

12/28/68

Dear Paul, *Hub*

This is hasty acknowledgement of your 12/26 mailing. Good time, very interesting contents which I will read as soon as I can. Here I comment on the letter.

When I was out there in October and you told me Jim was not working, and I knew that Tom was preparing to leave Garrison, having been working only part-time as it is, I immediately wondered if it could be arranged for him to go to New Orleans, if he would. I am impressed by his knowledge of both the 26 and the Archives. Since then, because of his knowledge of his own file (which is unimpressive, both ways), he is being kept on. If he gets the job he is looking for in New York, I believe with Jones Harris' help, I presume he'll take it.

This brings me to one of the reasons I'd hoped to be able to arrange for the IBM carding of all the indexes we have. I will not now be able to see the New York people whose SE man I introduced you to until after the trial. As soon as I returned I made contact, but the people are away until almost the day of the trial. During this period, what a time-saver that would be! And during the trial, I anticipate occasions on which instantaneous access to such data will be important.

When I was in New Orleans, I spoke to Barbara Reid. She will be able and willing to put several people up. She habitually stays up late and has the 26. This would be ideal for Jim, if both are willing. Barbara is a very generous, very intense person. She would welcome Jim, I am certain, particularly with his purpose. She could help him, and she would be delighted to learn what she will from his longer experience. He could breakfast there, I am also certain. If this does come to pass, he will not have great living expenses. The major one would be air fare. Were his coming to be delayed until the trial actually starts, and if he were to stay no more than a month, he could use an excursion ticket, which would be in the neighborhood of but \$200 by air. It has been so long since I spent much time on the 26, we can no longer depend on my knowledge of it. With the indexes, Jim could also pinpoint what might be available from the Archives. With his knowledge of what you have out there, he could also zero in on that. Does he like the bus?

Your concept of the ideal situation is in accord with mine. I do not know who we could have at the Archives, however. There is no one close to here with the time and knowledge.

Money will be a major problem. By the time you get this, perhaps you will have Jim's reaction. Perhaps he will have enough interest in being there to see if he can raise his own costs. I've been doing it too long myself, so I know the problem when there is no income. Meanwhile, I will raise the question in N.O. I do not know what they will think.

I am only too aware of your misgivings over the record of the past. However, there is a new arrangement I consider an excellent one if it is adhered to, and all the indications are that this is happening. Alcock is handling the case, with Sciambra helping him. I believe Oser will handle one aspect. Perhaps other lawyers also will handle portions. None of these people believes in undue publicity. They will do their court work solidly, conscientiously, and their interest will be court presentation, not publicity. The only consideration of publicity of which I am aware originates with me, and I suggested it in the event they subpoena Clark as a witness and he refuses to come. I suggested I could then have a press conference and present some of what he was avoiding testifying to, on suppression where it does not have the countenance of law or regulation, of

*his statements on Alcock, et, with perhaps some of my earlier correspondence*

Your comment on what happened to what you sent to N.O. is apt but the fault is not that of the men I've named or Ivon. We looked in Tom's file for some of the things I knew you sent and could not find them. He, incidentally, with all the work that is now so urgent, has absented himself for personal reasons. I have had a different arrangement for some time, to cope with just this problem. I've been sending things to Louis Ivon, who has a file to which no one has access. Recently, because he is actively engaged in trial preparations, I have been sending things to Moo, who keeps them with him and is not about to hand them to the press. These are things he likely or certainly will require for the trial. There is now a good working relationship. I believe it will continue. One of the major problems is that with the enormous waste of time of the past, these people have been occupied with has no relevance to what they will now be going into and they are seriously handicapped by what they thus did not have the chance to learn. Meanwhile, I think it is a safe assumption that the other side will have its own experts on the 26, the Archives, etc., and it will be able to draw on official facilities denied us.

Alcock has a deep and genuine concern over the suppression aspects and Clark and his statements on Shaw, etc. Sciembra likewise, and from my recent contacts with him, I know he is in accord with us on our beliefs about the 544 and literature data. They can be vital in the trial.

I will get copies of the Wasp documentation from Moo. I do not know how much of it I do not have.

I have had a few delaying problems here, dental, hurt back, and confusion. The pace at which I've been going precluded decent filing. Some of it has never been done, even poorly. Now I cannot find some of the things I need, so I've been going through some of the files in which they may have been misfiled and carding and filing them. I've gotten two drawers of documents done this way since my return, but still have not found what is missing. There are several of the things you may have, and if by Monday I have not located them, I'll ask you for copies. Some no one else has. These two are the Department of Justice March 2, 1967 confirmation to both the New York Times and the Washington Post that Clay Shaw and Clay Bertrand are "one and the same guy", approx. I also have a Department of Justice copy of their non-press release retraction. I need these for the Clark memo I am to do. This involves so little copying, perhaps if you have these or any other stories where reporters, after Clark's statement outside the Senate Judiciary room of 3/1, asked the specific question of the department, it might be good to send them.

Among the things Moo has asked of me is, if I had 15-18 witnesses to select to present the real story of what they saw happening in Dealey Plaza, who would they be and what could they say? I'd appreciate your suggestions, too, as soon as possible. Emphasis, I think, should be on such things as those who saw the President's head snap backwards, have solid reason for believing there were shots from the front, etc. And we will have to know the liabilities of each witness, like Holland, whose error can be readily explained without damage to his accurate observations and recollections.

By the way, if there are any valuable files you have on microfilm that it would be worth having on hand there, perhaps it would be a good idea for me to have them in advance. Like the ONI and FPCC files. Gary, who is here and in the Archives today, having gotten out what he wants to work on yesterday, also has some on film. I'll take this up with him so there will be no duplication. Another afterthought, tell Jim he'd be in N.C. for Mardi Gras.