

See last page

4 Jan 68

STEFFEN SORENSEN  
10118 - 63rd Avenue N.  
Seminole, Florida 33540

Dear Helen,

Sorry about running away from the phone, but we have dinner daily at about 4:25 and everything was ready just then.

When you phoned I was making up a list of things I subscribe to, with a column for expiration dates. So far it is 22 items long, & may not be complete yet. Enclosing a fax of it for your amusement. You might be doubly amused when I tell you that at the time of my mid-Pacific experience in Summer '66 I subscribed to absolutely nothing - unless it might have been one or two amateur radio magazines. One, I guess. Looking back on it, I'm thinking maybe I shoulda stood in ~~the~~ bed that morning when Reminger was tapping on the door & telling me maybe I ought to come lock.

Who Weisberg is, I just don't know. All I know is that I'll turn to Weisberg's books first when I have to turn to a "critic". He is certainly doing the most convincing job among them all in calling attention to the real essentials - at least among the offerings that the man on the street can buy. A puzzling thing, among maybe other puzzling things about him, is that despite the enormous amount of ~~material~~ legitimate material he has to offer, does offer, he does at the same time seem to "sabotage" himself now & then by saying things he must know are not true. You know already about the Minox. This afternoon I read in his *Osw In New Orleans*, p37:

"While all the typed transcripts were still "TOP SECRET" three years after the assassination, Liebler promised that "a copy of the transcript will be made available to General Walker" through the stenographer. It therefore is less than surprising...etc..." (11H415)

Now what Weisberg is wanting to suggest here is that Walker and Liebler are bedfellows, or however one would say it. Maybe they are, and I wouldn't quarrel with the possibility. Especially having read the vol 11 testimony myself. But what I do come to a full stop about is Weisberg's calling attention to this by introducing a completely false assertion, or suggestion: He wants his readers to believe that Gen Walker, perhaps as some kind of political buddy of Liebler, is being offered some "top secret" transcript of his testimony, a thing which was denied the other hundreds who testified. Helen, when you get into the 1-15 vols (mostly within the 6-12 vols, as I remember) you will see case after case of the interviewee, to coin a useful word, being told that he can have a copy of what he has just said by asking the court reporter for it later, simply by making the request & then asking the reporter how much he wants for his extra trouble - which seems usually to be 35¢ per page.

So this raises related questions. Why should Weisberg have to resort to dishonest means, and especially such easily discernable dishonest means, when at the same time he is providing us page after page with hundreds of unassailable facts? A few months ago I might have skipped over this, thinking maybe that this was a typical UFO dodge, in which anybody who wanted to have himself heard did it more or less freely as long as he sprinkled himself with enough cow droppings along the way so that he could be easily "discredited" whenever necessary. Today I can't any longer think that, not after having read 3 1/2 volumes of Weisberg. The reason I can't think it is because he just simply does not dilute himself sufficiently ~~##~~ with easily discreditable words. The ratio isn't right. He says too much.

2 Helen

4 Jan 68

This leads to another question, still on the subject of Weisberg's p37 remark. Is it possible that Weisberg himself has not actually covered vols 1 thru 15? It is a fact that JFK was shot on 22 Nov 63, a fact that the entire 27 JFK volumes appeared a year later. It appears also as a fact that Weisberg has lead the critic parade from the beginning, and has "done more" than all the rest of them combined. Surely this one man must know better than 1 man in 10,000 or 1 man in 100,000 or one man in 1,000,000 that General Walker could have had his "top secret" transcript for the asking, upon request & small payment.

Have just now opened vol 11 to see what preceded & followed Weisberg's reference to 11H415. In doing so, have discovered that this page does not contain that quote. I seem to remember the quote he gives, though, so won't search for it. But in looking back to the first page of the Walker testimony (11H404) to get the date, I see on that page the following:

(Referring to the Walker testimony to be taken:) "It may be purchased from the court reporter here in Dallas."

That was said by Liebler to Walker in the presence of Walker's lawyer (General Watts) and you will find it where I say you will find it, 11H404.

Pardon me for beating a dead horse, but the above offer of sale of testimony transcript was made to Gen Walker on 23 ~~###~~ July 64 and a common offering as long as it was suspected that the witness might be asking for it. To pick out one example from probably at least a dozen, there is Stovall on p173, vol 10. Jenner tells Stovall "...we have it written up for ourselves and that is why you can have a copy of it ~~###~~ at 35 cents a page", referring to the "TOP SECRET" testimony which Weisberg infers cannot be ~~###~~ delivered except between people within some one inner circle or another. Noting that Stovall appeared in the testimony vols 4 months before Walker, there can't be much question about precedences.

Incidentally, to lessen your confusion: The Stovall I just picked is not the same Stovall who picked the photographic equipment (Minox, Stereo, etc) out of Marina's underwear. This Stovall is the Stovall who employed Marina's husband in his photographic-process business. They are both "R. Stovall" and they both wear plain clothes, but one is named Robert and the other Richard. Just want to clarify this & unconfuse you, knowing how alert you must be to coincidences.

\* \* \* \* \*

9 Jan. Had abandoned this letter during one of those lucid moments when I could see the uselessness of what I was doing, whatever I was doing. Guess I must have had some reservation because I didn't tear it up. Thanks to being tanked up on BUSCH I am back at it again.

Having re-read this, I see I have to explain: The significance, or one significance, of Weisberg's attention to the Walker - Secret Testimony thing, an obviously erroneous reference, is this: That it sounds so much like the kind of error which can arise out of a COMMITTEE formulating and writing a book, rather than an error which one individual could make after reading for himself the first 15 vols - even if he read them thru quickly. There must be a dozen or more examples in the testimony volumes of persons being told that they can have, within days, a transcript of their testimony at some nominal cost by simply

3 Helen

4 Jan 68

buttonholing the court reporter after the testimony is over.

Anybody mulling over this slip long enough can come up within his imagination a number of ways in which such an accident can occur in a book. A "Committee" theory seems to me to offer up the greatest possibilities, the greatest chance for ~~###~~ a misunderstanding and such a blunder. The least possible chance of such an error taking place is the case of one man, Weisberg, making this alarming mistake on his own after having himself done the 1-15 vols. And having now read four of his books and having heard him twice on WLCY - it is just absolutely inconceivable to me that he isn't about twelve (12) times more capable than I am. Yet this Walker-Liebeler thing appears as one of the "highlights" of the Cow in NO book and is referred to later on some other page and seemingly cannot be just a thoughtless error.

Well, that is all I can say. Have already said that he might need to sabotage himself - as though he were writing about UFOs. Maybe I should be happy to ~~###~~ not know just what is going on.

A suggestion about doing the 1-15 vols: If you refer to them while browsing thru 16-26 or while reading a "critic" paperback, you ought make a mark at the top of these pages ("R" for "I have already read this once before, out of sequence", or any such mark). I did not do this, and a consequence of not doing it is that you will stumble onto some familiar thing every now & then & will not be able to tell if you've found a brand-new coincidence. The ideal thing would be noting on the page the thing which drew you to it. But of course then you get dragged down to a snail-pace by writing margin notes you suspect you'll maybe never again refer to. It's a problem. It's doubly a problem if you are already involved in maintaining a notebook, a thing which I did not do.

Somehow can't believe that there isn't available somewhere some mimeographed coordination among all the amateur assassination experts. Even if it were as diluted and pre-sabotaged as all the various UFO mimeos, it would be well worth having. If you continue an interest in this, guess you would want to search out any possibility ~~###~~ of such a thing - maybe by asking Weisberg if you continue correspondence with him. I make a point of mentioning this because I'm on the point of "bowing out" of the JFK thing, having come to a sort of end, but still wanting to read whatever comes my way - especially the most outrageous & ridiculous things.

Ha... here is something. Lyle Stuart's THE INDEPENDENT, which is a thing I get. Don't understand his preoccupation with "pornography for its own sake", which is a thing he does promote. It might be only a front for other things, I don't know. But what I do know is that he is a source of "information" you don't always find when you drop into your local drug store or book store. If he doesn't put it in his paper, he might have it for sale in a book. He is the one who seemingly bought out University Books, and now freely offers THE VELIKOVSKY AFFAIR to any scientist who doesn't mind receiving it by mail from The Mystic Arts Book Society, or some such. Sound familiar? Just can't put him into any category, don't know what or who he is. He might even be in a class by himself, like most of us. You don't get his THE INDEPENDENT as far as I know, so maybe you will be surprised to know that he seems to have a free access to Cuba, visiting Cuba, when he wants to. He comes back from his trips and tells us all nice things about Cuba and how well things are going in view of all the various outside pressures. He has to, of course, if he ever wants to return there. But the "coloring" he gives

4 Jan 68

his long<sup>g</sup> stories about visits to Cuba may not be any more "colored" than reports given by others. Even the St Pete Times, seemingly on the same side of the fence, doesn't want to agree with the color. The Times makes itself rather clear by saying nothing, ever, while taking a proper liberal stance in whatever else it might want to editorialize about.

Where all this puts Lyle Stuart, I dunno. I am grateful to the old gent who called in to Open Mike a few nights ago and made himself unintentionally misunderstood by ~~saying~~ suggesting that there might be an effort on someone's part to confuse Liberals with Communists. It was a good point, even though he seemed to be buffalooed by what he'd said after Ruark had essentially agreed with him. Don't know ~~if~~ whether Lyle Stuart is a Communist, in the real sense, or whether he might be simply another one of us Jew-Christians with emotions, a person who will go off and cry to himself when he sees his paperboy, a little nigger-boy, get stuffed into a pauper's grave after getting hit by a taxicab - that sort of thing.

Sorry about this (courtesy BUSCH, the Bavarian Bear), but what I stopped about (see "Ha...", previous page) was to say I'm enclosing a photo clip from the last issue of the INDEPENDENT showing Che Guevara & Lyle Stuart together. When I first glanced at the picture a few days ago my first impression was that I was looking at your Bob, and I didn't get unshook-up until looking at the caption. I can look at the picture now & see clearly that it isn't your Bob. Shades of Oswald, people being shown selected pictured!

This just pops into my head for no reason: Armstrong Exhibit 5302, a picture I've just relocated by flipping pages looking for it. XIX, p35. Thanks to my not having maintained the right notes I can't tell you who it was, but I am referring to some man, a 1-15 witness, some man who was known to ~~the~~ the Sister of Earlene Roberts if I remember it right. Maybe vols 10-14, somewhere. This fellow was shown the Armstrong 5302 photo, allegedly. Unless I have lost the last of my marbles, the man was shown this photo in the sense of wanting to know whether this resembled Oswald. The answer was something like "No, the hair isn't ~~thin~~ thin enough on top" or something like that. Now, apart from whatever else I might have thought mysterious about this I do recall this distinct impression: "This is like having somebody show a picture of Wallace Berry to a man and asking him if this is Jackie Cooper and then having him tell you that it probably can't be Jackie Cooper because the hair isn't just right." Good gosh, even if the witness were a complete phoney he would know that Oswald was a young chicken in his early twenties and certainly nothing at all like the 5302 man who is obviously not far from 50.

Well I'll be damned... I was just thumbing thru XIX, looking for p326 & thinking I'd find something connecting with this, Bertha Cheek, and I find on the back side of 326 the very page I was wanting to describe to you a couple of weeks ago: the DPD logsheet with the "computerized flavor". Sorry, I told you it was a left-hand page. I was so sure it was. Anyway, I've rediscovered it, and there it is. Apart from the significance of it, the part we've discussed, what a shame we can't have any more than this one tiny sheet - part of L thru Part of M on this particular date. Wonder what A thru Z might reveal, covering Nov 22, 23, 24 as a starter? I note also, confirming what I thought I'd seen, that this was done on a standard DPD form - presumably a standard normal procedure. Whether it was

5 Helen


4 Jan 68

handled routinely # on this DPD form by a computer or whether it was handled routinely by a bunch of girls, some kind of inference has to be drawn. In fact, probably a bunch of inferences. This is the same police department in which the chief of homicide swears he can't have a tape recorder even though he has kept asking for one, as he is reported as testifying in my edition of the Warren volumes. Don't know if I'm trying to be funny or sarcastic or what, referring to "my edition" of the books. What I do know, though, is that when you dig deep enough into anything you are apt to find similarities with things you've dug into in "completely different" areas. After a while you sit up & take note of all the coincidences & then you sit back down & speculate about all the crazy possibilities. I mean, don't we?

In honesty, should say that I don't believe that "different editions" of the 27 volumes are being served up as needed. Guess I'm getting sleepy. Time to go to bed.

Regards,

Seem to have worked myself into a mischievous & ugly mood. Will slip ~~###~~ this into the Thermofax & send Weisberg a copy \* It is, after all, Weisberg that this whole letter centers about. Hope you don't mind if I say that you are Mrs Helen Hartmann, 4666 27th Ave North, St Petersburg Fla 33713 and that probably wouldn't mind getting a mad letter from Mr Weisberg if he should be mad about anything. Me, I'm dropping out of all of this. It's all yours.



\* Which is how you come into receiving a copy of a letter opening "Dear Helen".