

10/26/69

Dear Sylvia,

I've now read your 10/10 letter to the Times carefully. It is excellent. Too bad there was no space for casual reference to the official disciplining of Hosty for unknown reasons. Bet the Times doesn't publish.

It wasn't until I reached into my pocket for cab money after leaving you that I wondered if I owed you change from the dinner. I merely glanced at the total when I had the check. If I do, please let me know.

On the return trip I finished reading Finck's N.O. testimony. I regard it as of the greatest significance. I'll be going over it again, with more care, when I return to the autopsy writings. I think you will find, on reading Frazier's, that much the same is true. If you have any ideas or suggestions after reading them, I would welcome them. CD5:400 is a good enough example of how easy it is to miss something. That is one of the first files I examined. The arraignment is one of the things that interested me. I believe I found different copies of the papers, asked that copies be xeroxed for me, and by golly, I think I never got them (This may have been explainable as a consequence of the xeroxing of a xerox.) But page 400 I missed!

Some of the other testimony we will eventually get, I hope after the election. We will also arrange for it to be available. I'll let you know if and when.

Sorry the day I was there was so hectic for you. We got to spend too little time together, for there is too much to cover.

It is too early to evaluate the results of the main purpose of the trip. My impression is that the prospective publisher is not, really, seriously interested in the subject. Men of principle, as he reputedly is, often sublimate their principles when money is involved. Perhaps I'll have an idea after he reads the book, if he does. It is pretty long. About a third of a million words without the extensive appendix.

Saw Bud Friday. Nothing new on suit. No letter yet from D.J.

Best regards,

