

2537 Regent St., Apt. 202  
Berkeley, Calif. 94704  
December 12, 1967

Mr. Tom Bethell  
638 Royal Street  
N.O., La. 70130

Dear Tom,

This is in reply to your letter of December 1, 1967, concerning columnists Robert Allen and Paul Scott, and in particular their recent column about Oswald's knowledge of the transfer of Eusebio Azque from the Cuban Consulate in Mexico City.

I know very little about Allen & Scott in general. I think of them as a somewhat right-wing equivalent of Drew Pearson & Jack Anderson -- and about as unlikely to be factually accurate. As the rest of this letter should indicate, I do not believe that they have done any thorough research on the assassination on their own. I would guess that they have sources who provide them with interesting documents from the Archives, and that neither the sources nor Allen & Scott are too interested in checking out the 26 volumes, looking for related documents, and the like.

I vaguely recall reading about the anomaly discussed by Allen & Scott somewhere, but I do not know where. Azque is mentioned briefly in Whitewash (p. 274, Dell edition), and the matter is discussed in the Warren Report. I have no idea what FBI report Allen & Scott are referring to; it sounds interesting.

The FBI's alleged conclusion that "there was absolutely no way Oswald could have obtained this information during his September visit to Mexico City, since the secret recall orders from Havana were not transmitted until after he had returned to Dallas" seems implausible, if you accept what the CIA said in that part of their report which was not quoted in the Allen & Scott column: "It was known as early as September 1963 that Azque was to be replaced. His replacement did arrive in September.... we speculate that Silvia Duran or some Soviet official might have mentioned it if Oswald complained about Azque's altercation with him."

I am willing to believe that Allen & Scott got this CIA document (which they describe as a "CIA memorandum to the Commission, now declassified and on file in the National Archives") from the Archives. However, what they quote appears on page 310 of the Warren Report (also CE 3126), with the additional passages I have cited above. The omission of what I feel is a plausible innocent explanation leads me to question both the columnists' intentions and the quality of their research. (Of course, the omission of these passages may have been due to not Allen & Scott but the editors.)

The FBI report concerning the interception of the Oswald letter (discussed in the 3 paragraphs headed "Letter Intercepted" in the Shreveport Times column you sent me) may simply be item 69, listed in CE 834. (Perhaps the Archives could provide a copy of this FBI airtel, if it is now available.) If the FBI's subsequent interest in this matter was as great as Allen & Scott suggest, Hoover's answer to question 28 in CE 833 seems peculiarly uninformative.

An earlier Allen & Scott column which may be of interest, also based on material in the 26 volumes, appeared about a year ago. (Berkeley Gazette, 12/6/66)