

The 21st anniversary:

169. 23 Nov 84 (AP in NYT) "Anniversary of Kennedy's Death Is Noted Quietly at Dealey Plaza" For the first time, there was no organized observance, just a "small but steady procession" of people. (Included: a photo of Evelyn Lincoln at JFK's grave, and a UPI item on the family at Hyannisport.)

170. 23 Nov 84 (AP in WP) "For some longtime Dallas residents, the decision local Democrats made last year to discontinue formal observance of the Nov. 22 anniversary was welcome. After 20 years of reliving history, some believed that the city had atoned." Fund raising for the \$3 million TSBD exhibit is behind schedule; estimated completion is now 1986.

171. 23 Nov 84 (SFX) "Conspiracy buffs replay Kennedy's death" (On page one, no less; by an Examiner writer in Dallas.) More than a hundred people gathered, "and fantasized about two, three, maybe eight gunmen. 'There were nine,' said a spry, 70-year-old man." It's Penn Jones, of course, who is still persuading people to climb into the sewer drain. "'Interest is dying rapidly,' said Jones.... 'It's over. I guess it's just a few nuts like me who find this fascinating.'"

172. 23 Nov 84 (SFC) A brief, routine note on "the Kennedy Thanksgiving" and the non-observance in Dallas.

173. 27 Nov 84 (WP) "A Wound That Is Healed," by Joseph Kraft. "A significant event didn't take place last Thursday.... A national wound has been closed, and it is instructive to see how the healing took place." Kraft considers the passage of time ("Serious attention to the past - a subject not nourished by TV - has declined"), Reagan's "appropriat[ion] of the Kennedy name" in the 1984 campaign, and the exposure of Kennedy family flaws. (The Collier-Horowitz book shows "self-advancement, getting even and philanthropy [sic; he must mean philandering] to be almost compulsory family duties. No serious person can now believe in the legend of Camelot.") The controversy over a possible assassination conspiracy is not even mentioned.

That's all I have so far, unless you count this. It's not very funny, and it certainly doesn't portray any of us, but I think it reflects a consensus in certain circles about conspiracy seekers.

**DOONESBURY** / Garry Trudeau

8 Dec 84



Justice Department review of HSCA material:

\* On October 10, the Justice Department said that "it is envisioned that the Attorney General will report the Department's findings and recommendations [on the HSCA report] to the Speaker of the House of Representatives within the next six months" - that is, by mid-April 1985.

This information comes from a letter to Rep. Charles Stenholm (D-Tex.) from Assistant AG Stephen Trott of the Criminal Division, prepared by his deputy, Mark Richard. (For a copy, ask for #1984.174 [2 pp.]) This letter was a response to a constituent inquiry by our man in Abilene, Lester Keene. His letter allegedly "expressed his concern that the recommendations for further investigation" in the

HSCA's final report "have not resulted in appropriate Department of Justice investigative activity."

At first glance, this letter does not tell us anything we didn't know about the JD review, except for the anticipated completion date. Back in November 1983, it was envisioned in Trott's office that "all actions undertaken in response to the HSCA report" would be completed by the end of the year, and that a report would go to the House "early" in 1984. (See #1984.3.)

The only HSCA recommendation or evidence specifically mentioned in the latest letter is the acoustics. As usual, it is presented as "the basis" of the HSCA's "conspiracy theory." In light of the difficulty in understanding the delay if only the acoustics is being considered, a closer look at the letter may be justified. I think one can read Trott's letter as a cleverly worded attempt to play down work on non-acoustical matters, without actually saying that no such work is being done.

The NAS (Ramsey Panel) report was released in May 1982. In response, a BBN news release said, "At such time as we have completed a full analysis of their report, we shall then issue a detailed statement." (#1982.39) If there has been an official rebuttal by any of the HSCA experts, I have not been made aware of its substance or its existence. (About a year ago, Gary Mack thought that Barger's rebuttal had been delayed because the work was being done in spare time and was due shortly. [Coverups, Nov 83]) Trott's 1983 letter singled out a rebuttal which appears to be Tony Marsh's [#1984.6], and in April 1984 I sent the Justice Department some of my critiques of the NAS report. It seems unlikely that either Marsh or I could slow the JD down for more than a couple of days. Barger or Blakey could generate a longer delay, but basically the NAS report has given the Department more than enough to close its books on the acoustics. As Trott's letter notes, "the NAS report discouraged undertaking additional expensive studies of this evidence."

I suppose it is possible that the JD has come across new evidence, showing that the DPD Dictabelts are not untampered originals. (Of course, this would only revive the possibility that the HSCA's four-shot result was correct, not prove that it was.) I have long suspected that some of the recordings were modified and copied for reasons unrelated to the shots and possibly unrelated to the death of the President.

My best guess, however, is that if the long JD delay means anything, it means that something non-acoustical is being looked at. Keeping in mind the risk of seeing too much in a carelessly assembled document, consider how Trott's letter supports this interpretation.

Look at the last sentence of a paragraph which is mostly about the acoustics and followed by another such paragraph. "Various factual issues raised by the HSCA report or Department of Justice attorneys who reviewed all investigative reports related to this matter were also referred to the FBI for investigation as appropriate." This makes more sense if "this matter" means the JFK case as a whole, not the acoustics. Would several JD attorneys be reviewing investigative reports on the acoustics, and raising factual issues on their own? While we may think the HSCA report raised factual issues needing further investigation, I can't see the FBI worrying about where McLain's motorcycle was, now that Steve Barber has heard and the NAS has spoken.

The forthcoming report will cover "Justice-sponsored acoustical analyses [i.e., by the FBI and NAS], FBI investigative activity, and the review of information received from the public." Assuming arguendo that any FBI activity is ipso facto "Justice-sponsored" (at least since 1972), this implies that the FBI has been doing something besides acoustical analyses.

One final point: after noting that the NAS report "discouraged" further studies, Trott wrote that "the FBI has subsequently completed its review of the specific factual issues referred for further investigation." This could refer to points mentioned (but not explicitly referred to the FBI) in Appendix F of the

NAS report; it could refer to the HSCA's other specific recommendation (the Bronson film); or it could refer to something completely different.

Both the 1983 and 1984 letters refer to the review of information received from the public. Here also, only acoustical matters are mentioned, but others are not really ruled out. I would like to hear from any EOC readers who have sent information to the Justice Department, especially if you received replies indicating serious interest. Not all members of the public are equal; perhaps some former HSCA staffers have been trying to push the JD. There may even be a "walk-in" with a story of personal involvement who is being taken seriously.

What else, besides the acoustics, might the Justice Department be looking at? The Russians, the Cubans, the FBI investigation, the Mafia, the Bronson film, or the Martin Luther King case, for example. I should emphasize that I have no evidence for any of these alternatives.

The JD may have been made aware of the President's interest (expressed publicly in 1979; see 6 EOC 3, p. 6) in the question of Russian involvement. The recent alleged plot against the Pope may have revived this hypothesis. It is safe to assume that some influential people suspect that Castro killed JFK.

An interesting possibility is that the JD and the FBI have systematically tried to rebut everything negative said by the HSCA about their work. When the HSCA report came out, my first reaction was that they had let the FBI off easy. Conclusions that the FBI properly investigated and evaluated Oswald before the assassination, and "conducted a thorough and professional investigation into [his] responsibility ... for the assassination" appeared in the report without any detailed supporting text. Although I am less anti-FBI than many critics, I would have found it particularly difficult to document that last conclusion. FBI people, however, probably took more notice of other HSCA findings - that the FBI "failed to investigate adequately the possibility of a conspiracy" and was "deficient in sharing information." Surely someone in the FBI might feel a need to set the historical record straight.

Perhaps the FBI has been trying to pursue the case against the Mafia, with the aim of resolving the allegations against Marcello and Trafficante once and for all, one way or the other. Marcello has been convicted on unrelated charges; presumably the JD's organized-crime experts have learned a lot about him and may have developed an interest in the HSCA's evidence, published and unpublished.

I would be quite surprised if anyone in the Justice Department takes the case against Marcello as seriously as Blakey does. (The public JD reaction to the HSCA report has been cool, if not hostile.) It is more likely that the FBI has been working to refute some specific HSCA criticisms in the organized-crime area. For example, an HSCA staff report over Blakey's name suggested that there were "highly disturbing implications" in the way the FBI responded, in 1967, to Ed Becker's account of Marcello's alleged 1962 threat. (9 HSCA 85; HSCAR 246) This staff report also noted that "the Bureau's limited work on the Marcello case may have been attributable to a disturbing attitude" on the part of SA Regis Kennedy of New Orleans, who thought Marcello really was a tomato salesman. (9 HSCA 70) (More bluntly, John Davis's book says that "some people believe" that SA Kennedy "had been turned." [P. 406])

The HSCA specifically asked the Justice Department to study the Bronson film. (HSCAR 480) The prominence of that recommendation is really an artifact of the late discovery of the film; the evidence of people in the Oswald window did not look very persuasive at the time. All I know about Bronson-film studies is what Mack has reported in "Coverups." We can expect the forthcoming JD report to deal with the Bronson film, but I don't expect it to include proof of someone other than Oswald in the window.

Considering how close "Reader's Digest" came to publishing excerpts from Henry Hurt's book, it would not be surprising if any sensational new information in the manuscript has become known to the FBI.

Trott's letters mention only the JFK case, but the HSCA did leave the MLK case up in the air, after strong criticism of the FBI.

What, if anything, should we do about this situation? If you have anything you want to tell the Justice Department, you may as well write Trott and make an official record of it. It may be too late already - Trott said "We are now in the process of concluding our review" of the JD's response.

In any case, don't count on an enthusiastic response. I wrote the JD in April, because I felt that they should see my acoustics material if they thought that Marsh's was worth mentioning in their status report to Rep. Stokes. I added copies of two of my 1980-81 letters to the JD, about the medical evidence relating to Lifton's thesis, and about Army Intelligence (e.g., reconstructing the destroyed Oswald file). Despite three followup notes, I did not get any acknowledgment until a phone call in October. A written reply arrived in mid-November. (#175, from Trott by Lawrence Lippe, Chief of his General Litigation and Legal Advice Section) Trott noted that my Army-related letter had been forwarded to the FBI in 1980, and that my "submissions have been made available to the Department of Justice personnel who will be preparing a report regarding the assassination investigation for the House of Representatives in the near future." The letter was polite enough, not discouraging further submissions "regarding acoustical issues and related matters."

I hope that one of the journalists reading this will persuade a Justice Department source to indicate what (if anything) is going on. Since the JD is not very communicative with me (and, anyhow, real buffs don't interview people), I plan to leave this for someone else to pursue.

#### "The Third Decade"

The first issue of Jerry Rose's research journal is out. It is 40 pages long; I have a few extra copies available for \$3, including fourth-class postage. (#176) (For Rose's address, see 6 EOC 3, p. 2.)

The major articles include "Loose Ends in the Death of George DeMohrenschildt," by Rose, and excerpts (dealing with the rise and fall of the HSCA under Sprague) from Gaeton Fonzi's long 1980 article (2 EOC 10, pp. 2-3). There are profiles (with addresses) submitted by 25 buffs, an editorial ("History Also Has Its Claims"), and some interesting short items.

\* Of special interest to me: "Hidden Exposure: Cover-Up and Intrigue in the CIA's Secret Possession of the Zapruder Film," by Phil Melanson. "The official, historically accepted chain of possession is wrong. The film's secret journey to a CIA laboratory in Washington on the night of the assassination raises serious doubts about the film's integrity as evidence.... Setting aside the worst-case scenario (an alteration of the original film in order to hide a conspiracy), there is still the fact that NPIC [the National Photographic Interpretation Center] generated data which would logically support a conspiracy theory, and that this data never reached the Warren Commission and appears to have been withheld from the Secret Service as well."

Melanson's analysis of the known details is fascinating and seems careful (although I know nothing about film processing), but where it all leads is not clear. I have never seen any persuasive arguments or evidence that the Z film has in fact been altered. Melanson notes that some deception about the chain of possession of the film may be attributed to deference to Zapruder's concern about retaining exclusive commercial rights.

I can provide some relevant documents to anyone who wants to try to untangle the evidence further:

177. [9 pp.] CIA 1641-450, notes from the NPIC analysis, as sent to the Rockefeller Commission in 1975 and released in 1976. See "Best Evidence," p. 556, for a basic description and analysis of this material.

178. [3 pp.] CIA 1635-1087 (7 May 75) More from the CIA to the RC, in response to my questions about the CIA's use of the Z film. (Released in 1982;

see 4 EOC 3, p. 8.) Oddly, the CIA gave the date of the NPIC analysis only as "in late 1963," while specifying that when the Secret Service brought over the film, the analysis was done "late that same night." That means November 22, Melanson argues. (For the first analysis, at least; were there several?)

179. [4 pp.] SS 990 (Jan 1964) This official account (prompted by a letter from "Life," included) was discovered by Melanson in the Archives in 1982, after a FOIA request. SAIC Sorrels said that one copy "was immediately airmailed to Chief" after Zapruder provided it. Melanson suspects that the government had the original for some hours before "Life" got it.

Books:

\* Henry Hurt expects that his book "Reasonable Doubt" will be published in late spring or early summer 1985 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

To many JFK-assassination buffs, the most interesting question about Watergate was never what Nixon knew or when he knew it. If you share my uncertainty about what the basic question should have been, you will probably enjoy Jim Hougan's new book, "Secret Agenda: Watergate, Deep Throat and the CIA" (Random House, 347 pp., \$19.95) In some ways reminiscent of "Best Evidence," this book focuses on the details of the break-in in an original way. As I interpret both the Watergate and JFK cases, to answer the big peripheral questions (such as the nature and cause of the coverup) we will have to deal with uncertainties about the central facts to which inadequate attention was paid for years.

The following two reviews concede, a bit grudgingly, that Hougan has raised questions which need further investigation. Neither reviewer is particularly taken by Hougan's case for his overall thesis, but they provide useful summaries.

180. 11 Nov 84 (Lukas, NYT) "A New Explanation of Watergate" [2 pp.] This book is "the first major attempt at Watergate revisionism." It "posits an intriguing subtext in which the CIA plays an important role. And there are titillating details aplenty: a CIA-sponsored call girl ring; Agency efforts to spy on the White House; the planting of false evidence and an effort by one of the Watergate burglars [McCord] to sabotage his own enterprise."

Hougan thinks that the phone tap Al Baldwin was monitoring was on the phone of a prostitution ring in a nearby apartment building. This tap, says Hougan, "was placed by Louis Russell (since deceased), a 'drunken, whoring and brutish' figure" who worked for HUAC in the past and now for McCord's private security firm. "Like many others ... Mr. Hougan is skeptical about Mr. McCord's (and E. Howard Hunt's) 'retirement' from the CIA. Therefore, he concludes that Russell too was working for the Agency. Ergo, the taps on the prostitutes' phones - and probably the call girl operation itself - were a CIA project, designed to gather information about the sexual activities of prominent Washingtonians, perhaps for blackmail, perhaps to construct psychological profiles. At this point, I was still following Mr. Hougan, still intrigued by his interlocking hypotheses. But as he piled premise upon premise, I found myself tottering on a tower of unproven assumptions."

181. 25 Nov 84 (WP) "Deep Throat, Phone Home," by Anthony Marro [2 pp.] "Nothing in Hougan's book suggests that Nixon's political apparatus was not to blame for the break-in.... His account goes well beyond.... 'In effect,' Hougan writes, 'the snake had swallowed its tail: CIA agents working under cover of Nixon's re-election committee came to be targeted against their own operation [and had to] blow their own cover.'"

Marro is not at all convinced that the prostitution operation was CIA-linked. "One of the disconcerting things about this book is the frequency with which Hougan mixes diligent information gathering with questionable, even reckless, assumptions about motive and purpose."

Marro dismisses as "searching for yet more conspiracy" a particularly interesting part of the book, which suggests "that 'Deep Throat' might have been a

member of the intelligence community, perhaps someone Woodward had gotten to know while serving as a Navy officer in a Pentagon communications unit." Hougan's work here is more than just suggestion, and Woodward was (he says) more than just an ordinary Navy officer. Hougan's own conclusion: "What may be more important than Throat's actual identity, however, is the distinct possibility that by confiding in Woodward about Watergate he was acting on behalf of - or with the approval of - his superiors ... [in] that part of the military which Admiral Zumwalt represented...."

182. 6 Nov 84 (NYT) "'72 Data Show FBI Questioned If Burglars Bugged the Watergate" According to new documents released to Hougan under FOIA, the FBI lab "doubted that telephone taps found ... were compatible with eavesdropping receivers used by the defendants," and some FBI people believed that one bug may have been planted after the fact by the Democrats. The prosecution chose to believe that the FBI simply "goofed." (That is also the too easy way to deal with the Sibert-O'Neill report on the JFK autopsy.) I am not swayed by Marro's suggestion that the failure of these reports to surface years ago is odd, if they are "as clear as Hougan makes them to be."

183. Nov 84 [4 pp.] The publisher's news release for "Secret Agenda," including the table of contents and a summary of key revelations.

Why discuss this book in EOC, when I am so far behind on JFK-case material? For one thing, Hougan thanks two experts on the JFK case for their "research assistance and patient criticism." Jeff Goldberg helped run the Assassination Information Bureau during the HSCA investigation, and Bob Fink looked at some aspects of the case (notably, possible CIA interception of Oswald's mail) while on the staff of Bella Abzug's Government Operations subcommittee in 1976. Some areas of special interest to us may have been looked into but not published. I understand that the scope of the book was determined entirely by Hougan.

A more provocative connection to the JFK case is the role played in "Secret Agenda" by Bud Fensterwald, founder of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations. A 1980 article based on Hougan's work in progress (#1980.12) left me wondering how he would ultimately evaluate Bud's role as lawyer to McCord and friend to Lou Russell. Hougan's book mentions "whispers suggesting that Fensterwald was himself a deep-cover CIA agent," but adds that the allegations "seem to be based on groundless suspicions.... His friends, clients and sources include any number of spooks from any number of intelligence services," but that comes mostly from his interest in the assassinations. (P. 304) As I understand Hougan's thesis, it implies that Fensterwald was used by the CIA, through Russell's help in making McCord his client, to guarantee that the case would develop along political (i.e., anti-Nixon) lines. McCord's previous lawyer "saw the case as a criminal one," which could have led to an examination of the details of the burglary which would expose the CIA's funny business.

The CTIA popped up in the original public investigation, since Bud cashed some of Russell's checks through a CTIA account. Bud hired Russell to investigate certain unspecified "non-Watergate-related events" of interest to the CTIA. Hougan reveals that Bud and two CTIA employees (B. Smith and K. Smith) told him that Russell had indicated to them that he was bugging some of the prostitutes' conversations.

This book deliberately narrows in on the events surrounding the break-ins, and on the CIA's possible role at that point. If Hougan is correct, better known CIA angles of the Watergate story need to be re-examined. For example, what about the surveillance of the CTIA carried out by the D.C. police for the CIA? (A May 1972 CIA report is quoted in the Fensterwald-Ewing book, pp. 104-5.) Perhaps the CIA was really not interested in the Warren Commission critics affiliated with the CTIA, but in Bud's clients or other associates. (Hougan does not discuss this surveillance, but he does look closely at the CIA coverage of Jack Anderson, about which comparable questions can be raised.)

"Secret Agenda" does not have much on the many connections which have been suggested between Watergate and various other conspiracies, including the JFK case. Authors of "Dallas to Watergate" articles, including Peter Dale Scott and Jonathan Marshall, have examined such matters as the prior activities of the Watergate burglars, White House anti-drug programs, and various Cuban angles. I wonder particularly about Nixon's concern over "the whole Bay of Pigs thing," possibly meaning the plots to kill Castro, and the possible relevance of the 1967 CIA Inspector General's report (the Primula Report, in Ehrlichman's novel). Lukas's review suggests that Hougan underestimates the possible significance of the Hughes-O'Brien connection.

Hougan's account of a long-standing CIA and D.C. police interest in sex in Washington raises an old question anew. Who knew what about JFK's intimate friends, including but not limited to three who obviously should have been of special interest to the CIA: Judith Campbell Exner, Mary Meyer, and Maria Novotny. Hougan provides information (new to me) about specific people (notably in the CIA's Office of Security) who kept files containing sex-related information.

The statements of fact in this book which I had doubts about are not central to Hougan's case, but I am no expert on the details of Watergate and I have no idea how well his analysis will hold up. I think that Lukas's conclusion is correct: in addition to "some valuable new evidence," Hougan's "principal achievement may turn out to be intuitive - a bold imagining of what Watergate was all about."

There is a 22-page chapter on the JFK assassination ("Losing Lancer") in Phil Melanson's new book, "The Politics of Protection: The U.S. Secret Service in the Terrorist Age" (Praeger, \$22.95). Some of the ground covered is familiar (trip planning, agents drinking the night before, the reaction to the shots), but Melanson provides an interesting and original analysis of the old issue of a failure in the Secret Service's preventive intelligence function. Melanson argues persuasively that Oswald's background really did not make him a candidate for SS attention (except possibly for the Hosty note). The error which may ultimately have had an effect on what happened was the failure to respond to the presence in Dallas of a potentially violent group of anti-Castro Cubans. "Had the presence of Alpha-66 been detected and reported, the Secret Service might have been able to convince the President to accept additional protective measures, or agents might have operated with a keener sense of impending danger." (P. 178)

The provocative failure to notice Oswald was that of the Dallas Police. Melanson comments on documents showing the wide range of people who were of interest to the DPD Criminal Intelligence Section, and notes that it "missed a very specific opportunity to catch Oswald in its data net: he joined one of the 14 groups under surveillance," the ACLU. (Pretty radical by Dallas standards.) If any official investigation (including the HSCA) has taken a critical look at the implications of alleged DPD lack of interest in Oswald (a question which has long fascinated me), I don't think we know about it.

In another chapter, Melanson has a few choice words about the imprecise use of the concept of a "loner." Although Oswald "did not appear to have a charming personality," he did have a family and met people through his friend George DeMohrenschildt. The "loner" personality does not really argue against a conspiracy; one acquaintance may be enough to entangle someone in a plot.

The book as a whole, like the JFK chapter, focuses on the Secret Service's mandated missions. There is little or nothing on such topics as the SS role in the investigation of the JFK assassination, Lifton's allegations, and SS involvement with Nixon's taping system. Melanson analyzes the effect of the "political process and ... culture" on the SS's mission. The book is designed as a survey, "the first major analysis of the U.S. Secret Service in 16 years (other than by a former agent)." The price is a bit steep for 222 pages (even on acid-free paper). For that money, someone should have caught all of the typos (e.g., "disbursing"

for "dispersing" protesters).

This being a scholarly work, the biographical note on Dr. Melanson lists the most reputable journals he has published in, and refers to "various newspapers and magazines." We know about "Oui" (#1983.97); he has now branched out in a different direction, to "Car Collector and Car Classics." The September 1984 issue includes an article on Presidential limousines, based on research for this book. (#184, 6 pp.)

Queries:

Q69. Is anyone interested in producing an index to EOC, for distribution? (Computerization would be nice, but not at all necessary.) I can provide back issues and encouragement.

Q70. Does anyone know the recent whereabouts of Thane Cesar?

Q71. Does anyone know if there is any basis to a second-hand report, said to have been broadcast in early 1981, of a photo showing a man leaving the knoll area dressed in a policeman's uniform which does not match the DPD uniform?

Q72. Seymour Weitzman said he turned over a piece of bone (found in the street right after the assassination) to the Secret Service. (7 WCH 107) Dr. Burkley got a similarly described piece of bone from SS agent Bouck. (7 HSCA 24) Do we have any documents about this fragment? In particular, has anyone looked in the Secret Service records at the Archives?

\*

"Lee Harvey Oswald in Mexico: New Leads"

An article with this title by Steve Dorril appears in the November 1984 issue of "Lobster." (#185, 3 pp.) Dorril reports on information he obtained from Nina Gadd, who worked for Comer Clarke and claims to have provided the information attributed to Castro in his 1967 "National Enquirer" article. (See 4 EOC 3, pp. 5-6.) There is also a report that Angleton had turned a KGB man in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico by 1964, and an analysis of previously known information, e.g. about "Solo." More details will appear in a forthcoming EOC.

The cover (#186) includes subscription information (see also 6 EOC 1, pp. 8-10), and a photo (possibly doctored) showing Oswald distributing "Hands off Cuba" handbills and copies of "Lobster."

More Clippings: On the JFK case, by or about buffs/investigators

187. 22 Nov 83 (Nat. Enq.) "Panel of Experts Probes - 4 Pieces Still Missing in Assassination Puzzle" [2 pp.] The Enquirer's panelists were Gary Mack, Cyril Wecht, Harold Weisberg, and David Wrone. The four questions discussed here: JFK's missing brain, the possible visit by Tippit's police car to Oswald's rooming house, the Bronson film, and the missing film apparently taken by the babushka lady.

188. 22 Nov 83 (CNN, 6 pp.) A brief survey of assassinations from Caesar to Sadat, plus interviews of David After (a political scientist) and David Abrahamsen (a forensic psychiatrist and author of "The Mind of the Accused" [S&S, 1983]). The discussion is mostly general. Abrahamsen says he was surprised that Oswald did not confess, and that his mother was "very strange." He has concluded that LHO was possibly trying to kill Jacqueline, not JFK. (This theme also appears in "22 Fires," a silly 1977 novel by Jerome Agel.)

189. 22 Nov 83 (Detroit News) "Kennedy buff hunts 20 years for 'truth'" A not-unsympathetic profile of Jan Mierzejewski.

190. 22 Nov 83 (Hartford Courant) "Remembering What Kennedy Stood For, Not Just What He Did," by Sen. Christopher Dodd [2 pp.] Dodd praises JFK's "ability to inspire" and his actions on civil rights, the nuclear test ban, and the Peace Corps. Dodd does not mention his service on the HSCA; he just notes in passing that "assassination junkies are out in force, weaving ingenious new theories about the horrible events in Dallas."

191. Information about purchasing tapes of the first part of "Ambiguous



Legacy" [2 pp.] The program, produced by Rosemary Reed and Larry Schlossman, aired 22 Nov 83; see 6 EOC 1, pp. 1-2. These three hours (on the JFK presidency) cost about \$41; the subsequent panel discussion on the assassination is not available from Pacifica.

192. 22 Nov 83 (The Rebel) [First issue; also dated 1/84] "The Nazi Connection to the Assassination of John F. Kennedy," by Mae Brussell [14 pp.] I wouldn't dare summarize Mae's work, and I won't reveal the name of the writer whose editorial improvements are apparent in the first part of the article. Some of Brussell's articles can be obtained from John Judge [Box 6586, Washington DC 20009], along with his own work on Jonestown and other matters.

193. 23 Nov 83 (USA Today) "Ford's Theatre Replays Kennedy, Lincoln Tragedies" At a lecture on both cases by Dr. John Lattimer, the parallels intrigued the audience. "What did it all mean? 'I don't think there's anything metaphysical about all this. It's just interesting,' said Lattimer, a noted urologist who got involved in the Lincoln-Kennedy research as an outgrowth of his collection of swords."

194. 24 Nov 83 (LA Sentinel) A neutral and undetailed account of comments on the JFK case by Dick Gregory at a Black Women's Forum luncheon.

195. 29 Nov 83 (Globe [tabloid]) "Truth about JFK's death, by TV double" Martin Sheen's spokesman says he was shocked by Jack Gordon's videotape, and "believes the public should know the entire truth." Comments by Gordon, arguing for a hit from the knoll, are included. (On the same page: "Was he doomed by a Buddhist curse? Top psychics visit his grave & the site of the shooting to discover grim new facts.")

196. 30 Nov 83 (St. Louis Jewish Light) "Second Thoughts on the Second Oswald: The JFK Conspiracy," by Richard Popkin [3 pp.] A substantial overview, touching on a wide range of "supportable" scenarios. There are only a couple of particularly unusual allegations: the claim of personal involvement by Luis Castillo (a special interest of Popkin's some years ago), and the alleged warning of a plot against Connally by Edward Bray (of "Justice for the crew of the Thresher"). "We are so numbed by now ... that we would probably adjust to and accept any of the eight scenarios I have offered, and face our future with fear and trembling now that we realize the powerful conspiratorial forces that exist within and without our borders, forces that can literally end human history in an instant."

197. 22 Dec 83 (TCI) Penn's account of his anniversary gathering in Dealey Plaza. Larry Flynt drove through in a black limousine.

198. 22 Dec 83 (TCI) A partial transcript of a Brussell tape. Pure Mae, as unedited as you can get - short of tapping into her medulla and bypassing all higher brain functions. Listed here because of her comments on Mark Lane ("he went to London to work with British intelligence"), Michael Baden ("a dangerous man from the CIA"), and Mary Ferrell ("This woman has suppressed"). Amusing or depressing, depending on your mood.

199. 23 Dec 83 (Hollywood Press) "Confidante [Mitch WerBell] Dies as Flynt is Jailed Again" for acting crazy in court, basically [2 pp.] Among his recent visitors, reportedly, were Gordon Liddy and Gordon Novel.

200. 1984 [11 pp.] The introduction from "Philosophy and Contemporary Problems," a reader by Popkin and A. Stroll. The assassination controversy is recounted as an example of the problem of verification of reality.

201. 23 Jan 84 (Rebel) "The Flynt Papers: November 6-27, 1983" [8 pp.] A relatively straightforward account by Don Ray, including the details of Flynt's JFK motorcade re-enactment and his arrival at Parkland with ketchup on his face. (Dallas taxi driver Charles Kimerlin claimed that Oswald rode with him on 11/22, carrying nothing and paying "with exact change - no tip." Is this a new story?)

202. 31 Jan 84 (Jack Anderson, SFC) "1984 - A Year for Terrorists?" Among other things, HSCA recommendations have been enacted by Congress; the Secret Service is prepared.

203. 13 Feb 84 (Rebel) "Farewell America" [3 pp.] "How French Intelligence wrote a book about the Kennedy assassination," by William Turner, a participant in this odd story. (The book is less interesting than the story; #203B [3 pp.] is an excerpt.)

204. 30 Mar 84 (Hollywood Press) "Larry Flynt Says He Doesn't Believe [white racist Joseph] Franklin Shot Him" (He thinks his interest in the JFK case triggered the shooting.)

205. 22 Apr 84 (TCI) "Coincidence ... Conspiracy ... or Happenstance" A note by Steve Barber (with Penn Jones and Elaine Kavanaugh) on his problems getting assassination photos processed properly. Steve asked me to mention that, because of editing, this article is not an accurate account of his own views.

206. 5 Jun 84 (Miami Herald) "Assassination Theories Never Die" Columnist Sydney Harris blames "wild speculation" in the Lincoln and JFK cases on the pre-trial death of each assassin. "The 'Dallas Conspiracy' will never die, we will never know the whole truth for sure, and authors will keep on making money out of the 'plot' behind Kennedy's death."

Credits: Thanks to S. Dorril (#185-6), B. Fensterwald (196), J. Goldberg (169-70, 180-2), G. Hollingsworth (191, 194, 199, 204), L. Keene (174), P. Melanson (179), J. Mierzejewski (189, 193, 206), G. Owens (200), J. Rose (176), L. Sprousser (184, 190), and G. Winslow (206).

Another book:

On Jonathan Marshall's recommendation, I recently got "The Belarus Secret," by John Loftus. (Knopf, 1982. Now available for \$3.98 + p/h from Barnes & Noble; write to 126 5th Ave., NYC 10011 for a catalog.) It is "the first full account of an extraordinary clandestine operation carried out in direct defiance of Presidential orders: How certain government agencies [notably Frank Wisner's OPC], in the aftermath of World War II, smuggled into the United States hundreds of Nazi collaborators from Eastern Europe [particularly Byelorussia] - and have continued to protect them from investigation and deportation."

Marshall suggested that Loftus's account of the withholding and doctoring of official files might be food for thought in the JFK case. Loftus describes in fascinating detail how information was kept from one agency (or part of an agency) by another. Loftus found sanitizing of the record as early as 1956 and 1963, and as late as 1980.

Loftus was not stopped by claims that a file had been routinely destroyed or could not be found. "One of the interesting things about intelligence files is that they are so extensively cross-referenced that it is almost impossible to destroy them completely. Copies always exist in another agency, or even in another file within the same agency." That is more or less what I suggested to the Justice Department in 1980, in connection with the destroyed Army Intelligence file on Oswald. (Harold Weisberg has found a couple of post-assassination Army documents in an FBI file.) At the least, there should be a surviving paper trail behind the Defense Department's false statement to the Warren Commission that no additional Oswald files existed.

By coincidence (presumably), Oswald lived in the capital of Byelorussia (Minsk) in 1960-62. U.S. intelligence agencies probably had more complex and compartmentalized interests than I previously realized both in Minsk when Oswald was there and in Byelorussians living in the U.S. I am not yet convinced that the HSCA did everything necessary to look for documentation of U.S. intelligence interest in Oswald. Among other things, new index checks on some of Oswald's Russian associates in Dallas, to look for intelligence contacts, might be useful.

Loftus was an attorney in the JD's Office of Special Investigations, which is basically the Nazi war crimes unit. As Jim Lesar has noted, that is a precedent for looking at old crimes, and maybe the JFK case should be turned over to it or to a new, similar, office, also in the Criminal Division.