

May 10, 1975

Dear Lifton,

It is two years since I wrote that our correspondence was marked by lapses of years' duration. I don't believe you answered that letter, but hope you will pause long enough in your researches and writing to explain an anomaly in the Sighttext edition of the transcripts of the Warren Commission executive sessions.

The errata sheet accompanying the transcripts noted the accidental omission from the table of contents of a listing for the transcript of the session of February 24, 1964 which, however, was included in the body of the volume but out of chronological order. A more important error relates to "page 65 making its appearance for the second time and carrying the incorrect page number '20' (your pagination; not the transcript's)." A correct reproduction of "labeled page 20 (in the book, as printed)" for insertion in the proper place accompanied the errata sheet, and restored the continuity of the transcript.

44 But a number of points about page 65/20 are puzzling and call for elucidation. Page 44 of the transcript of this session (page 45 in your accompanying pagination) is followed by a blank page, unnumbered in the transcript; 45 in your pagination. A partly typed and partly handwritten two-sentence notation occupies the width of the page just above the center of the page. The first sentence reads: "Pages 43-68 of this transcript are withheld from research under the terms of 5 U.S.C. 552." If pages 43-68 were withheld and according to the accompanying letter from the National Archives are still withheld, page 65 was and is classified. How did you get hold of it? More importantly, do you have pages 43-64 and 66-68? Will you "declassify" them? 4/2 followed

These pages, of course, would document the immediate context of page 65/20, make its content comprehensible, and might throw light on the extraordinary discrepancy in subject matter between its content and the second sentence of the notation on your page 45, which reads: "These pages relate to the employment of personnel by the Commission." Page 65/20 contains comment by "Chairman" (Warren) who thought General Counsel Rankin "ought to explore all those things and come back to us at a future meeting;" by "rep. Beggs" who said he "can foresee situations;" by "Sen. Russell" who said "It could involve the Post Office Department;" by "Mr. McCloy" who pointed out "He (Oswald?) got money orders;" by "Rep. Beggs" again who said "Everyone has all kinds of questions, reading the FBI report leaves a million questions;" and by "Mr. Dulles" who made "One other point...in the case of the CIA they can't do much on the Soviet end until they receive these papers that have been submitted to us by the FBI" on which the CIA "started when I was there;" and who opined "The Russians have not told us anything about it but they were paying him...quite substantial sums...some five thousand rubles," which shocked the spymaster/commissioner "at first," and presumably his fellows as well.

Nothing at all about employment of personnel by the Commission.

The importance of pages 43-68 is obvious. What do you say?

Expectant! Thomas Sumner