

I wrote this soon after noting the correspondence, and have not analysed further, nor looked at other sets of numbers.

I checked with someone who knows a little about codes and thinks there may be something behind 19106 and 110669. You can't go far with just two numbers, however; it does not give you enough data on which to search for a system.

I'll check further with someone who knows more. I wanted you to have this undigested material in case you should speak with someone about it before I have a chance to write again.

Still,

Dick

Bernabei

11 March 69

Harold:

Here is another note regarding the possibility that LHO was using codes. Again, I advise you that I have no idea what meaning there may be to the following. This may be irrelevant, but I thought I should call it to your attention anyway.

In connection with my note on the numbers 19106 and 110669, I said that both numbers used only the four digits, 1,6,9, and 0. I thought that that information might bear at least on the probability that the correspondence between the numbers is not accidental.

Now look at the numbers that were in LHO's possession when he was arrested (you sent me these a month or so ago):

AL 2-4611	(1,2,4,6)
CO 7-3110	(1,3,7,0)
OR 9-9450	(4,5,9,0)
RI 8-9711	(1,7,8,9)

Each of those numbers respectively uses only four digits. I consider that a remarkable occurrence, and I believe that the probability of this happening by chance is very, very low.

Gary, Paul, Bal

3/16/69

Dear Dick,

I have not responded to your letters of 3/7,10,11 only because I've been laid low by a high fever from which I have not yet entirely emerged. I've woozy and weak. I'm trying a little work for the first time today.

Many thanks for the Dell confirmation.

C I am sending copies of your fascinating observation of the numbers to but three of those with whom I work. It happens that there is an amateur cryptographer with whom I have been in touch. If I get around to writing him today I'll enclose a copy of that letter. Two of the three men have copies of the documents from which I got the number 110,669. I will spell it out to the other in person.

O I have observed a simple Oswald misuse of numbers in a way that had meaning to him. For example, when I checked out 117 Camp it made no sense at all, but on the spot I was able to observe the significance, for by going to that address he would immediately see what he wanted, 107, the office of Ronnie Caire. He had another I did not solve, another nonexistent one, 1032 Canal. I am embarrassed for not noting the similarity to ~~101~~ 19106, which uses the same digits. I can only wonder at the odds against this occurrence. Or of the meaning of "DD".

P He did the same thing with names. For example, David Crawford in his notebook is David Chandler, as Chandler confirmed to me. What he told Chandler, then a States-Tem reporter, is fascinating: that Bringuier was connected with paramilitary activities on the other side of Lake Pontchartrain. Chandler confirmed this to me also. The FBI interviewed Chandler twice, never in person, but filed one report only.

Y Please keep me posted, as I will you. Again, thanks.

Sincerely,

Herold Weisberg

907, Paul, Bud

3/18/69

Dear Mr. Brown,

Again I consult you as cryptographic expert, this time with the observation of a friend who I had asked to look for any occurrence of the number 110,669. His letters are attached.

C Should you consult anyone else, I'd prefer that these numbers not be disclosed, if at all possible. Could you pose any question with substituted similar numbers?

In fact, I would like the entire matter to be quite confidential.

O However, I do let you know the significance of 110,669. It is one of the most entirely suppressed facts of the entire investigation. Despite all the misrepresentations, it is the number allegedly that of Oswald as an agent.

P He was never alleged to have been Agent S-179, or to have been paid on Voucher No. S-179. These were deliberate misrepresentations. They served the additional deceptive purpose of making it possible for affidavits of denial to be prepared by the J. Edgar Hoovers with no danger of perjury.

I look forward to hearing from you. I plan to use this in a partly-written book, AGENT OSWALD.

Y Have you tried to learn whether there might be significance for the Russian "DD" before the 19106 in Oswald's notebook?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

(sorry for the handwriting; my typewriter is not handy. I'll try to write larger than I usually do)

7 March 1969

Harold -

You told me to watch out for the number 110669, and why that number is significant. I have thought about it, and the material that follows indicates the first step in the course of my thinking. I plan to pursue this further when I can get in touch with someone who can help me, but now I offer it merely as a suggestion for a line of inquiry.

I caution you that I do not know about matters related to codes, so realize how tentatively I offer this. I'll try to contact someone who knows about such matters, and he may be able to determine the validity of this line of inquiry.

I suggest that you compare 110669 with the number 19106 that appears in the notebooks of both Shaw and Oswald. LHO uses the Russian letters for "DD" preceding 19106, and Shaw lists the following address:

Lee Odum
PO Box 19106
Dallas, Tex.

Not only do the notebook numbers correspond, but also the name Lee Odum corresponds with Lee Oswald in the first name and first initial of the last name; that is, Lee O(dum) corresponds with Lee O(swald). That relationship adds considerably to the probability that the correspondence between the two notebook numbers is not accidental.

Considering the numbers themselves, one ought also to ponder this feature: that both 110669 and 19106 contain only the digits 1, 6, 9, and 0. All these four digits appear in both numbers, and neither of the numbers contains other digits.

The conversion of one number to the other is easily accomplished. Because I do not know about cryptography, I cannot explain the rationality of the system, but I shall try to check and learn whether there is a ~~standard~~ standard or systematic method of conversion.

The 5-digit number can be converted to the 6-digit number by repeating the last digit, and shifting the second digit to the end of the series; e.g.:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 9 & 1 & 0 & 6 & \\ & \underline{} & & & & \xrightarrow{} \\ & 1 & 1 & 0 & 6 & 6 & 9 \end{array}$$

Conversely, the 6-digit number can be converted to the 5-digit as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & \text{(delete)} \\ & & & & & 9 \\ 1 & \uparrow & 1 & 0 & 6 & \downarrow \\ \hline & & & & & \end{array}$$

As I said, I do not know about codes, and cannot tell whether this represents a logical method of conversion. I suggest that you make inquiries about it; I'll do the same. I think I may be guessing in the right area, but do not know if my reasons for so guessing are justified.

To carry speculation one step farther (assuming that I am right about the association relationship between the two numbers), this might be the motive for the inclusion of 19106 in the notebooks of the five men:

Oswald wanted to remember the number 110669, and entered it cryptically in his notebook (while in Russia) as "DD" 19106. The letters "DD" may have no significance.

Shaw wanted to remember not only the number, but also the person with whom it was associated. The name Lee Odum stands for Lee Oswald, and 19106 is a coded version of 110669.

The "real" Lee Odum, who surfaced in Dallas after Garrison played with the number 19106, would of course negate all speculation regarding the association of the two numbers in question. If it appears that there is a standard or systematic method of converting 19106 to 110669, then I would be strongly inclined to reject Lee Odum of Dallas as a phony. I suspect that, in any case.

Does this make sense to you?

Still,

Dick

BERNARD