

Dear Howard,

4/15/76

Time and other pressures are greater than usual and today's mail is loaded with letters that require detailed response. So I'll have to be brief ~~just~~ with your two of the 12th. I have to get more copy read for retyping in my ~~absence~~ absence, which means I can do little more than correct it; and I'm now not going to be able to do the shopping Lil asked me to do.

While I think I wrote later about Bowley, let me give a couple of explanations.

There is what I had missed and Rod found, a typographical error in one of the three log transcripts, I think CE705. It does say ~~xxx~~ 1:10 when it isn't. That should be 1:19 and the tape is clear.

C The problem with the Enquirer is Pope's fetish on "entirely new." Thus he will not go for Bowley's affidavit alone. The tape distinguished three different voices, Callaway's, too and otherwise as you say. Rod's solution is to see Bowley and have the interview with him as this entirely new thing. And it is along the same general line you suggest, of suppressing Bowley and for the reasons you comprehend, of timing the killing to an earlier moment.

O On Melin and his long way around jazz and the FBI's immaterial timing: they had the problem of having their "Oswald" do as Maricham is said to have said. Therefore, they had to go "the long way around," any other way being immaterial. It was not a simple question of airline distance. You will recall no explanation of any Oswald being there at that place for any reason. The tape's value now seems to be that it validates Bowley, establishes suppression, and again raises questions about whether there ever was anything that could be called an investigation.

P Assuming Maricham was truthful and not led into testifying to direction, with right to left not the same as her inability to identify ~~max~~ compass points, then with it having been impossible for that to have been LHO she has to be saying somebody else.

Y On Frazier, thanks. What you have is helpful. My point was what Kilty tried to tell me, that they never took comparison-microscope pictures. It is not a simple question of the FBI's knowing or understanding. The agent testifies. He has to have something to support his testimony. They did take some of these pix in King but not one where it can or does make a difference. What I want is something that can show the practice when testimony is to be called for, not their own internal purposes or needs.

I leave for NYC early Sunday, have dinner that night with Lamont, return to DC late Wednesday, do an early a.m. TV show Thursday (King) and thereafter return. In this connection my 544 files have been gutted, too. I had a separate one on Paul's work and the empty folder only is there! I will want, if you have it, a clear copy of the page of his pamphlet. I have a less than good one I'm taking to him, with a couple of other reports. (His late wife was a friend of mine in the late 30s.) She and her then husband were fine people. He and I were on the same committee.

Thanks much. Don't misread the haste. Best,