

Despite increasing years and illnesses, I do indeed recall you and thanks to Hoch I've read your interesting memo.

I'm aware of your interest and if I could have added anything I'd have sent it. Unfortunately, because I did not intend to spend time on the police tapes when so many other were, I did not make separate copies for subject filing of all the info I obtained and some of it thus, as a practical matter, I cannot retrieve from the great mass of the Dallas files.

Paul has and I'm sure you are familiar with what I did file separately. Let me explain.

I've preserved the records I've received from the various agencies exactly as I received them, have them filed that way, but as I read them those that were of special interest to me or I thought might be to others were copied. The originals are as I received them and the copies are filed separately by subject.

I cannot trust my recollection, but my belief is that there was a record or perhaps two of which I sent copies to Dallas without making a copy for myself and subject filing. I received no response at all, so I sent the next copies to another and again received no response. It is my recollection that I sent copies to Gary Mack, Earl Golz (when he was still on the paper) and Mary Errell, without receiving any responses. After Paul's interest was known to me I sent him a copy of all in this file and he has communicated it to you.

What makes this even more confusing is the FBI's dishonesty. I have its Dallas index, but that index is strictly limited to what it sent to Washington for possible distribution to the Commission. This is not a genuine subject index. It is merely an index to let the FBI know what it might have let the Commission have. And there is absolutely nothing in the index relating to the obtaining of dubs of the police broadcast recordings. Incredible but true. I've checked every possibility. The first record, after the end of indexing, is the Bowles report, according to my subject file. My perhaps faulty recollection is that there was more, but nothing of earlier date than after HSCA's interest.

In an FOIA suit in which all of this is pertinent the FBI has lied in every conceivable way about the tapes, never once providing a first-person attestation from the Dallas office, especially none from Udo Specht, who has best knowledge there, or from Gamberling. Nor have they denied Bowles' accuracy. I used the record you refer to to reflect that the FBI did have dubs.

I think it is important to bear in mind that the DED machines did not have provision for direct dubbing and that any copies had to be made by playing the recordings alone and recording that and that this was done in the DED where their machines were. So, crosstalk is possible, particularly between the two channels.

The details with which Paul was not familiar are those of the litigation only. Those records were too voluminous to copy and send him and added nothing of substance.

While I have no way of knowing what actually happened, it appears to me that the easiest way for the FBI to obtain dubs was to use the existing machines to duplicate because there were or two parts, that is, to play aloud on one side and rerecord on the other. Each machine had this capability. And although it is clear that there is certain evidence, especially photographic, that the FBI shunned from the outset in order to support its original preconception, the first law was cover the Bureau's ass, the second was cover your own, and either indicated a need to have (and not let it be known) dubs of these broadcasts. And that this is why it is not indexed and that all pertinent records are filed outside the various main assassination files. Like some DED file...Please excuse my haste and typos. I rush to be able to respond and mail the same day I received your letter and in order to make the outgoing mail I'll be going into town in a few minutes. Good luck and if you can make any firm determination, as long as

my suit for the Dallas records is before the court let me know so I can try.

280 Redford Park,
Greystones,
County Wicklow,
Ireland.

September 12, 1983

Mr. Harold Weisberg,
Route 12,
Old Receiver Road,
Frederick, Md 21701,
USA.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I doubt that you remember me, but I have corresponded with you from time to time over the past 14 years, and am the proud possessor of a copy of each of your books which I re-read from time to time. They help to remind me what true "research" means.

In the past year or so, I have diverted my long-time interest in the JFK assassination photographic evidence to a study of the acoustics data, with particular reference to the chain of possession relating to the DPD dictabelt recordings.

In March this year, I put together a 43-page "discussion paper" on the non-technical questions surrounding the acoustics evidence, which was reviewed by Paul Hock in his newsletter dated June 6 (5 EOC 2, item 86, pp.5-6). If you wish to obtain a copy, it would probably be quickest for you to get it direct from Paul.

The purpose of this letter is to elicit some information from you, which Paul first mentioned to me in a letter dated May 10. He said, "Harold Weisberg is now doing some work on a supposed early FBI copy of the Dictabelts. I'm not familiar with the details, but he may well be on to something."

I would be very grateful indeed for any information you can give me regarding the date and origins of the FBI copy of the belts mentioned by Paul. The first record I have of FBI access to the belts, or even reference to the belts, was March 6, 1964, when the FBI asked the DPD for a transcript. I know that Jim Bowles said the FBI had the belts "within a few days" of the assassination, but other records (such as SS 324) suggest to me that it was the Secret Service rather than the FBI who got the belts in the first few days - unless the FBI borrowed them for a few days ("several days", according to Bowles) prior to November 29, when the Secret Service had access to them. Anyway, any information whatsoever that you can give me will, I assure you, be very much appreciated, and I give you my solemn word of honour that anything you tell me will be treated in the strictest confidence, unless you say otherwise.

I hope very much that you will be able to spare a few minutes to reply to this letter, and I thank you most sincerely in anticipation of hearing from you at your earliest convenience. For what its worth, I am firmly of the belief that the dictabelts which now exist, and which were the basis of the HSCA and Ramsey panel studies, are not the originals made on November 22, 1963. Would you agree?

Many thanks, and sincere best wishes.

Yours faithfully,
Chris Scally.
Chris Scally