Sorry I did not reread your 4/2 note prior to reading those pages of Newman. So I did not mark them up. The inferences of red-lining by deM are noteredible, if this is what you meant. What even Newman does not avoid to the effect that deM was a sort of liberal, off-beat, individualistic is credible. Or, even Newman canôt make out a case except to those who have to take his word without questioning. Nor is there an Oswald=red case. The Moore Scott did not identify was then CIA station cheif, well known as suchmalargely publicly, too. I think has expertise was what you would expect in cil land. Have I missed what you had in mind? I am quite serious in calling this the assassins committee over the deM matter. It amounts to killing him. If deM were a CIA agent, and I'm sure he was no more than a source, there still is no credible connection with the assassination or with setting Oswald up. I've not read the clips yet, but thanks for all of this. I'll provide JL with copies, of what he wants. He has left on a 10-day trip at please watch NYTimes with care for me. Their new reporter on story is from the Inquirer. He sure knows Sprague! He, Wendell Rawls, is the one who got the DJ to confirm the Munt letter is genuine, when the Dallas Morning News experts did. Not before. Quist day so far. Thanks and best, HM 4/8/77