

3 September 1965

Dear Vince,

It was good to hear from you, I wasn't sure when you were due to return from your trip. Needless to say, I shall be interested to hear more about your visit to Dallas, when we next meet. It is very kind of you and Mrs Salandria to invite me to your home. I would like that very much, and this is not merely polite, I genuinely mean it. As you know, I have been putting aside everything that draws me, in an attempt to complete the subject index. Happily, it is very, very near completion. I think I would like to bring it with me when I come, and perhaps take advantage not only of your advice but of your photocopy machine. Is a weekday feasible, or is a Saturday or Sunday better? Also (I am ashamed to admit it) I have not been to Philadelphia, what is the best way to travel?

I have made inquiries about copywriting the index and I have also made some telephone calls to publishing houses and written to some university presses. It would be an enormous relief to get out from under the index and return to the case, from which this gruesome labor has separated me. By the way, here is a copy of the supplementary name index--it has not yet been checked for accuracy but it may be of some use anyhow. Thomas Stamm has kindly agreed to check the citations and eventually I will have a corrected copy for you.

Perhaps Stamm will have been in touch with you already. If not, let me mention that his vacation was truncated by what appeared to be a serious illness but fortunately was a false alarm. He did not get to Dallas at all for that reason but he did visit the Archives, yesterday, and saw the Zapruder film (as a motion picture). He feels that the film shows decisively that the head shot sent the President violently back and to the left, ruling out any possibility of the sixth floor window. By sheer coincidence, just before Stamm phoned, I had received and was studying some new photographic material from Beverly Hills with an interpretation which advocates exactly the same conclusion that Stamm reached by seeing the film.

No, the Long John show was not very gratifying. The main guest was someone called Al Newman, formerly with Newsweek and The Reporter, who is writing a book on Oswald's motivation "WHY WHY WHY" or some such unique title--without of course having asked himself if the man was actually guilty. His approach is that Oswald was motivated by leftist groups (?) or convictions, it was not very clear. A second guest was Kieron O'Dougherty, 99 and 3/4ths percent malice and a professional anti-communist whose style is reminiscent of that evil man Wm Buckley Jr. The discussion was saved from absolute disaster by a medical doctor, Howard Miller, who said flatly that he did not believe Oswald committed the crimes of which he is accused, starting with the Walker shooting, and ~~then~~^{who} took the focus away from the area of unqualified speculations about Oswald's inner self and into specific issues such as marksmanship, ballistics, etc. Miller was admirable but not really well-versed in the case, so that his effectiveness was not as great as it might have been.

I hope that you have seen the NYU Law Review, May 1965 (actually issued end of August) with the symposium on the Warren Report. There are some useful things in some of the five articles but the orientation is dismayingly unseptical about the official conclusions.

What do you think of Marina's newest contretemps? It strengthens my distrust and suspicion of her.

Mrs Field of Beverly Hills will be visiting New York early in October for a few days; I hope that it will be possible for all of us to meet her and that you will be able to join us for an evening. She is one of the best-informed students of the case, as I have mentioned.

I look forward to seeing you again soon, here or at Philadelphia, and thank you and your wife again for your invitation to visit.

Warm regards,