2 pp.] Includes a good account of the history of the project. Producer Daniel Selznick: "We will feel we succeeded if the audience is torn between sympathy for Hoffa and sympathy for Kennedy."

My own opinion is that the 1979 book was quite awful - the part I read, anyhow. (See my brief comments in EOC for 7/7/79.) I recall nothing subtle about the good guy/bad guy [RFK/Hoffa] approach. Ruby popped up a lot in the book, unconvincingly; in the film he has only a walk-on role, shooting Oswald. I felt that the book's limited viewpoint was comparable to that of "Executive Action." But I thought the TV version was really pretty good. Clearly the final script reflected the work of someone familiar with the facts. (Or at least with the literature, probably including the "definitive" Blakey-Billings account of the JFK assassination and the Moldea book.) If the final script is published (does anyone know?), it would be worth having.

I should admit that I also liked the controversial ABC docudrama on Oswald a few years ago; maybe I'm just easy to please. But sometimes the context of someone's actions, and the tone of his relationships, come through more realistically in such dramatizations than in most written accounts.

81. 4 Feb (NYT), 3 Mar (MG), and 15 Mar (Toronto Star) An ad and two brief items on the alleged North American premiere of "Lee Harvey Oswald," a play by Michael Hastings. It was published in 1966 (and, according to the Wrone bibliography, performed in Atlanta and England). There is talk of a NY run.

82. 29 Apr (SFC) A review of a play whose central character "is obsessed with the cinema" and "also has an inordinate interest in the deaths that occurred on Nov. 22, 1963."

83. 15 Mar (Nat. Enq.) "Kennedy clan fuming over planned [British] miniseries about JFK and his gals" The programs will go into his "alleged affair with a mob-connected gal.... Insiders say the family's keeping a close eye on the project. They're afraid it will turn out to be a seven-hour embarrassment - and even make JFK's mom, Rose, ill." (When the Kennedy clan fumes, watch out!)

84. 19 Apr (NYT) A short summary of forthcoming TV programs on the Kennedys. The 7-hour British series will be on NBC starting on November 22. ABC News "is developing a documentary," and "there will also be at least three documentaries offered to individual stations by independent producers." Early in 1984, CBS will give us 6 hours on RFK, based on the Schlesinger book. In 1985, ABC will present a long program on the Kennedy family, based on a book now being written by Doris Kearns.

85. 20 Apr (?) (DFP) "'Kennedy' miniseries [on NBC] to stage shooting" Apparently for budget reasons, the re-enactment will be in Richmond, not Dallas. Also, David Susskind will produce "JFK" for Showtime cable, and the titles of three syndicated documentaries are given.

Acoustics:

There is no news, really. Issue #8 of "Coverups" includes a detailed account of the letter from Barger to Blakey which was summarized in the last EOC.

* 86. March 1983 An "Acoustics discussion paper" by Chris Scally. [44 pp.] (For just the table of contents and the summary, 5 pp., ask for item 86A.) Scally focuses on the possible inauthenticity of the HSCA Dictabelts, the chain of possession, irregularities in the transcripts, the sirens, and motorcycle and other sounds. Some of the analysis has been reported in EOC before; some was new

to me. Scally does not go into the Ramsey Committee's analysis of the cross-talk match or of the probabilities of the HSCA results, but he does seem to cover most of the other questions which can still be raised.

This paper claims that the audible background noises correlate strongly with the movements of Officer Hargis, as known from his testimony and from photos. Of course, he was not in position to be the motorcycle detected by the HSCA analysis.

Scally includes a rather interesting analysis of the radio traffic relating to Officers Tippit and Nelson. "It is my strong but unproven belief that something, involving Officers Nelson and Tippit in a series of telephone calls which may have been totally unrelated to the assassination of President Kennedy and the murder of J. D. Tippit, was excised from the transcripts - if not the Dictabelts themselves - by the Dallas Police. In order to hide their embarrassment, I believe the DPD copied the Dictabelts ... before the FBI received them in July 1964." I haven't tried to verify the details, but this seems worth pursuing.

* 87. 10 May 83 [4 pp.] My response to Scally's discussion paper. If you ask for #86, you should get #87 also. My letter provides some additional information, ideas about further work, and a couple of factual clarifications.

Oswald, acid, Atsugi:

88. 14 Apr 83 (Rolling Stone) Two short and insubstantial letters (one favorable, one not), under the rubric "Half-acid," of course.

89. CD 194, p. 38. The basic FBI interview report on Gillin, as discussed in #1983.25. This is dated December 13, 1963, but Ranftel says that the New Orleans file indicates that Gillin first contacted the FBI within a few days of the assassination.

Mike Ewing notes that Oswald himself claimed to have visited the N.O. DA's office, in another context. "I infiltrated the Cuban Student Directorate and then harassed them with information I gained including having the N.O. city attorney general call them in and put a restraining order pending a hearing on some so-called bonds for invasion they were selling..." (16 WCH 341, spelling improved)

90. 27 Aug 75 (Wichita Sun) "Wichitan guinea pig for CIA experiments" [2 pp.] The account of the Marine at Atsugi (in the same "division" as Oswald, but a different "subsection") who says he was plied by the CIA with LSD and other drugs. From this article alone, it's hard to tell if he had just been reading too many exposés of the CIA.

91. Oct 1978 (Hustler) Two pages from an article by Mark Lane, not the most reliable or critical source. Lane says that another of Oswald's fellow Marines, David Bucknell (who was unknown to Epstein) says that Oswald told him that he had been approached by a Japanese woman for information. Oswald reported this, was told to go along, and was given false information to pass on. For what it's worth, Oswald allegedly also told Bucknell that he was going to Russia on an intelligence assignment and would return in 1961 as a hero.

Richard Sprague on the framing of Oswald:

92. Richard E. (Critic) Sprague has made available his unpublished 1982 manuscript entitled "More evidence of the framing of Lee Harvey Oswald." [23 pp.] Sprague uses shadows and other information to determine the timing and sequence of photos of the sixth-floor sniper's nest taken by the DPD and by Dallas Morning News photographer Jack Beers. Sprague concludes that most of the official photos of the sniper's nest were in fact taken on November 25, after the boxes were rearranged. (In the FBI files, two of the DPD photos have typed notations which point out that the scene was reconstructed.) Two Beers photos appear to be the best evidence of what the area looked like at the time of the shots. Sprague further concludes that the boxes did not form a functional sniper's nest - that in fact there was not enough room for anyone to sit where Oswald supposedly sat and fire a rifle out of the window.

93. [22 pp.] The photographs on which the previous item is based. I haven't been able to follow Sprague's analysis of these photos in detail. In particular, I have some trouble with estimating and comparing distances, in the absence of careful photogrammetry to take angles into account. However, Sprague did convince me that the "official" photos of the sniper's nest portray an inaccurate reconstruction. (See, for example, WR 138-9 and the description on p. 140.) The box on the sill, for example, was in fact on top of one of the other boxes. As far as I know, none of the official investigations have established that someone could have stood or sat there and fired out of the window, given the actual arrangement of the boxes. This is all quite interesting, but it doesn't constitute proof that no shots were fired from that window, or that the rearrangement of the boxes must have been part of a frame-up of Oswald.

94. October 1973 (Computers & Automation) Sprague's original article on the framing of Oswald. [16 pp., including photos] Deals with some of the sniper's nest photos, and other matters, including the purportedly fake backyard photos (which, I am now convinced, are real).

"Contract on America"

* This new book, subtitled "The Mafia murders of John and Robert Kennedy," is available from Argyle Press, Box 3215, Silver Spring, MD 20901. The price is \$11.50, postage and handling included - pretty good for a 483-page book. The author, David E. Scheim, is a computer systems analyst at the National Eye Institute (part of the NIH) in Bethesda.

Item #95 is an ad for this book, plus the "Book Flaps" column from the D.C. "City Paper" for April 7. "In the arsenal of assassination theories, this book ranks with the best in terms of its research." There are also favorable comments from G. Robert Blakey and Dan Moldea.

I definitely recommend that you get this book - but read it critically. Unlike the Blakey-Billings book and the Mafia section of the HSCA report, which it generally resembles, it has both an index and footnotes. Scheim has made extensive use of Warren Commission material in the Archives, and even of the Texas AG's microfilmed files, which have been cited only rarely by other buffs.

The general material on the Mafia is impressive - well organized and well documented. However, I still can't get as upset about organized crime as Scheim (and Blakey, Ewing, Moldea, et al.) think I should. I feel less threatened personally by Carlos Marcello than by the governmental capos and their consiglieri in Moscow and Washington whose soldati have nuclear weapons.

Scheim's book was particularly helpful in making me think through some of the consequences of the Blakey account - well worth doing, if you want to believe that it is the definitive story. For example, Scheim looks in detail at the evidence on Karen Bennett Carlin, whose request for money supposedly took Ruby downtown on the morning of November 24. Ruby himself said that if there was a conspiracy, she would have to be part of it; Scheim concludes that she was indeed a pawn of the conspirators. (Blakey says only that the HSCA checked out her call to Ruby and found no link between her and the shooting of Oswald; she is named often in the HSCA volumes but not in the report.)

Scheim does not avoid the possible relevance of official (e.g., police) corruption, when looking either at the mob in general or at the events of November 22-24. There are a number of interesting specific points, such as the editing out of references to organized crime in the U.S. edition of Thomas Buchanan's 1964 book. Also, Scheim says that in 1933 the Mafia used an authentic lone nut, going after FDR, while mob gunmen got the real target, Chicago mayor Anton Cermak.

I have trouble with quite a few of the sources which Scheim takes rather seriously (e.g., Rose Cheramie, Alex Bottus, and Dick Gregory), and with some of his interpretations (of the mysterious deaths, Paulino Sierra Martinez, Bud Fensterwald, the Mexico mystery man photo, and, for that matter, of Ruby and the

HSCA, in part). It's certainly interesting to see Garrison listed as one of the heavies, in a chapter on four key suspects!

Scheim's focus on organized crime struck me as too narrow. For example, I found no reference at all to Ruby's service as a PCI (potential criminal informant) for the FBI. That doesn't mean Ruby wasn't dominated by the Mafia, but it is part of the story. More significantly, there is not much in this book about Oswald's role in the conspiracy. There is an extensive analysis of Ruby's pre-assassination contacts and phone calls, the thrust of which is to suggest that the assassination itself was set up through Ruby, who can be "linked" to Oswald. I find it unlikely that the actual shooting would have been arranged either through Ruby or by means of many phone calls; it seems more plausible that all those calls involved some other activity (quite possibly criminal, and quite possibly mob-directed), and that Ruby came into the picture only after Oswald survived the afternoon of the 22nd. My impression is that any scenario based on the mob as the only driving force will have trouble fitting Oswald in, as either assassin or patsy. Whatever our disagreements, Scheim has made me think about these issues.

One of Scheim's interesting points is the WC's deletion, from CE 1356, of an allegation that Ruby was "a frequent visitor and associate" of Dallas Mafia boss Joe Civello. I'll have more on this and its implications in a later issue; if you don't want to wait and are especially interested, ask me for my 2 pages on this deletion and the 9-page chapter on Ruby from my unpublished 1974 manuscript on the interactions between the Warren Commission and the FBI.

Also new: Robert A. Phillips has compiled a new JFK assassination bibliography, covering through November 1982. It is a selective listing of books, in order by author, with an index by title. Dates and other basic publication data are provided; there is no analysis. This softcover book (66 octavo pages) can be obtained for \$7, postage included, from the author (871 Coachman Place, Clayton, CA 94517).

The big picture: "Parapolitics/USA" is being published again. For an explanatory form letter from Jonathan Marshall and Ted Rubinstein, ask for #96.

Credits: Thanks to M. Allen (#48-54), M. Ewing (54, 58), G. Fonzi (60), J. Goldberg (66A, 71, 74, 76-77, 84, 95B), G. Hollingsworth (64A, 65, 68-69, 91), W. Kennedy (61B), M. Lee (90), H. Livingstone (55-57, 61A), J. Marshall (96), J. Mierzejewski (72-73, 75, 85), C. Oglesby (81B), R. Phillips (bibliography), R. Ranftel (67, 78), C. Scally (86), D. Scheim (95, book), R. Sprague (92-94), L. Sproesser (66B), T. Summers (81B), K. Walsh (48-50, 52) and Anonymous. And thanks also to everyone who has sent stuff which I haven't gotten around to mentioning in EOC.

The assassination of Robert F. Kennedy:

97. July 1983 (Phil Melanson, Oui) "Who put RFK on ice?" [6 pp., rated PG] A summary of the questions which still persist, after 15 years, and of the evidence of conspiracy as presented in the books by Kaiser and Christian & Turner. There is some new material based on Melanson's analysis of the released FBI files and Sirhan's diary. Melanson says that RFK's departure route (through the pantry) was predictable early in the evening (but not by Sirhan himself). Also, because of the relatively few references to RFK or to Middle East politics in Sirhan's diary, it raises more questions than it answers about his motives. There is more on the girl in the polka-dot dress; "FBI documents show that numerous and credible witnesses saw her." Melanson's conclusion: "Like the fairy tales which scare children just enough but spare them the more graphic horrors of real life, the nightmarish myth of the lone assassin is not nearly as threatening to our political culture as the conspiratorial reality which it masks."