

Please return to Meagher

March 11, 1985
Paul L. Hoch

JFK conference:

* On March 28, 29, and 30, 1985, Hofstra University will sponsor a conference on "John F. Kennedy: The Promise Revisited." The conference will feature speakers from the Kennedy administration: McGeorge Bundy, Ted Sorensen, and Dave Powers, for example. One of the speakers, Harris Wofford, has extensively analyzed the impact and context of the assassination. (See 3 EOC 4, p. 9.) Other speakers who have written about the case include Herbert Parmet, Arthur Schlesinger, and William Manchester.

Assassination buffs will be as welcome as Banquo's ghost at Macbeth's dinner table, I expect. Nonetheless, if I were in the area, I would dust off my Ph. D., put on my coat and tie and my best scholarly manners, and check it out. I would welcome a report from anyone who attends.

The registration fee is \$60 (\$50 in advance, \$15 for students). For information, write to the Cultural Center at Hofstra U., Hempstead, NY 11550. (This is on Long Island, about 20 miles from NYC.) Or, call 516-560-5669/5670.

The above information is from #1985.1, an ad in the Chronicle of Higher Education (20 Feb 85), which also includes the names of 13 additional speakers.

2. 17 Feb 85 (NYT) "Ex-Kennedy Aides to Attend Conference on His Presidency" Some 200 scholars are expected; over 70 papers have been received. Members of the Kennedy family have cooperated in the planning. Paul Harper, director of the conference, noted that because of the assassination, "there was no chance to see if during a two-term Presidency that promise could have been fulfilled." (That is, I think, just one reason historians should be interested in the controversy surrounding the assassination.)

3. The official conference program [10 pp.] Sen. Kennedy is scheduled to speak at 12:30 on Friday (!) the 29th. There is one direct reference to the assassination: a talk in the session on "Kennedy and Europe" is entitled "Like Children in the Darkness: European Reactions to the Assassination of John F. Kennedy."

E. Howard Hunt's libel suit:

4. 29 Jan 85 (USA Today) "Trial revives charge that CIA killed JFK" "Lawyer Mark Lane... said Monday he would prove that the CIA orchestrated President John Kennedy's assassination. Lane's forum: a retrial in Miami of a libel suit" by Hunt in response to a 1978 article by Victor Marchetti in the newspaper of the right-wing Liberty Lobby. "Lane said he will prove that Marchetti's article is true and that the CIA and Hunt were involved in Kennedy's death.

For information on the original trial of Hunt's suit, where he won a \$650,000 judgment which was later overturned, see 3 EOC 8, #664 and #668.

5. 7 Feb 85 (Doig, Miami Herald) "Hunt-JFK article 'trash' but not libelous, jury finds" One of the six jurors called the article "sloppy," and noted that "the conspiracy theories offered by... Lane were 'absolutely not' the reason for the verdict. 'We were worried that our verdict might give the wrong impression to the public,'" she said. Two jurors indicated that the verdict went against Hunt because the article was published without malice (in the legal sense).

(Gordon Winslow told EOC that on TV another juror said "it's very plausible and probable that there was a CIA coverup involved." When asked if Hunt was involved, she said "Yes, I believe so.")

"Through the second trial, Lane defended Marchetti's article as true. Afterwards, he backed off only slightly from his strong closing-argument claims that Hunt was involved in a plot. 'I don't know,' Lane said when asked if he really believed that Hunt had anything to do with Kennedy's death. 'But there's no doubt in my mind that the CIA was involved. And Hunt was a CIA agent.'"

Before we get to additional clippings on this trial, we should take a fresh look at the article in question.

6. 14 Aug 78 (Marchetti, Spotlight) "CIA to 'Admit' Hunt Involvement in Kennedy Slaying" [3 pp.] (An article by Joe Trento in the Wilmington News Journal, covering some of the same topics and more, was listed in 4 EOC 1 as #1982.25.)

Marchetti's main prediction was that the CIA would throw Hunt to the HSCA's wolves as part of a "limited hangout." The Agency was supposed to admit (or, to be precise, claim) that Hunt was involved in the assassination, while higher-ups remained protected. Of course, nothing at all like that happened.

A key piece of evidence cited by Marchetti was a 1966 internal CIA memo which "said in essence: Some day we will have to explain Hunt's presence in Dallas on November 22, 1963." This memo was supposedly "unexpectedly received" by the HSCA "a few weeks ago [after] the agency just happened to stumble across [it] in its old files." As reporter Steve Doig noted in item #5, the memo "wasn't produced at the Miami trial." And no wonder.

* EOC has learned that this CIA memo was a figment of the imagination of a person well known among the buffs for his belief that Hunt was involved in the assassination. To put it as generously as possible, this person hypothesized the existence of such a memo, floated the story, and was persuaded by the reaction that the memo really did exist. I have only one source for this account, but he has provided reliable information in the past. I find his account credible.

By the way, I am not implying that any writer who discussed this memo knew that it did not exist. It is not clear from what I have seen so far if Lane believed it exists, or if he emphasized it during the trial. I gather that one of Lane's key pieces of evidence was the story in the following item:

7. 5 Feb 85 (Doig, MH) "Castro's ex-mistress: Hunt was in Dallas" Marita Lorenz, who said she was afraid to come to Miami, gave a deposition in January, with "roughly the same story she has been telling publicly since at least the mid-1970's, to widespread disbelief."

In the version reported by the HSCA, she went to Dallas in November 1963 with Oswald, Frank Sturgis, Gerry Patrick Hemming, Orlando Bosch, Pedro Diaz Lanz, and the Novo brothers. (10 HSCA 93) Fortunately, they didn't have to squeeze themselves and their load of weapons into just one car; they used two.

To top off the story, when they reached Dallas, the man who came to their motel room and gave them money was Jack Ruby. As Blakey and Billings noted, that did not enhance the credibility of Lorenz' account, which as far as I am concerned was low to start with. (It could have been worse - she could have included Clay Shaw and Allen Dulles.)

To paraphrase JFK on Thomas Jefferson, it was perhaps the greatest collection of conspiratorial talent since Lee Harvey Oswald dined alone.

In the version of Lorenz' story mentioned in Marchetti's article, "the secret squad assigned to kill President Kennedy... allegedly included Hunt."

In Lorenz' latest account, according to #1985.7, "Hunt came to their Dallas motel, the name or location of which she couldn't recall, to give Sturgis an envelope full of cash. Sturgis and other supposed conspirators named by Lorenz also have denied her story."

Perhaps it is not meaningful to ask if a lawyer like Lane believes this story just because he used it in court. But he seems to believe it. On February 11, he appeared on the PBS broadcast "Late Night America," and cited the Lorenz story when asked about the startling information he claimed to have. When host Dennis Wholey asked about her credibility, Lane noted that she had worked for various intelligence agencies. He did not mention the alleged roles of Ruby and Oswald in this episode.

If you are waiting on pins and needles to see what Lane has to say for himself, I can send you item #8, my rough handwritten notes on Lane's half-hour PBS appearance. [2 pp.] (If you really want a tape, ask someone who takes this more seriously than I do.)

One highlight: when asked if he was working on a new book, Lane said that he may do one; his 1966 book said who didn't kill JFK, and he thinks it is time for one which says who did it (i.e., the CIA). If he writes the book, he said, it will probably take another year or so.

I understand that Lane was not happy with the coverage in the Miami papers (provided to EOC by G. Winslow); he allegedly referred to Doig as "Hunt's publicist."

9. 27 Jan (MH) "Libel trial resurrects JFK conspiracy theory" [2 pp.] Last year, Hunt's lawyers failed to persuade the judge not to let Lane defend Liberty Lobby. "Lane, who underwent a quintuple heart bypass operation last summer shortly before the trial first was scheduled to begin, now is ready to defend in full Mark Lane fervor."

A photo of Lorenz with Castro in 1959 is included. By the way, Lorenz and Sturgis are undoubtedly interesting people, and even if they have spread disinformation, their stories deserve some attention. Her claim to have been involved in a plot to poison Castro is discussed at 10 HSCA 156-7 and 176.

10. 28 Jan (Miami News) "'Startling' facts in JFK death promised [by Lane] in Hunt libel case," in sworn statements by Liddy, Helms, and Stansfield Turner. Unlike in the first trial, Lane said he would not concede that Hunt was not in Dallas. "I've been waiting for this trial since November 1963," Lane said. "It's a first step toward finding out what actually happened." (Those with long memories will recall that by 1969 Lane was confident that Jim Garrison had solved the case.)

11. 29 Jan (MH) "Watergate figure denies JFK murder"

12. 29 Jan (MN) "Hunt says he was in DC that fatal day in Dallas"

13. 30 Jan (MH and MN) "Hunt denies he was in Dallas when JFK was shot down" He said "he had no personal knowledge... of CIA plots to kill" Castro, but he "would have hoped there were such plans."

14. 31 Jan (MH) "Ex-CIA chief [Helms] wrong [in recalling that Sturgis once was a contract agent], Hunt testifies"

and 31 Jan (MN) "[CIA] typist supports Hunt [alibi] story in trial"

and 1 Feb (MH) "Ex-CIA officials testify on Hunt" Helms and Turner, in depositions, said they had no knowledge of the supposed 1966 CIA internal memo on Hunt's presence in Dallas.

and 2 Feb (MH) "Writer admits he used JFK 'rumors'" Marchetti "admitted... that key parts of his 1978 article... were based almost solely on Washington rumors Marchetti said he heard from a Penthouse magazine columnist. The columnist, Bill Corson, later denied in a sworn deposition even talking about the rumors with Marchetti. 'I had no corroboration of Corson's story...,' Marchetti testified, but added that he knew two other reporters who were checking into the same story."

15. 3 Feb (Doig, MH) "Conspiracy buffs weaving theories at Hunt libel trial" Not flattering, but inevitable, and I've seen worse sidebars of this type. "'Where are the people?' [Spotlight subscriber Jim] Hatcher demands. 'They're being kept away by the CIA.' He dismisses the idea that, 21 years after the fact, only Hunt, Lane and a few conspiracy hobbyists really care anymore."

16. 6 Feb (MH) "Federal jury continues Hunt libel deliberations" Lane "was at his thunderous best in his final argument, calling the jury a 'people's commission' investigating the assassination.... Lane reiterated the stream of charges he had raised during the seven-day trial: The investigations were flawed, important facts were covered up, Hunt is a confessed perjurer, Hunt and the CIA hated Kennedy, Hunt can't prove where he was that day, Hunt's

alibi witnesses were CIA liars, and so on."

and 6 Feb (AP in MN) "Jury denies any libel damages to Hunt"

I have six more reports of the verdict, all from papers dated February 7. #17 is AP in the Frederick Post; #18 is UPI in the LA Daily News; #19 comprises three shorter versions of the AP and UPI reports (NYT, LAT, SFC), and #20 is a short account in the Washington Post.

From #17: "Outside court, [Lane] said that unidentified journalists 'do everything in their power to protect the governmental establishment which has hidden the truth from the American people.'"

Item #18 includes comments by both sides and a juror on whether the decision resulted solely from consideration of the malice issue. Lane "said the verdict also showed there was some credence to the conspiracy theory."

Anyone who has heard Lane's basic speech on the case knows that he is a better "communicator" than Reagan and funnier than Mort Sahl, so I would not be either surprised or impressed if he did persuade some jurors that there was a CIA conspiracy.

21. 29-30 Jan 85 (Irish Independent) Two short articles. "'I don't know why the CIA wanted to kill President Kennedy, but we will have to ask Mr. Hunt that,' Lane said."

22. [11 pp.] The official docket (a 9-page chronology of the case, going back to 1980) and a 2-page list of exhibits.

Issue #20 of 'Coverups!' includes a selection of articles on the Hunt case, including some from the Miami Herald.

Speaking of libel suits by ex-CIA officers:

I have no new information on the status of David Phillips' libel suit against Gaeton Fonzi. The last I heard, it looked moribund. But there is some news about his suit against Don Freed and Fred Landis:

23. 18 Jan 85 (Pub. Wkly) "Ex-Agent Faces Court Order in Libel Suit" In light of Phillips' failure to answer certain questions, the judge ruled that certain key facts would be taken as established for the purposes of this action: for example, that Phillips "specialized in propaganda and the planting of false information in the media," and that he had motive and means for assisting "in the concealment of any complicity of DINA personnel in the murder of... Orlando Letelier."

24. 23 Nov 84 [2 pp.] The full text of the judge's order.

Phillips has not been completely silent:

25. 17 Feb 85 (NYT) Ad for four books of FIBS (the Foreign Intelligence Book Series), including "Careers in Secret Operations: How to Be a Federal Intelligence Officer," by David A. Phillips. [2 pp.] The book is "peppered... with personal anecdotes." Helms calls it "a 'must' for those Americans interested in joining any U.S. intelligence organization."

26. A circular for this book. [2 pp.] Lyman Kirkpatrick has also contributed a blurb.

Books: News and Reviews:

Henry Hurt's book:

* The advertised publication date is August, which means books might be available late in July. The price is \$18.95, for 560 pages. Holt's spring catalog (#1985.27) describes "Reasonable Doubt: An Investigation into the Assassination of John F. Kennedy" as "a massive synthesis," based in part on interviews of "hundreds of people involved with and knowledgeable about the case."

John Davis' book: ("The Kennedys: Dynasty and Disaster")

The paperback edition, with a new epilogue, should be out this month, from McGraw-Hill.

Davis has an ongoing interest in the JFK and RFK assassinations. For

further details, and his address, see the January 1985 issue of "The Third Decade."

Seth Kantor has reviewed this book, along with the Collier-Horowitz book. (#28, 15 Jul 84, Atlanta Constitution) He considers Davis' book the more important and impressive one. "Davis does an especially good job of presenting the buildup of hostilities between organized crime" and RFK, "and the relevance of that war to the assassination of the President. Collier and Horowitz, on the other hand, ignore the assassination as an investigative issue, not caring to hike through the furrows of facts and would-be facts that already have been plowed by others."

The Davis book is definitely the one to give to any friends who are interested in the Kennedy family but not yet in the assassination. Don't be misled by the fact that Davis is Jackie Kennedy's cousin, or by the ascot he is wearing in the cover photo. The book is, ironically, more political (even radical) than the one written by two former "Ramparts" editors.

Davis takes a hard line on the question of Kennedy involvement in the plots against Castro. (See 6 EOC 2, p. 10.) He is surprisingly blunt about RFK's pro-Israel gestures in the 1968 campaign. His personal contacts with Bouviers and Kennedys are not overplayed; he is sympathetic to Jackie, but not uncritical (and he is rather nasty about the Radziwills). As a whole, the book provides a rather good synthesis of leading theories about the assassination, in the context of the personalities and politics of the Kennedy years.

As mentioned in 6 EOC 2 (p. 8), Davis gave more credence than I do to a previously unpublished allegation involving associates of Vincent Marcello. Like that story, a lot of Davis' evidence seemed vaguely familiar to me, and he seems to take some things more seriously than I do (e.g., the Rose Cheramie story). The factual errors which I noticed were minor. Since there are no detailed source notes, it is hard for me to identify new information, but there certainly is some.

For example, Blakey told Davis that RFK met with John McCone to discuss whether to tell the Warren Commission about the CIA plots against Castro. McCone sort of denied this. In any case, Davis is critical of RFK as well as the CIA for not telling the Warren Commission about the plots. (Pp. 498, 462) Blakey also said that RFK was nonfunctional as Attorney General after the assassination (p. 458). Davis effectively reviews the political as well as personal basis for JFK's fatalism.

According to documents released to Antoinette Giancana, her father Sam channeled a campaign contribution through Joe Kennedy. (Did we know that?) Did we know that Desmond FitzGerald was a social acquaintance of RFK, and that he was playing tennis with the French Ambassador when he died? (The latter fact argues against my paranoid fantasy that his death, at the height of the 1967 controversy about the Castro plots, was not what it seemed to be.)

Davis' analysis of Oswald's relationship with George DeMohrenschildt is interesting. Also, Davis speculates that Oswald may have been motivated by direct knowledge of the AMLASH operation, through the chain suggested by the Schweiker Report.

29. 15 Jul 84 (NYT) A short review, emphasizing the unflattering personal portraits. "Those who simply can't get enough of the Kennedys will find their favorite sordid details between these covers."

30. 22 Jul 84 (LA Times) A good review of the Davis and C&H books.

31. 6 Feb 85 (Liz Smith, NY News) Three paragraphs on the commercial success of the Davis book. A TV version is being considered.

More on "Secret Agenda":

In the last issue, I mentioned some "Dallas to Watergate" authors, but I inadvertently omitted Carl Oglesby's work. As early as 1973, he wrote about the possibility that McCord was a double agent. The following articles, which

appeared in the Boston Phoenix, will interest those of you curious about a very early manifestation of some of the theses in Hougan's book.

32. 3 Apr 73 "3 Versions of McCord" [2 pp.]

33. 17 Apr 73 "Did McCord Infiltrate Nixon's Camp?" [2 pp.]

34. 1 May 73 "Watergate: McCord's Real Role" [2 pp.]

Oglesby interviewed McCord in 1975; naturally, he denied conspiring to expose the Plumbers.

Oglesby expanded his analysis in his 1976 book, "The Yankee and Cowboy War." There is a whole chapter on "McCord, Double Agent." In support of his theory "that McCord was the pointman of an anti-Nixon plot formed within the CIA whose purpose was to disrupt a larger White House plot having police-state ramifications," Oglesby cited and analyzed five factors: "(1) an indication that whispers of an impending anti-Nixon plot were circulating before Watergate; (2) the denunciation of McCord by his confederate Plumbers; (3) direct evidence of a still-concealed CIA involvement in Watergate; (4) intimations of Yankeehood in McCord's career; and (5) McCord's overall role in the development of Watergate as a public issue."

Oglesby now concedes that his original articles were overly theoretical and that they contain factual errors and excesses of assumption. He admittedly worked from a general theory of power in America, looking at the details in that context. Like some of the JFK books, Hougan's work probably owes more to such general theorizing than the presentation - which focuses on central factual details - suggests. For example, we all had copies of the Sibert-O'Neill report, but Lifton's previous attention to the larger questions of who might have been behind the assassination, and how to interpret the contradictions in the medical evidence, allowed him to pursue the statement about head surgery productively.

One review of Hougan's book makes a comparison to the JFK case, but not one I had in mind:

35. 2 Feb 85 (Nation) "Mixed Nuts," by Aaron Latham. No orchids for us from this mother. Hougan's book "reads like a Kennedy assassination conspiracy book. By which I mean that it seems to have been written by a pecan or an acorn or a peanut or some other small-bore nut. American nightmares have a way of being transmuted over time into national nonsense.... It's time to put such silliness to rest before someone writes a book to the effect that Lee Harvey Oswald's accomplice was Deep Throat."

Latham quotes Woodward, who doesn't care for the book at all: "It's the Flat Earth Society of Watergate." Woodward says (flatly) that he was not in naval intelligence, and (earthily) that the book is "wacky... insane... one of these turds in the soup." Incidentally, Latham is wrong to say that Lou Russell "died a couple of years ago and so Hougan was not able to interview him, having come to the Watergate story somewhat late." Russell died in July 1973. (SA, p. 310)

36. 3 Jan 85 (Wall Street Journal) "Reinvestigating Watergate: The Elusive Glow of Truth" A basically favorable but not uncritical review, by Jonathan Kwitny. Woodward is quoted here also, but less dramatically than in #35.

37. March 1985 (Hustler) [2 pp.] Larry Flynt refers to an alleged suit by Spencer Oliver "to make sure something called the Gemstone File was never made public," and says that Liddy "confides to friends that the Republicans had an insider" at the DNC before Watergate.

38. 10 Dec 84 (Wash. Times) "A whole new arsenal for the Watergate skeptics! Saga suggests CIA duplicity brought Nixon down" A basically favorable review by M. T. Owens, who "is on the staff of a U.S. senator."

39. (Same paper, same date) A profile of Hougan, with quite a bit of factual material. [6 pp., with photos] Included, for example, is Hougan's account of his conversations with John Dean on the identity of Deep Throat;

at some point, each suspected Secret Service agent Alfred Wong.

40. Feb 85 (Wash. Monthly) A mixed review. [2 pp.]

The Collier-Horowitz book: ("The Kennedys: An American Drama")

41. 29 Mar 84 (AP) "Ethel Kennedy punished her sons after [RFK's] assassination"

42. 16 Jun 84 (from WP) "Authors accused of pushing David Kennedy toward brink"

43. 19 Jun 84 (SFC) "Kennedys: The Dark Side of a Clan" [2 pp.]
An interesting interview of the authors.

44. 1 Jul 84 (Detroit FP) "Cutting through the myth of Camelot"

45. 1 Jul 84 (Detroit News) "Dying dynasty? Kennedys' pride ruined their kids, authors say" [2 pp.]

46. 16 Jul 84 (SFC) "The Kennedy Clan - Before John and After"
The authors "are less interested in the outward politics and history the family has made than in the way these things reflect the Kennedys' inner values and relationships."

47. 14 Jan 85 (WSJ) "Camelot Lost: The Saga Continues" Includes a few critical paragraphs on the Davis book.

I found the Collier-Horowitz book valuable because of, rather than in spite of, its relentless focus on the family's view of the world. It helps explain how the assassinations looked like just part of a long chain of accidents, and how the family could be uninterested in uncovering possible conspiracies. For someone who already knows the political context from other sources, the gossip and the depiction of personalities does add a lot. The book contains valuable source material on the question of the consequences of personal quirks (including but not limited to who was sleeping with whom, an issue for the Kennedys which we have not heard the last of.)

I had a pleasant conversation with Peter Collier over lunch last fall, but he had no new material on the assassination for me.

Miscellaneous: (Rats, Moles, and History)

48. 13 Jan 85 (WP) "The Two-Senator Thriller" Due this spring (from Morrow) is a novel, "The Double Man," by Senators Gary Hart and William Cohen. A possible Senatorial mole is involved, and "the events which took place in Dallas 22 years ago turn out to play a key role."

49. 22 Jan 85 (SFC) "What's Behind Sinatra's Outburst?" "You are all dead," he said to TV reporter Barbara Howar (no doubt metaphorically). He was apparently angered by a generally favorable WP piece on the history of the Rat Pack. Gossip columnist Liz Smith quotes an intimate who says "Everything Frank is doing these days is a hedge against Kitty Kelley's coming book." This article is not relevant to the case - although Kelley's book might be, if it discusses JFK and Sinatra's other friends, male and female. I am listing this item so that I can quote from the following one.

50. 28 Jan 85 (SFC) "Contempt for the Past," by Richard Reeves. The WP article "mentioned that Sinatra has known a gangster or two, and that a grand jury or two would like to have known him better. 'It was just a regurgitation of stale material that has been written and written and written,' said Sinatra's press agent.... So, that was his gripe. Tough!"

"In fact, if there is a lesson to this tempest of temperament, it's that the press, like most everything and everyone else in America, doesn't pay enough attention to 'stale material.' In more elegant phrasing, we have no sense of history, and we're paying a price for this...."

"In 1968, Richard Nixon raised contempt for the past to its highest state, creating a 'new Nixon' - who, alas, turned out to have the same old stale defects of the old one. In 1980 and 1984, the press focused on Ronald Reagan as the performer of the day, rarely checking into or reporting the stale stuff about how he got where he was...."

51. July 84 (Inquiry) "Did Andropov finger the pope?" [2 pp.] A review of the Sterling and Henze books by Jonathan Marshall. "The bottomless depth of intrigue so far uncovered is strikingly reminiscent of the [JFK] assassination. Like Agca, Oswald was a mysterious figure, infinitely investigated but never understood, whose contacts with political extremists and intelligence agents of all sides blur his own loyalties.... Though neither case may ever be 'solved,' both remain important for all that we have learned from them. The Kennedy investigation opened a new window on the secrets of covert CIA operations and assassination plots against Castro; the pope case exposes to view as never before the terrorist crimes and machinations of the Soviets and their allies. The very similarity of the cases may highlight their most salient lesson: Great states have more in common than their official ideologies ever suggest."

Booksellers: I have recently heard about The Last Hurrah Bookshop (937 Memorial Ave., Williamsport, PA 17701) and The President's Box Book Shop (P.O. Box 1255, Washington, DC 20013). The latter, which specializes in assassination material, sent me a six-page listing, heavy on rare material in collectible condition (e.g., Flammonde for \$25, the 26 volumes for \$650). (As some of you know, I have often bought books from Tom Davis Books, Box 1107, Aptos, CA 95001.)

For computer users: If you want to get in touch with others interested in using personal computers for JFK-case research, please send me your name and a paragraph about your interests, and I'll circulate a list. (I have some micro-computer expertise myself, but no home computer and little spare time.)

Daniel Brandt has done some work which might be valuable to us:

52. "Using Microcomputers for Power Structure Research" (Summary memo)

53. A sample printout from Brandt's retrieval program and a list of the books (including a few on the JFK case) indexed on his general data base (along with many clippings). [2 pp.]

54. A "user's guide" for his search, entry, and merge programs. [4 pp.] Brandt is willing to make available his programs, their source code, and his data base. His impression is that indexing all the JFK books would be a manageable job.

Credits: Thanks to D. Brandt (#52-54), B. Cutler (#6), J. Davis (#28, 31), M. Ewing (#20, 35, 48), D. Freed (#24), J. Goldberg (#19C), L. Harris (#38-39, 48), G. Hollingsworth (#6, 18, 19B, 23, 29-30, 35-37, 40, 47), H. Hurt (#27), S. Meagher (#4), P. Melanson (#26), J. Mierzejewski (#44-45), C. Oglesby (#32-4), R. Ranftel (#2, 25), C. Scally (#21), L. Sproesser (#4, 15), H. Weisberg (#17), and G. Winslow (#5, 7, 9-16, 22).

Subscription information: There were 4 issues of EOC last year; let me know if you missed any. The minimum rate for a paid subscription is 5¢ per page, plus postage. For 1984, that comes to \$2.80 in the U.S. and Canada. (That is, 70¢ for each 10-page issue.) For postage to Europe, add 40¢ per issue; to Australia, 50¢; U.S. funds only. Additional contributions cover complimentary subscriptions and help with other expenses. Please make any checks payable to me, not to EOC.

I don't usually have time to keep track of when subscriptions expire, but nobody gets cut off without notice. If I have never asked you for money, you are getting a complimentary subscription; please notify me if you don't want it.

Trivia: Which member of the Warren Commission is the first to appear on a U.S. postage stamp? Not Earl Warren, but Richard Russell. (See the envelope.)