

6 June 1970

Dear Harold,

Thanks for your thoughtful and generous comments on my article in the Texas Observer, I do appreciate knowing that you read the minutes of the executive sessions in generally the same way as I do. I wrote this review in September 1968, just as TMO was folding up, and it took more than a year to finally get it published—which illustrates the kind of indifference (if not worse) that we are up against.

Have you read the Al Newman book? I have managed only about 140-odd pages so far, and I need not take your time or my own to express my reaction, which I am sure is about the same as your own. In reading the first section of the book (which I don't have with me just now), I did start thinking about certain oddities that I had not given much attention in the past. For example, Newman has Oswald casing the Walker house and taking photos of the house and environs (as does the WR) on a date in March 1963 at least two days earlier than the money order for the rifle was purchased and before the .38 Smith and Wesson was shipped to Dallas on 3/12/63.

First, it struck me that it would have been strange indeed for anyone to prepare in such detail to commit a shooting (going to the scene, taking photos) when he did not at the time have any firearms at his disposal and had not even ordered the rifle allegedly used. (And I leave aside the fact that the Dallas Police, in the course of investigating the Walker shooting in April 1963, apparently took photos of the house and environs some of which seem to be identical in location and subject as the photos allegedly taken by Oswald.) Next, it dawned on me that it was also strange that Oswald, if he really forked over just under \$30 on 1/27/63 for the S&W, and if it still had not arrived by 3/10/63, would merely wait in patient silence. Everything we know about Oswald suggests that he would have sent inquiries and complaints if his order was not filled in a reasonable time after he had made a substantial advance payment. ^{What do you think?} It is all inferential, of course, but in psychological terms, ^{the official story} becomes all the more dubious.

In the course of trying to answer an inquiry from Fred Newcomb, I rechecked some of the CE's this morning and again was struck by a discrepancy that I should have noticed long ago, on the photos of Oswald holding the rifle and the Militant etc. These sensational photos were supposedly found on 11/23/63 at the Paine home, yet they do not appear to be prominently displayed (as they should have been) or present at all in the photo of all the objects seized in that particular search which is in the Curry book, as I may have mentioned earlier, when I got the Curry. This morning, in studying the list of property seized at Irving on 11/23/63 which was typed on 11/26/63 in the FBI office and certified by De Brueys and which appears in CE 2003, I became excited to discover that there is no mention in that list of any photos of Oswald holding a rifle or of any such negative(s). Surely such photos as CE 133A and B would have been segregated and explicitly described? In contrast, the photos and negatives are described specifically in Stovall Exhibit D—but that is undated and could have been improvised months after the actual search. Note also the striking differences between the lists given in Stovall Exhibit A on the 11/22/63 search and Stovall Exhibit B on the 11/23/63 search, which again does not specifically mention the photo of Oswald holding rifle. If the photos and the official account of their discovery were really authentic, I find it impossible to understand why they were not explicitly and prominently mentioned in the inventories. Again, I would be very interested to your reaction to this line of reasoning—maybe I'm all wet but as of now I think this may be important.

As ever,