

the complexities of the known photographs and films, and given us a good sense of several of those still out there or otherwise lost or destroyed. As in any other major work on this case, we will all have our own particular areas of interest where we would have wished Trask would be a bit more open-minded, but this writer found himself mostly impressed with the author's sense of logic, though never overlooking that some of the book is often both selective and subjective.

POTP is likely to get some of the research community's photographic experts ticked-off in places. This is probably unavoidable, considering their well-contoured views and personal interpretations about this evidence, which they've worked on for so many years, often with great results, sometimes not. Their closeness to and defensiveness about their work is just human nature. But an objective reading should reveal that this dedicated historian/archivist is very much up to the task, and that his many years of serious effort have produced an indispensable, clearly written study of the assassination films and photographs, and thus, much of the case itself. It should not be taken as any kind of "final word" on the subject, however: Trask is sometimes inclined to dismiss a number of good arguments for conspiracy too readily, and often without their intrinsic strengths intact, as I see it.

But in an age where sensationalistic journalism, sloppy methodology and outright fakery seem often to replace incisive assassination research, this book is a tough act to follow. Here's a richness in the clearly told and heavily footnoted detail here, tainted only by Trask's sporadically nonchalant approach to conspiracy research. But don't let that constrain you—Trask does it gently and respectfully for the most part and with much food for thought. Without doubt, Richard Trask is a serious "player" and this reviewer is confident that *Pictures of the Pain: Photography and the Assassination of President Kennedy* will be considered a pivotal and even seminal work for a very long time to come.

(C) Jan R. Stevens 1994 All rights reserved. Thanks to Gary Ack, Walt Brown and Ed Bell for valuable assistance.

## THE BLEDSOE BUST:

### *A Case Study in the Possibilities and Perils Encountered Investigating New Leads, Documents and Sources*

by

James R. Folliard

#### Background

On April 2, 1964, Mary Esther Bledsoe joined a long list of Kennedy assassination witnesses deposed in Dallas by Warren Commission Counsel Joseph Ball. Mrs. Bledsoe, 67 years old and divorced, lived at 621 N. Marsalis Avenue, in Dallas' Oak Cliff section, in the boarding house she owned.

Ball had two reasons to want to get Bledsoe's testimony. On Monday, October 7, 1963, she had rented one of her rooms to a nondescript young man who (she said) signed the register "Lee Oswald" and paid her \$7 for his first week's stay. But by Saturday the 12th, she had grown uncomfortable with her new tenant, and abruptly evicted him—without refunding the \$2 Oswald requested for the remainder of his week.

The second reason involved her report of a more dramatic encounter with her ex-tenant six weeks later, just after the shooting in Dealey Plaza. After watching the presidential motorcade in downtown Dallas, Mrs. Bledsoe boarded a bus to return home. Her bus continued west on Elm Street and picked up another passenger several blocks short of Dealey Plaza—Lee Harvey Oswald. She described him as looking "like a maniac...He looked so bad in his face, and his face was so distorted." Almost immediately, news reached the passengers that President Kennedy had been shot, and "Oswald" got off two blocks later. [1]

Mrs. Bledsoe was the only witness to positively place Oswald on this bus, so her testimony was critical to the Warren Commission's reconstruction of his movements immediately after the shooting. But even more crucial was the information she supplied about Oswald's appearance, particularly his shirt, which had "a hole in it, a hole, and he was dirty, and I didn't look at him. I didn't want to know I even seen him." [2]

She was referring to a "distinctive hole in the shirt's right elbow," marking it as the same brown shirt Oswald had on when arrested little over an hour later at the Texas Theater. The crucial point: cotton fibers identical in color-composition

---

James R. Folliard,  
42 Spring St.,  
Newport, RI 02840



to fibers from this shirt were found wedged in the butt of the alleged murder weapon, Oswald's MC rifle. Bledsoe was the one witness able to place this shirt "on Oswald" right after the shooting. [3]

Mrs. Bledsoe's testimony provoked raised eyebrows from the moment she gave it. She took the unusual but by no means unique step of having her attorney, Melody Jane Douthit, with her for the deposition. From time to time she referred to notes for her answers, causing Ball to ask her why. She needed them, she said, because otherwise "I forget what I have to say." Douthit added that the notes were prepared at the suggestion of Dallas Secret Service Agent Forrest Sorrels. [4]

A more substantive problem with her testimony was that only two other witnesses came within hailing distance of placing Oswald on the bus—and both stopped well short. Busdriver Cecil J. McWatters and passenger Milton Jones each vaguely recalled a man in a light (or faded) blue jacket, not a torn brown shirt. McWatters felt he may even have mistaken Jones for Oswald! Neither recalled Mrs. Bledsoe at all, although this "failure" is hardly significant. [5]

Mrs. Bledsoe's credibility also suffered from the general confusion of her testimony, perhaps the effect of a mild stroke earlier in 1963. She recalled, for example, how the passengers talked of the shooting on the bus: "Oh, it was awful in the city...and then all of us were talking about the man and we were looking up to see where he was shot, and looking—and then they had one man and taking him, already got him in jail, and we got—Well, I am glad they found him." [6]

Such conversation about an arrested man was hardly possible at 12:45. And her reluctance to look at Oswald long enough to be recognized herself—"I just glanced at him and looked the other way and I hoped he didn't see me"—doesn't quite jibe with her action later that day, when she contacted the police about his presence on the bus, thereby getting herself squarely involved in the investigation. [7]

Nevertheless her role remained a minor one, and Mary Bledsoe's story became little more than a footnote in the vast literature on the case.

#### A Document is Discovered

...Until February, 1994, when researchers Jack White of Fort Worth and John Armstrong from Tulsa visited the Burnett Library at Texas Christian University.

Marguerite Oswald, erstwhile and feisty defender of her son Lee, had over the years amassed a huge collection of memorabilia, books and documents about the case. After her death in January, 1981, about thirty boxes of these items were

transferred to the Special Collections division at Burnett Library, as specified in Mrs. Oswald's will.

For three days Armstrong methodically sifted through the materials. He eventually came upon a Dallas Police Department General Offense Report concerning an incident at Mary Bledsoe's rooming house that occurred "Thursday, October 11, 1963"—a fight between one "Alek Hidel," a tenant whom she knew as "O.H. Lee," and "J.R. Rubenstein," causing damage to furniture and a TV set in "Hidel's" room. [8]

On the surface, the document looks like a stunning and definitive confirmation of a thirty-year old hypothesis: that Lee Harvey Oswald and Jack Ruby knew each other, and as more than casual acquaintances, prior to November 22, 1963. [9]

Armstrong then spent a week in Dallas trying to determine if an original of the Report existed in DPD Archives, or could otherwise be accounted for. He was told that since "no action was taken" (i.e., no one was actually "booked" or prosecuted), the original had been "probably routinely destroyed." Armstrong also attempted to trace a witness cited in the report, one with the tantalizing name, "H.H. Grant." [10]

By now author Jim Marrs had been enlisted. White, Armstrong and Marrs concluded that, while questions remained about the document's authenticity, they had gone "as far as we thought we could" with it. They decided to publicize the discovery, "in the hope that others could take it from there." Marrs prepared a three-page press release, dated for March 13, 1994, accompanied by a copy of the document as found in the Burnett library, the "legible interpretation" as reproduced here, and some "additional points and comments" by Jack White. The package was issued to about thirty media outlets under the CTKA (Citizens For Truth About The Kennedy Assassination) letterhead. [11]

According to David Perry, "Over the years the local newspapers, TV stations, and media at large have been deluged with so much assassination hokum they are most wary. Often Gary Mack and I get requests to look at such information to see if it stands logical tests." It was Mack who received the Bledsoe story from "an Associated Press regional reporter." According to White and Marrs, this was Hugh Aynesworth. [12]

Perry in turn wrote an as-yet-unpublished article highly critical of the research work done (or not done) by the White-Marrs-Armstrong team in seeking to trace the document to its source, and concluded that the "Bledsoe report" is a fabrication. [13]

Except for an abbreviated account of the discovery that



Form OP-GF-368  
POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF DALLAS  
GENERAL OFFENSE REPORT  
21-18-1-6-9-14-11  
Name of Complainant: Mary E. Bledsoe  
Race/Sex/Age: W/F/6(?)  
Residence of Complainant: 621 N. Marsalis  
Offense Serial No.: (illegible)  
Reported by: same  
Offense as reported: disturbing the peace  
Place of Occurrence: 621 N. Marsalis  
Division: 13 Platoon: (32?) S.car (10?)  
Officer Making Report: J.C. White  
Day of Week: Thurs. Date of Occurrence: 10-11-63 Time of Day: 11:30 p.m.  
Date Reported: 10-11-63 Time Reported: 11:40 p.m.  
Report Received by: (illegible) Received--Time Typed: 12:20 a.m.  
Property Attacked: Rooming House  
Damage Done: (Breakage?) to bed, chairs, TV set  
Details of Offense: Mrs. Bledsoe, owner of rooming house, reported a scuffle going on in one of her rooms, one she just rented earlier in the week to a w/m O.H. Lee. After the arrest of the suspects below Mrs. Bledsoe identified one of the men as her roomer, Mr. Lee. His name was actually Alek Hidel. When confronted with his identification cards and mail addressed to him, Mrs. Bledsoe said she was not sure if he was the roomer or not. When brought into police headquarters, the complainant again changed her story concerning how the fight began and so all suspects were released pending further investigation.  
Suspects Name-Address:  
J. R. Rubenstein, 1203-1/2 Commerce  
Race/Sex/Age: W/M/59 Height/Weight/Eyes/Hair: 5-9/169/B/Brn.  
Alek Hidel, 621 N. Marsalis Race/Sex/Age: (W?)/(M?)/24  
Height/Weight/Eyes/Hair: (?)/()/()/Br.  
Witnesses Names-Address:  
H.H. Grant, 1417 Garrett (Garnett?) Race/Sex/Age: W/M/32  
Height/Weight/Eyes/Hair: 5-11/150/B/Br.  
Description of Property (etc.): nothing missing, only broken goods  
Estimated Value: 50.00  
Persons Arrested: above suspects released pending inv.  
Arresting Officers: White/Hargis → the Motorcycle guard who got splattered!  
Charge: dist. peace  
Offense Declared: Pending  
Date: 10-12-63

The Bledsoe Document: "A Legible Interpretation"



appeared in CTKA's Probe newsletter, the story never ran. As one editor put it:

*"I'm unconvinced by either [Dave Perry's] or [Gary Mack's] claims that this is a provable hoax...*

*On the other hand...there are serious flaws in your [White-Marrs-Armstrong] write up on the matter and enough suspicions of documentary forgery to make publication premature...I don't want to be party to another 'Ricky White'...incident of putting out a story that can be so easily struck down." [14]*

This decision left none of the interlocutors happy, and leads into our first issue:

Should "news" of newly-discovered evidence be published when the source and authenticity of the evidence remains unclear?

This is a pertinent question for the entire research community, particularly at a time when newly-released documents are becoming available at the National Archives. People are sure to come upon significant finds; and it is equally certain that bogus or disinformational documents will turn up among the new materials.

At the outset, it is worth remarking that the original White-Marrs-Armstrong report was in the form of a short newspaper story, not a heavily-annotated, tightly-argued research study. As such, it was certainly no worse than any number of other news articles about the case that have been published through the years. Its basic piece of "news" is fairly simple and straightforward: a document has been found.

Perhaps the question should be put in the following terms:

What obligation does the discoverer of a document or other evidence incur to determine its provenance (date and probable originating source of a document) and authenticity (the internal truth or falsehood of a document or other evidence)?

Let's clarify these terms with a familiar example: The record is clear that Abraham Zapruder shot film depicting the assassination: The Z-film's provenance, in other words, is well-established. But allegations have been made over the years that splices, processing damage, and other "interventions" have altered the Z-film. Its authenticity as a true representation of what Zapruder's camera saw is challenged.

Perry and Rose argued that the Marrs-White-Armstrong team should have carried out more extensive checking into the Bledsoe document's provenance and authenticity. Here, for example, are a few of my own questions I raised in April, based on my surprise that Marguerite would fail to publicize such a document if she knowingly had it in her possession:

I'd want to find out: (a) When the collection was deposited in the Burnett Library, was it accompanied by an inventory or catalogue of the materials?

(b) In any case, library archives typically prepare such an inventory themselves, especially if the material is extensive. Did the library make one? Was this police document listed as among the original items?

(c) Have any contributions been made to the collection from other sources since the files were first deposited at the library? [15]

These and other questions were pertinent at the time because, from the materials at hand, I had no way to date the document. For all I knew, it could easily have been fabricated and placed in the Oswald collection as late as January, 1994!

White, and later Marrs, strongly expressed to me the view that the discovering trio had gone as far as they could with their investigation of the document. They cited the follow-up efforts of Armstrong in Dallas, as well as the personal, professional and job constraints upon all three. They feel that by publishing the story of the document's discovery, they would thereby open the unresolved questions of provenance and authenticity to investigation by other researchers.

There's a certain merit to this argument, especially in a research field populated largely by part-timers, with limited time, money or other resources for complete and thorough investigations. Our individual limitations seem to make a collective division of labor a very sensible idea. On this score, researchers might re-read and ponder some comments made by Sylvia Meagher in 1966, when she told Lewis and Schiller that she was "just not competent" to "make investigations by trying to see witnesses or examine rifles. ...I'm not a detective. I am not a trained investigator of any kind." [16]

Honest humility—especially from someone who spent 20 years as a research analyst for the World Health Organization! But Lewis and Schiller had only contempt for Meagher's acknowledgment of her limitations, as well as her methods:

*Like most assassination buffs, Mrs. Meagher has not directly interviewed anyone of significance related to the events of November 22-24, 1963. But she can instantly cite chapter and verse of anything within the twenty-six volumes of evidence, and, as a result, despite her disturbing lack of firsthand knowledge, she is generally regarded as an indispensable authority. [17]*

Returning to our subject, the Release itself took no firm position on the authenticity of the document: "A Dallas police report may reveal a secret..." (p. 1); "Both Armstrong and



White believe the document to be genuine, but are puzzled by its origin and inclusion in Mrs. Oswald's files." (p. 2); The possibility that the document may be a hoax is fully acknowledged in the report. Whatever a reader may feel about the White-Armstrong "belief," they are certainly entitled to have one and to express it.

That said, it must be stressed that their opinion is based largely upon the document's "fit" with a body of evidence suggesting a clandestine Oswald-Ruby relationship prior to the assassination. The document also provides an inferential explanation for Mary Bledsoe's later WC testimony. But such arguments, interesting and deductively-sound as they may be, must remain subordinate to the empirical foundation that must be laid for "admitting the document into evidence" at all—its provenance and authenticity. [18]

Perry is equally entitled to his belief that the document is bogus. But his opinion, like that of White-Armstrong-Marrs, is at this point essentially irrelevant. As we shall see, he bases his conclusion largely upon an appeal to authority. Again, no matter how well-argued, authoritative opinions remain subordinate to empirical investigation.

Neither article succeeded in laying that foundation. As far as this reader was concerned, its authenticity remained open to investigation; what was important was the fact of the document itself. Even a bogus report could hold significance. This seems like ample justification for publishing news of such a discovery, but without distracting lawyers' briefs.

For there is really no adversarial position to be taken at this point in the investigation. Other researchers are, in effect, invited to investigate the document's origins and analyze its content, after which a collective or consensus judgment about its authenticity may become possible.

#### The Bledsoe Document: Provenance

Questions concerning the date of the document had been already partially answered by Perry in his unpublished article, which I was able to obtain and read in August. Perry learned from Mary Ferrell that "back before the Garrison investigation the report had circulated and everyone considered it a hoax." (p. 1).

I had a long phone conversation of my own with Mary Ferrell on August 13. She confirmed other information reported by Perry, and asserted to me that the document was given to the late Rev. Al Chapman by John Carl (J.C.) Day of DPD—the same Lt. Day immortalized in photos showing him holding the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle aloft hours after the assassination. Chapman, Ferrell said, had brought it to the

attention of Jim Garrison in New Orleans, and gave a copy to his close friend, Marguerite Oswald, as well. [19]

Perry quoted Ferrell as using that meaningless generic "everyone," and a basic purpose of my call was to find out exactly who the "everyone" was who thought this report was a hoax, and why they thought so.

It is a common fallacy in historical writing, and assassination research, to make part of a group into the whole group, as in "All Americans believe..." or, "Everyone old enough remembers where they were and what they were doing when they got the news of the assassination."

In a field that insists on empirical evidence, such statements are flagrantly anti-empirical. They become working assumptions which limit wide-open inquiry, and become a subtle inducement to group-think and conformism. Here's a good way to avoid this trap: Whenever someone says something like, "Everyone knows..." immediately stop knowing! Start asking questions, like, "Who's everyone?"

According to Ferrell, the everyone here included herself, Penn Jones, Jr., and by inference, Jim Garrison and Marguerite Oswald. The inference is that, had they thought the document was genuine, they would have made some public use of it. Perry and Marrs added J. Gary Shaw to this list, as he heard from Ferrell that the document was a hoax. (p. 6, an account confirmed to me by Marrs.)

But we must ask: has Mary Ferrell demonstrated that the document is definitely a fake? Does she have reliable witnesses or evidence? Or is it Mary Ferrell's opinion that 'The Bledsoe Bust' is bogus? This is not to pick on Mary Ferrell; her opinions enjoy a well-deserved reputation, but they are not exempt from error—or analysis. Here we have the fallacy of argument from authority, as if that alone is enough to close the case. [20]

There is nothing wrong with authoritative guidance or opinions, but the basis for those judgments must always be spelled out. Perry falls deeper into this fallacy in the next paragraph: "Sadly, Jim Marrs, by distributing this 'release' to the press, has placed his imprimatur on the story." (p. 6)

Neither Jim Marrs, nor Mary Ferrell, nor anyone else has an imprimatur to place on anything. Assassination research is history, not theology. Unfortunately, all too many researchers rely on imprimaturs and authorities without asking their own questions or doing their own thinking. To his credit, Dave Perry usually does so—except here, where he places excessive reliance on Ferrell's unbacked opinion.

All investigations of the case, whether by official bodies like



the WC or HSCA, or Jim Garrison's DA office, or by individual researchers, or by that elusive research community, have one thing in common: they all have been failures to date. Nearly thirty-one years after the event, and after countless hundreds of person-years of investigation, the murder of JFK remains unsolved. If this says anything at all, it is that investigators and historians are well-advised to take nothing for granted, nothing on faith, nothing as decided, nothing on authority alone.

Nonetheless, Perry provides us with a useful chain of possession for the document, even though it is based on the hearsay recollections of Mary Ferrell, Randy Chapman, and Gary Shaw. But it seems safe to say that Al Chapman reported the existence of such a document prior to 1967—to Ferrell, and presumably to Garrison and to Marguerite Oswald. Efforts to locate J.C. Day have been unsuccessful to date; from a provenance standpoint, Chapman is as far as we can go right now, and remains our only source for locating the origin of the document somewhere in the Dallas law enforcement community, at close to the relevant time. Such an origin, while hardly probative (any police employee is capable of cooking up a bogus document), would argue strongly for the document's authenticity. [21]

#### The Bledsoe Document: Authenticity

A judgment about authenticity ultimately rests on analysis of a document's content. Where bureaucratic practice and procedure are involved, such analysis should pay closest attention to the document's routine elements, matching these with similar documents from the same time, place, or agency. The unique elements (for example, names and addresses of suspects, description of incident, etc.) really provide shaky foundation for such a judgment, simply because they are unique and not repeated elsewhere.

The basic dilemma is that unique elements can be argued both ways. Perry, for example, argues that "Thursday...10/11/63" is a (suspiciously) mistaken "Date of Occurrence" since October 11, 1963 fell on Friday. (p. 3) But one could as easily speculate that, while the event took place late Thursday, the 10th, the paperwork began after midnight on the 11th: hence, a plausible mixup in typing the dates. But both arguments rely on reading things into the document.

Frustrated by unanswered questions and fruitless games of telephone tag, and my own failure to make better headway on these issues, I decided to apply Nero Wolfe's standard advice: "Use intelligence guided by experience." In practice, this consisted of ransacking files, indices to books, directories, and memory, as well as looking for leads buried in conversations and correspondence. There had to be someone within reach

somewhere who could answer some basic questions about this document!

A morning of concerted telephone time paid off with a veteran member of the Texas media who, during a long conversation, suddenly thought of a source I should try to contact. Two lengthy phone calls and an exchange of correspondence indicated that the source is highly knowledgeable and reliable about the case itself, and about the personnel and procedures of the Dallas Police Department at the relevant time.

According to this source, the following anomalies (or departures from routine) among the routine elements in the police report mark it as inauthentic, a fabrication:

1. Offense as Reported: DPD at that time would not use "Disturbing the Peace" in an incident involving destruction of private property. The latter, more serious, offense would be used.
2. Division: This would invariably be either R (indicating 'Radio patrol'), or F (indicating 'Forgery,' which served as the general offenses bureau).
3. Platoon: This would invariably be 1, 2, or 3—no preceding zero, e.g. '01'), and indicating a shift: 1 was used for Midnight to 8 AM; 2 for 8 AM to 4 PM; 3 for 4 PM to Midnight.
4. Beat (and not "S.car," as corrected by Perry): This would be 80—something; e.g., '85,' or '87,' but at any rate, a number beginning with 8.
5. In cases involving "further investigation," an investigating officer would be assigned and named.
6. Arresting Officers: This block would always include full names (or initials, as in 'J.C. White') and would always include the badge numbers. An entry like "White/Hargis," the source says, would never be used.
7. The numbers appearing directly below GENERAL OFFENSE REPORT have no meaning and would not typically appear.
8. There is no correlation between J.C. White, who worked in accident investigation, and either of the officers named Hargis then with DPD: (a) J.P. (James Paul) Hargis was a Forgery (i.e., general offenses) detective who always worked days, never nights; (b) B.W. Hargis was motorcycle only, and would not respond to a Radio Patrol or Forgery call.

(I would argue that the following, while certainly departures from routine, have less standing than the others, due to the possibility of police complicity in covering up a clandestine Oswald-Ruby relationship or operation:)



9. Certain stamps would appear on such a document: "Indexed \_", "Tabulated CM," and "Date of Filing" (although I can see where these might not appear on a carbon copy, or if the report was "pulled" prior to completion).

10. It was routine at the time to hold (not release) suspects in cases "pending further investigation" for up to 72 hours, especially, as here, when the identity of a suspect was in question.

This is hardly definitive proof for a fake document. But the source and the information together have all the earmarks of authority and credibility. The normally unsatisfactory use of a single confidential source is offset by the very specific information provided, which can be readily tested by other researchers, especially in Dallas.

### Conclusions

For now, the provenance or origin of the document cannot be traced further back than to 1966, and to its putative possession by Rev. Al Chapman. There are enough anomalies or outright errors within its routine elements to mark it as a fabrication. Both key factors, provenance and authenticity, argue against the document's value as evidence for an Oswald-Ruby relationship, or as explanation for Mary Bledsoe's behavior in the case.

Nevertheless, hoaxes deserve examination in their own right. Some hoaxes, for example, may be designed to be exposed and discredited, with the very purpose of discrediting or diverting attention from their too-close-to-home subject matter. (I plan a follow-up article which will explore this context for the Bledsoe document in detail. It will report results from leads generated by investigating the document itself, including a draft UPI dispatch concerning H.H. Grant, the "witness" cited in the report, and information about the Bledsoe family.)

Five months of correspondence, research and analysis caused me to feel "70-30" that the document was genuine. It's now "30-70," or even less. Does that mean the whole "Bledsoe bust" story turns out itself to be a bust?

I don't think so. Here are a few of the reasons why:

1. It's a story of the research process in microcosm: from burrowing through boxes at the Burnett Library; to the maddening effort to track, corroborate, or refute; to the tough editorial judgments that accompany every kind of research; and to the imperfectly-realized goal of research through mutual collaboration and criticism. It shows that in research there's no such thing as a bad result.

2. It's a story filled with practical examples of the tools,

methods and rules of thumb for researching and writing investigative history—and some of the fallacies, traps and pitfalls out there waiting to blindside us.

### Notes

1. 6 WCH 409. In these notes, WCH refers to the Warren Commission Hearings and Exhibits; here, Volume 6, p. 409. WR refers to the Warren Report.

2. Ibid.

3. WR, 124.

4. 6 WCH 408. According to David Perry, researcher Gary Mack surveyed the WCH volumes and found at least 20 Commission witnesses who had attorneys with them. Perry, "A CTKA Story?" MS, p. 5.

5. McWatters: 2 WCH 262-289. Jones: CE 2641, 25 WCH 899-901, and FBI report of his account, 4/3/64. Dallas police identified McWatters' bus through a transfer found in the pocket of the same brown shirt. The bus incident is analyzed in Sylvia Meagher, *Accessories After the Fact* (NY: Vintage, 1976), pp. 75-83.

6. 6 WCH 416.

7. Ibid., 409-410, 412.

8. See the accompanying "legible" interpretation of the faint carbon/xerox copy of the document found in the Burnett Library. In 1963, the relevant "Thursday" was October 10. This discrepancy is discussed infra.

9. See, for example, Seth Kantor, *The Ruby Cover-Up* (NY: Zebra Books, 1992), pp. 385-397, where Kantor summarizes some of the evidence, concluding that the two "probably didn't know each other," but may have been separate parts of a single conspiracy. Kantor originally published as *Who Was Jack Ruby?* (NY, Everest House, 1978).

10. Information about the discoverers and critics of the document is from correspondence with Jack White, (March 31, May 3 & 18, August 19 & 31, Sept. 3, 1994); and David Perry (August 7, 17, & 30, 1994); and other correspondence or phone conversations as noted.

11. "Dallas Police Report Links Ruby, Oswald 44 Days Prior To JFK Assassination."

12. Perry to JF, 8/17/94; White to JF, 5/3/94. Marrs also identified Aynesworth: telephone conversation, 9/6/94.

13. David Perry, "A CTKA Story?" MS, 1994. References to this article are hereafter made directly in the text.

14. J. Rose to White, Perry, et al., 4/22/94.

15. JF to White, 4/23/94.