

COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS RE FIRST CHAPTER, AGENT OSWALD

The development of LHO letter to Connally (pp. 5-7) is very unclear. You mention the letter, drop it and spend 4 graphs on press leaks, and then pick it up by referring to it as "this letter." One will easily forget that you previously mentioned "this letter" since as it was mentioned, it bore no context to anything discussed, and when you changed the subject to that of press leaks, it seems that you have just dropped the letter.

You do this again beginning line 4, p. 7.

On p. 8, there seems to be no relation with your first graph defending the SS and the second, re a CD. In the second you do not mention that the Houston office and a Special Agent are both of the SS. The uninformed reader will not know this and consequently will have no way of knowing what agency the report originated with.

P. 9--your excursus on Sweatt <sup>of the photographs put in papers.</sup> should be ~~deleted~~. It breaks up your line of thought too much and, for the reader who has assumed a context of Oswald as an agent, this is confusing and unneeded.

P. 9--~~the~~ graph up from bottom--what is the significance of this? ~~Delete it. in this context?~~ Put in as a footnote

*is not mt  
too  
uncommon*  
P. 17--3rd graph down from top--So what? I really think things like this are unnecessary and detract from your presentation. Instead of personalizing your account (which may be your intention), it is just more information, more numbers, more burden on the reader, and hence more confusion. Even you think the omission of p. 6 was an accident. So what relevance does it have that they forgot to send something and later did at your request?

*is sarcastic, rephrase it for it now does not employ sarcasm.*  
P. 17--This is minor, but first sentence of last graph should read "Hudkins had spoken by telephone to ~~KMEXEX~~ Mrs. Ruth Paine, with whom Marina Oswald and her children lived near Dallas." Or something like that. The way you have it is confusing unless you take the time to pick the sentence apart and you should not expect that of your readers.

*do*  
P. 27--You have a habit, in referring to the Ex. Ses. not to mention the date of the session from which you are quoting. This is bad because it denies the reader a chronological context and does not permit him to go to the original source, if he wishes (as I often have). Your large quote on p. 27 does not give the date and here, as anywhere, it is important. When did the WC express its desire not to have ~~KM~~ everything published?

*do*  
P. 28--You do the same thing. And here I think it is especially important to know just when Boggs wanted to know if the transcript would be top secret. If he made this statement early in the invest, it is far more culpable. If it were made late in the invest, one wonders if Boggs participated in the previous sessions without the understanding that what he said would be kept secret.