

Everybody's Nuts Except the CTIA (or some of them) and Nobody Else Is Doing Any Work,  
Which Is Why Oswald Was Guilty and His Gun Was Used Even If He Did Not Use it.

Oh, Yes, The Spectro and all the other cases are the CTIA's.

So, dear Jim, I know why you didn't send me "obile's masterpiece, his best of many efforts  
of similar sterling character. It has been so long I'll remind you of the appropriate-  
ness of the date it appeared in the Long Island Press: 11/23/73.

Or about the time Bob Smith, the quoted and the only quoted source, decided there  
was no reason for him and the CTIA to remain bonded.

He/it are ""stabbing practically alone in the assassination wilderness." With the  
limitation, I have no strong objection.

It by inference alone "fights the good fight by suing the government for secret data."

Bob Says, "I don't believe the assassination was covered up by the government."

An nobody involved could have been connected with the government.

Example of "incomplete investigation?" The spectro case, introduced with something  
less than the precision one would expect of the standing alone's "research director."

Can people see this suppressed stuff? Answer, Smith:

"We're attempting to do that. The committee had a case pending in the court of  
appeals under the Freedom of Information Act to obtain access to the FBI's analysis of  
the bullets [several sics], but the court ruled against us [sic] about a month ago."

When did you say the standing alone will be standing not quite alone in Pittsburgh?  
Ain't quite soon enough!

And it was the Kennedy family's "casual interest" in the subject that had Sheridan  
in "ew" rleans.

The medical evidence proves there could have been no shot from the front because  
"clearly" there was no entrance wound of the head (presumably this is the only part of  
a President's anatomy and because there was no rear exit wound also of the head only.

"Four different psychoses" is all Bob says the DOD attributed to him. They decided  
too soon.

From the stuff he talks about as significant as well as from this, I fear Bob is  
much sicker than I've thought or you've indicated and I do believe that the sooner he,  
leaves the better off he will be. He can't take it, and I believe in part what he can't  
take is having accomplished nothing at all.

I was lucky I did no more damage to myself when he was here than almost taking a  
thumb off. He must have been in better than average shape that day, judging from this.

I don't care about this as it relates to (entirely unmentioned) me or about "obile,  
whose stuff has always been so awful I never even started a file (oversight corrected  
with this). But I do care that there exists any kind of agency for getting this kind  
of awful stuff out and credited.

It does seriously misinform people and because of the misdirection it also hurts  
the possibility of accomplishing anything.

I don't mind that you didn't send me a copy and my bloodpressure isn't up a bit.  
I sorry, ~~xxxx~~ rather, that Bud's money has gone for this kind of insanity and that Bob  
is this sick and this eaten with the result of his own incompetence.

Maybe he didn't show you a copy? Mine came from Howard yesterday and will not make a  
very clear copy. I'm sure he'll provide one, which would be better than this, which has  
much black and gray where it does not belong.

## An uncommon conversation

# He keeps JFK death probe percolating after 10 years

By PHILIP NOBILE

Ten years after the assassination of John Kennedy, the harvest is plenty but the laborers are few. Most of the overnight experts have turned to other pursuits and the buffs are a dying breed.

Standing practically alone in the assassination wilderness is the Washington-based Committee to Investigate Assassinations. With a paid staff of one, and a mailing list of 1,000, the committee fights the good fight by suing the government for secret data and acting as a clearinghouse for information concerning the JFK, RFK and Martin Luther King murders. Who pays the bills? The committee's founder and executive director, Bernard Fensterwald, Jr. Fensterwald rose to prominence recently as counsel for Watergate defendant James McCord.



Philip Nobile

In order to learn what's what these days with the JFK assassination, I talked to the committee's mild-mannered research director, Bob Smith. Smith worked as a Defense Department analyst in the 1960s until his security clearance was lifted, a decision that was reversed in court last year.

Although Defense Department lawyers accused him, he says, of displaying "four different psychoses," Smith appears pretty sane to me, especially on the subject of JFK.

I'm kind of glad Smith is on the job.

Q. If the JFK assassination was a conspiracy, then it turned out to be a perfect crime. Nobody's cracked the conspiracy yet and nobody seems to be even close.

A. I have to agree with you. Insofar as no one has confessed to or come forward with incontrovertible evidence of a conspiracy, the presumption is that (a) there was no conspiracy or that (b) it's so small and tightly held that no leaks have sprung.

Q. Various critics contend that the Warren Commission didn't try very hard and even intended a white-wash all along.

A. I don't believe the assassination was covered up by the government. Nor do I accept that any of the conspirators were agents or employees of the government. However, I do fault the Warren Commission for covering up its oversights and for conducting an incomplete investigation.

Q. Those are the kindest words I've ever heard from an assassination expert about the Warren Commission. Could you give me an example of the incompleteness of its investigation?

A. The ballistic details of the case were ignored. Although three bullets were supposedly fired by the assassin or assassins, only the equivalent of one-and-a-half bullets was ever found. These fragments were analyzed spectrographically. And laboratory data exists on them. Yet the Warren Commission failed to inquire whether all the bullet fragments came from the same source. The answer could have been determined quite simply if the lab reports had been consulted.

Q. Is it possible for outside investigators to get a look at the ballistics file?

A. We're attempting to do that. The committee had a case pending in the Court of Appeals under the Freedom of Information Act to obtain access to the FBI's analysis of the bullets, but the court ruled against us about a month ago.

Q. On what grounds?

A. Well, the decision had nothing to do with national security or taste or delicacy. The file contains nothing but routine scientific data. Apparently the court was persuaded on the narrow legal grounds that the law does not require the FBI to release its investigatory files.

Q. Still, withholding of crucial evidence seems suspicious to me. What has the government got to hide? No wonder people suggest the CIA was behind the plot.

A. You can't draw conclusions from the absence of data. Sure, for 10 years we've known many things are missing, and some things have disappeared only lately. But until this information becomes available, we can't be certain what it will prove. All the more reason, therefore, that we ought to get the information. Let's not leave unanswered questions for history to decide.

Q. Apart from the ballistics file, what evidence would you really like to lay your hands on?

A. A magazine advertisement for a handgun was allegedly found in Oswald's possession. Someone had written "October 1959" on the ad. The FBI has never identified the handwriting and now they claim they've lost the ad. Yet this is probably an important piece of evidence. If it was not Oswald's handwriting, then whose was it? Perhaps the ad could lead to Oswald's accomplice or to someone who framed him.

Q. I have always been curious about the reaction of the Kennedy family. Are they interested in pursuing the case?

A. Not as far as reopening it. They believe we're wasting our time and they say we are offending their feelings. I suspect the family too was once convinced of a conspiracy, but the kooks finally got to them. They thought the whole world went crazy.

But even as late as 1968, the Kennedy family maintained at least a casual interest in the conspiracy theory. An associate of Bobby Kennedy's, Walter Sheridan, went down to New Orleans to gather information on the Garrison case.

Q. What assassination lore do you dismiss? It would be useful to discover which theories and which so-called facts have been discredited.

A. It may sound shocking to you, but I place no cred-

ence in the grassy knoll theory. The medical evidence we have been allowed to examine, if valid, shows rather clearly that there was no entry wound on the front of the head and no exit wound on the rear of the head. Consequently, no guns could have been fired from the grassy knoll or from in front of Kennedy.

By no means do I eliminate a second gunman. Another gunman could have shot from the rear, either from the Texas School Book Depository where Oswald was supposedly located, or from another nearby building.

Second, I am convinced no large team of conspirators were involved in the assassination at Dealy Plaza. There's just no evidence to support this theory.

Third, theories which postulate the outright fabrication of evidence are preposterous. You couldn't keep that kind of conspiracy quiet.

Q. What hard evidence do you have that two or more gunmen fired from the rear?

A. The bullet's trajectory as indicated by the wound in the President and Governor Connally apparently can't be matched up with a rifle location in the sixth-floor window of the Depository. The Warren Commission hedged all around this question, but finally said everything was consistent.

Oswald could have fired the head shot. I'll concede, but not the one that hit the President's back and throat and Connally's chest, wrist and thigh.

Q. What about Oswald? Was he or wasn't he involved?

A. Of course he was involved. But his involvement might have been no greater than the use of his gun. He could be innocent of the actual shooting, but his gun could have fallen into other hands, either inadvertently or with his collaboration.

Oswald obviously showed some sense of alarm that afternoon. He did flee, and that shows anxiety, if not guilt.

Q. If Oswald had help, what were the roles of his fellow conspirators?

A. They could have been gunmen or evidence planters. I incline toward a second gunman in the Texas School Book Depository and perhaps one other person to coordinate matters and make last-minute suggestions as to the right spot from which to fire.

Naturally, other conspirators could have paid for and planned the whole operation.

Q. You've been in this business long enough to have formed an opinion of New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison. Is he a complete fraud or did he have something to go on?

A. Well, Jim was aware of certain paradoxes and inconsistencies. But when he seized on Clay Shaw, he was really just striking at random. His case against Shaw was less than ethical and he lost it. However, even though he brought discredit on the rest of us, I'd say he was sincere.