

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE
NEWSLETTER
vol.1, no.5

NOT A TIME FOR SILENCE

If this issue of the AIC Newsletter has a theme, it is the problem of silence. Our own silence over the past couple of weeks is easily explained by one bothersome word: Time. For us, putting out this Newsletter is necessarily a part-time activity, and sometimes it has to be put aside while we meet the demands of our various professions. We apologize for the delay.

But there is a silence of another sort. There is the silence that Jim Lawrence, Radio News Director at KHJ in Los Angeles, speaks of in the very fine letter which we are reprinting here. It is the silence of the general press. Perhaps the statement by Morris Rubin, editor of The Progressive, that he will not only publish but will give "a very special ride" to evidence of Administration cover-up provides a glimmer of hope for breaking this silence. We hope the Critics will take up Mr. Rubin's challenge.

There is also the new silence of ex-crusaders like Elliot Mintz-- formerly with KPFK-FM, now with KLAC-- who says it is all over, and we might as well give up. Is it all over? The most disturbing silence of all is that which exists at present in New Orleans. Has Garrison, too, given up? We don't think so. We suspect that he has only changed his tactics. We are sure that he would agree that as far as the rest of us are concerned, it is not a time for silence.

Prescott S. Nichols

HAROLD WEISBERG TO SPEAK OUT IN SAN DIEGO

Harold Weisberg, prolific author of the Whitewash series and Oswald In New Orleans, arrives in San Diego this month to speak under the sponsorship of the Assassination Inquiry Committee. Weisberg has been one of the sentinel critics from the outset, whose careful research and dynamic presentations have brought the story of the conspiracy to millions of Americans. (Readers will recall his timely and forceful piece in our "war" issue challenging Epstein's position vis-a-vis Garrison.) On the morning of March 3, 1967, the Washington Post told its half million readers, "The scenario guiding New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in his investigation of President Kennedy's assassination...is Garrison's, but the script apparently started with Harold Weisberg, former Senate investigator and author of Whitewash."

Garrison, in his introduction to Weisberg's Oswald in New Orleans, has stated, "The question now is whether we have the courage to come face to face with ourselves and admit that something is wrong, whether we have the will to insist on an end to deception and concealment with regard to the execution of John Kennedy- or whether we will let the official fairy tale be told and re-told until the truth itself fades into a yagrant rumor and finally dies forever." The Assassination Inquiry Committee is pleased to present Harold Weisberg to help dispel this "official fairy tale" and elucidate the dimensions of the conspiracy before the people of San Diego.

(next page for details)

Mr. Weisberg will deliver two major lectures here. The first will be on Monday evening, October 28, at the University of California San Diego in the Revelle College Cafeteria from 8 to 11 PM. His second appearance will be at San Diego State College, from 8 to 10 PM, in Social Sciences Room 100, in conjunction with the experimental college series described later in the Newsletter. Both talks will include question and answer periods. Admission is free and all are invited. Weisberg will also appear twice on Channel 8 TV (CBS in San Diego), at 3 PM on Oct. 28 on the Bob Dale Show, and at 8 AM on Oct. 29 on the Sun Up Show. Finally, he will be featured on KPRI-FM (106.5) for a free-wheeling session, including telephone call-in and comment by listeners, starting at 11:30 PM on Oct. 28.

We look ahead eagerly to these events and know many Southern Californians will participate with us. A. George Abbott, M.D.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Gentlemen:

For several weeks I have been reading your newsletter with increasing interest. You are to be commended for your consistently objective, lucid presentation of facts and speculation regarding the assassination. I was particularly impressed by that portion of volume 1, number 4 devoted to the silent press. In that connection you may be interested in the following stories:

Our news department was instrumental in bringing Mr. Garrison to Los Angeles for his appearance on November 14, 1967. That night and the following day we broadcast an account of his speech and excerpts from it. However, not one word cleared the national wires. It seemed to us odd that such serious allegations by any duly-elected chief law enforcement officer of a major jurisdiction (let alone Jim Garrison, by then an international celebrity) should be ignored. We began trying to learn why it was so. After several days of being put off, we were told by a leading news agency executive that Garrison's allegations were "too hot". The executive reminded us that his business is highly competitive, and he could not afford to see his Washington news sources "dry up".

On December 14, I flew to Albuquerque to record Mr. Garrison's speech at the University of New Mexico. The address was reported in Los Angeles only on KHJ, to my knowledge. On May 13, Mr. Garrison spoke to students at American University, the scene of President Kennedy's famous nuclear test ban speech of June, 1963. Mr. Garrison drew the National States' Rights Party into the conspiracy and amplified his charges against the government. The speech was never covered by the general press.

One week earlier I had interviewed Mr. Garrison in his New Orleans office. During our discussion, he offered to make his files available to Congress for the purpose of a full Congressional investigation. We reported this offer with great excitement. Other media overlooked the offer and continued to attack Garrison for alleged "personal opportunism". In that same interview, Mr. Garrison charged that the war machine would not allow anyone who could end the Vietnam conflict to live. Thirty days later, I watched in stunned belief as Dallas became Los Angeles- Parkland became Good Samaritan- Jack became Bobby. "What will it take", Garrison had asked me in May, "to wake the people up?"

(see next page)

LETTER CONTINUED

On March 15, we called the District Attorney of the District of Columbia, Mr. David Bress, who is a federal official. Mr. Bress declined to serve a Louisiana witness subpoena on Mr. Allen Dulles, whom Garrison had wished to question. Such inter-jurisdictional service is ordinarily a routine matter, and we wondered: why the exception for Mr. Dulles? Mr. Bress, allegedly a public servant, refused to explain his action. I angrily dispatched a protest to Attorney General Ramsey Clark and received a most apologetic telephone call from his office the next day. But the Department of Justice still flatly refused to give a reason for Mr. Bress' action.

The foregoing examples represent, at best, incompetent reporting and/or poor news judgment. At worst, they show governmental arrogance and determination to suppress evidence.

Jim Garrison is my friend, but I do not demand that his contentions be accepted on faith; that is why we are saddled with the Warren Report, and Garrison wants no such blind, blanket endorsement. What he does want is fair, complete reporting of the subject, and the chance to tell his story in a court of law. To that end, we should all be pledged. For even if we forget the facts of the assassination, we are left with the fact that our present government feels obliged to lie and compelled to conceal.

No thinking, caring American can allow this situation to continue. Let us devote ourselves to informing those thinking, caring Americans. Keep up the good work!

Best Regards,
Jim Lawrence
Radio News Director, KHJ

Gentlemen:

My ironic use of the word "conspiracy" (ed. in a recent issue of The Progressive) was not intended to suggest that I do not believe any conspiracy was involved in the assassination of President Kennedy. I guess I intended only to emphasize the flimsy character of Mark Lane's disclosure of "conspiracy" among the liberal press in suppressing his findings. I deal with this subject in the "Office Memo" of the October issue of The Progressive... I give credit to Mr. Lane for many of his disclosures and for raising many doubts in the minds of the public regarding both the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination itself and in the manner in which the Warren Commission conducted its inquiries...

As for my own views on the overall subject, I confess to considerable confusion and ambivalence. I have grave doubts about the validity of the Warren Commission's findings that Oswald was a lone assassin, but neither do I believe that Lane and others have put together a wholly convincing case that Oswald was in fact aided by conspirators unidentified. I see no justification for the Government's policy of keeping evidence locked up in the national capital and Archives; nor can I condone the failure of the Warren Commission to examine the autopsy x-rays and photographs.

As for your question regarding the restraining orders in the New Orleans goings-on, I find myself on rather murky ground. Certainly, in a general sort of way, I would like to see the court action speeded so that we can know one way or the other what if any role Clay Shaw played in the whole tragic episode.

(see next page)

LETTER CONTINUED

You ask, "If you were certain, on the basis of factual evidence, that the present Administration was covering up the true facts about the assassination, would you deem it important to inform your readers?" I find this question gratuitously insulting. It should be self-evident from the nature and character of The Progressive that we would publish any such finding based on factual evidence. Indeed, we would give it a very special ride in the magazine.

Sincerely,

Morris H. Rubin

Editor, The Progressive

Dear Sirs:

I have just read with particular interest the Newsletter of 21 July and the references to my position on Garrison by Brescott Nichols on page 1 and by Richard Popkin on page 7. Under the circumstances, I cannot complain about the publication of Mr. Popkin's account of what he considers or assumes my position to be, rather than my own statement of position. However, Mr. Popkin's remarks are incomplete and do not reflect my views adequately or quite accurately. I should therefore hope that, as a matter of courtesy and simple fairness, you will publish the following clarifications.

It is not quite accurate to suggest that I have been "extremely sceptical" of Garrison from the time he came to the fore. From the time I first learned of Garrison's interest in the assassination (January, 1967) until Perry Raymond Russo testified in the preliminary hearing of the Clay Shaw case (March, 1967), I was a wholehearted supporter and admirer of Garrison. I volunteered any and all assistance which I could render, and sent him considerable material from my unpublished as well as my published work. Ironically, I even disputed some of my colleagues among the critics who were then extremely cautious about or suspicious of Garrison (without cause, in my opinion), the same critics who are now ardent champions of Garrison (despite massive evidence which has piled up which compromises his methods and his "case" in much the same way that the Warren Report is blatantly compromised).

My scepticism began when Garrison offered as serious witnesses Messrs. Russo and Vernon Bundy, whose allegations and testimony were inherently bereft of credibility. My disenchantment became complete when Garrison proclaimed his deciphering of the so-called code ("P.O.19106"), in May 1967, with unprofessional haste, impetuosity, and foolishness. The so-called "code" was a preposterous and amateurish blunder on Garrison's part, in the first instance; but when he failed to retract his claims after being made aware of the fatal defects in his facts and reasoning, but only reiterated and expanded his cryptographic "evidence", the "code" became outright fabricated evidence. Mr. Popkin, in a lengthy apologia for Garrison in the New York Review of Books last year, omitted mention of the code, although I scarcely see how it is possible to make any assessment of the New Orleans "investigation" without taking account of it and its implications with respect to Garrison's prosecutory standards and skill.

Mr. Popkin is quite correct in saying that I was disturbed by Garrison's promiscuity with the facts and his "mixing them up". I do indeed insist that the facts be "kept pure and pristine" (or, to paraphrase Mr. Popkin, precise and accurate), and I take his remarks as a compliment even if he did not intend them as such. Facts must be respected, as a general principle, and certainly they may not be

LETTER CONTINUED

trifled with in a homicide, much less an assassination of the gravest national and international repercussions. A central charge against the Warren Report by the critics is that it trifles with, omits, and perverts material fact in order to arrive at a "lone assassin" who is utterly irreconcilable with the actual evidence. I have devoted rather a massive Book to the exposition of the Warren Commission's liberties with the facts. I have no intention of applying a less rigorous standard to Garrison's "facts", however prissy or sanctimonious that may strike Mr. Popkin; and I only wish that he and Garrison's other devotees would apply to him the same scepticism and objectivity as they applied to the Warren Report.

Finally, it is not my position-- as Mr. Popkin suggests-- that "one has to stick to just the facts and not do any speculating". To prohibit speculation would be to circumscribe severely the marvelous capacity of the human brain to master environment and to interpret events. but I do insist that speculation be identified as speculation, not foisted in the guise of established fact or mixed indiscriminately with hypothesis, theory, evidence, and proof. If some wretched fool wishes to speculate that an assassin fired at the President from a manhole, let him do so; but if he proclaims his speculation to be fact, I would hope that an eminent academician like Mr. Popkin would be among the first to recoil, and publicly.

Yours very truly,

Sylvia Meagher

RECENT PRESS ABSTRACTS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

"JFK Death Forecast Subpenaed" (from the New Orleans' States-Item, 9/27/68): A diary which allegedly refers to a man who mentioned in April, 1963, the possibility that President Kennedy would be killed with a high-powered rifle from a building has been subpenaed by the district attorney's office. Florida Assistant Attorney General Seymour Gelber is directed by the subpoena to deliver the work to the DA's office by 10:30 AM, Oct. 8. The subpoena describes the material as: "A certain diary and notes kept by Mr. Seymour Gelber while an assistant district attorney in Dade County, Florida, during an investigation conducted by the state's attorney for Dade County into activities of extremist groups." Assistant DA James L. Alcock said he is mainly interested in the names that may "pop up" in the diary. The diary also refers to Joseph Milteer, a Georgian, who reportedly told Willie Somersette, a Miami intelligence agent, in April 1963, that JFK would be assassinated."

"Shaw Petitions Top Court" (from the New Orleans' States-Item, 9/27/68): Counsel for Clay L. Shaw today appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to halt prosecution of Shaw by District Attorney Jim Garrison. Attorney Edward Wegmann today filed a lengthy appeal with the high court asking for a hearing on Shaw's request for a permanent injunction barring Garrison from prosecuting him in state court. If the Supreme Court agrees to hear the case, it will set a hearing after it reconvenes Oct. 7. If it declines, the case will revert to state court and Shaw can be tried on the conspiracy charges. The appeal filed by Weggman today was from a decision by a three-judge federal panel in New Orleans. The panel denied Shaw's injunction but did hold

PRESS ABSTRACTS CONTINUED

up the prosecution until a Supreme Court appeal could be taken. In the appeal, Shaw asked for the same remedies that the three-judge panel denied in its July 23 decision: a ban on prosecution by Garrison; a judgment that the Warren Report conclusions be declared valid, accurate and binding on all courts; a quashing of the indictment against Shaw; a ruling that certain Louisiana laws under which Shaw has been prosecuted are unconstitutional; joining U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark to the case as defendant. The appeal contends that the Louisiana law preventing women from being selected for jury service unless they request it is invalid, as well as the laws regarding selection of the grand jury venire. Further, the appeal argues that Louisiana law preventing attorneys from accompanying clients into grand jury proceedings is unconstitutional and that Garrison's prosecution of Shaw violated his civil rights. "Public officials are conducting a reign of terror by misusing and abusing their offices by conducting an illegal, unwarranted probe of the assassination of President Kennedy", the appeal said. The prosecution of Shaw is for the "sole purpose of getting a judicial forum for attacks on the Warren Report", the appeal stated...Shaw was arrested March 1, 1967, and subsequently indicted on the conspiracy charge. Various legal delays since then have prevented the case from coming to trial."

"Ray Lawyer Threatens To Quit" (from the New Orleans States-Item, 9/28/68): MEMPHIS (AP) Arthur Hanes Sr. said in court yesterday that he may have to withdraw as James Earl Ray's lawyer. "Serious difficulties have arisen between me and my client on the best way to handle this defense", Ray's chief counsel said without elaboration.

"Minister In Hiding After Giving Police Evidence of RFK Plot". by William Dick (from the National Enquirer, 9/29/68): A California clergyman is in hiding after telling police he can prove more than one person was involved in the murder of Senator Robert Kennedy. One attempt already has been made on the life of the Reverend Jerry Owens, and he has received two telephoned warnings to keep quiet or he and his family will suffer the consequences. The Rev. Owens, a Baptist evangelist, said accused assassin Sirhan B. Sirhan had at least three associates, one of them a girl, and he can identify all of them. The minister said he met Sirhan and his confederates before the assassination and was almost duped into an unwitting role in the conspiracy itself, as driver of the getaway car after the murder. Owens is now in hiding in the outskirts of San Francisco at a location known only to a handful of LA authorities and his lawyer, celebrated criminal lawyer George T. Davis. "My client has told his story in full to the LA Police but so far they have not extended their investigation and they never asked him to appear before the grand jury", Davis told the Enquirer. "Meantime Owen's life and the lives of his family are in jeopardy from the plotters who want his lips sealed...My client could be an important witness in the RFK assassination and in proving his murder was linked with those of JFK and Martin Luther King." The Rev. Owens story, as related by Davis, was this: On June 3, the minister picked up two hitchhikers in his car in LA. After the June 5 assassination of RFK, the minister saw a picture of one of the two men on television. It was Sirhan. The minister said that Sirhan, while riding beside him, commented on the car's hood ornament, a silver horse. "Sirhan told me he was interested in horses, because he

PRESS ABSTRACTS CONTINUED

had been a racetrack exercise boy and would like to have a horse himself" Davis quoted the minister as saying. "I told Sirhan that I had a palomino, I would sell him for \$300. We arranged a meeting for 11 o'clock that night and I gave Sirhan my card with my telephone number." The minister said when Sirhan showed up that night he was accompanied by the other hitchhiker, another man and a girl. He said that Sirhan told him the money would be ready at 8 AM the next day- the morning before the Kennedy murder. Sirhan and one of the men appeared that morning as scheduled, but Sirhan reported the money would not be available until that night at 11 PM. Then Sirhan asked the minister to give him and his companion a ride to the Ambassador Hotel where they got off at the kitchen entrance, Sirhan explaining he had to get the money from a friend on the kitchen staff. Sirhan asked the Rev. Owens to meet him at that same entrance at 11 PM that night to pick up the money. It was in the kitchen passageway of the Ambassador Hotel that Kennedy was fatally shot at 12:30 AM, 1½ hours after the scheduled appointment. "Something interfered with my own schedule so that I was unable to keep the 11 PM appointment", the minister told Davis. "It is just as well that I did", he continued. "for it is perfectly plain to me now that the conspirators intended to use me in their escape plan following the killing. In fact I believe the assassination may have been scheduled originally for 11 PM, possibly in some other area of the hotel, after which the conspirators would leave in my car. But when I did not show up at 11 PM, the conspirators probably were thrown into confusion. They were forced to revise their plan with the result that the assassination was put off for an hour and a half. (Following recognition of Sirhan's picture on television the next morning) the minister lost no time in going to police headquarters and telling his story, in which, however, the police officers seemed to show a scant amount of interest. Davis said that very night the minister got an anonymous telephone call from a man who said: "Keep your ... mouth shut if you know what's good for you and your family." Davis commented: "The call had to come from one of the people the Rev. Owens had been negotiating with because only they had his number, which was on the business card he said he gave Sirhan. He had an unlisted telephone number. A second telephoned threat was received by the minister two days later." Then on July 1, came the attempt on the minister's life. Accompanied by a body guard supplied by Davis after the phone threats, the Rev. Owens was driving his car near San Francisco when another automobile sped up alongside and tried to force the minister off the road. Only by skillful maneuvering of his car did the minister escape a possible fatal accident. Davis has suggested the minister go before the grand jury. However, Chief Deputy DA Compton told J. Robert Smith of the Pasadena Independent Star-News: "There would be no legal or practical value in having this man repeat his story before the grand jury." Davis achieved national prominence as defense attorney for Caryl Chessman... More recently, Davis defended Jack Kirschke, the former LA Deputy DA accused of murdering his wife and her lover. In Davis' view, the LA police are too anxious to wind up the case in a simple fashion- with just one defendant on whom they can concentrate their investigation.... "To look into a possible conspiracy means a lot of extra work. It is so much easier to lay everything on one person rather than to consider him as a possible patsy. What I'm saying is that Sirhan could be a patsy in this case", stated Davis. Davis said he is becoming increasingly convinced that a link

exists in the killings of President Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. "Every one of these has been blamed on a single individual in almost an identical pattern. But I don't think it makes any sense to ignore the possibility of a conspiracy. I still say my client may be a very important witness in proving that all three killings are linked. And as an attorney who has handled many important criminal cases over the past 37 years, I am not going to put my reputation on the line for something I don't really believe", Davis told this reporter. Meanwhile, the threats to the minister coming from some person or group that wants him to keep quiet are very real... "He is a sensitive target for somebody even though the LA police are not giving him any attention", Davis concluded.

SOME MISCELLANEOUS POINTS AND QUESTIONS ON K-1, K-2, and K-3

- K-2 According to an article in the LA Times (8/15/68), the Alabama author who is going to write-up the experiences of James Earl Ray characterizes Ray as "a man who led a lonely life of crime, a literate writer and reader of books 'who was used by forces he didn't understand!'" (emphasis added) Among the books that Ray reads are Psycho, Self-hypnosis, and How To Cash In On Your Hidden Memory Power, all of which were in his possession at the time of his arrest in London (LA Times) 7/17/68) For what purpose? They don't sound like books one reads just to pass the time!
- K-2 Charles Q. Stephens, the man who allegedly saw King's assassin, is considered such a crucial witness that he has been locked up in a Memphis jail all summer. According to an AP article (New Orleans States-Item, 8/13/68), "The district attorney's office said Stephens was placed in protective custody to insure his safety and to assure his presence when needed to testify". There are discrepancies concerning Stephens. For example: this AP article says he is 57, but an article in the LA Times (8/28/68) gives his age as 43. The latter article also states that Stephens "saw a man in left profile whom he identified from mug shots as 'very much like' Ray"; but William Turner (Ramparts, 5/29/68) quotes Stephens as saying in response to Ray's (Galt's) bartending-school photograph, "Unless he was wearing a wig or had a face lift or something, it's not the man I saw. The hair is too full and the face is too young."
- K-3 Apparently Richard Nixon, for one, does not believe that Sirhan assassinated Robert Kennedy for his advocacy of jet fighters for Israel, for he is advocating precisely the same thing in his campaign.
- K-1 and K-3 As is well known by now, the Warren Commission members never saw the pictures taken at the autopsy of President Kennedy, and they did not include them in their recorded evidence because, as Warren put it, "It would make it a morbid thing for all time to come." (Warren Commission Executive Session, April 30, 1964). Robert Kennedy's autopsy pictures, however, are already so available to the general public that the California State Legislature felt constrained to pass a bill prohibiting their commercial exploitation. Apparently the K-3 pictures are not nearly as "morbid" as K-1.

Prescott S. Nichols

AIC SPONSORS COURSE AT SDS

Under Assassination Inquiry Committee sponsorship, the Assassination Inquiry Workshop will convene on Tuesday nights at 8 PM in Aztec Center Conference Room K, San Diego State College. This non-credit course, an integral part of San Diego State's Experimental College program, will continue throughout the semester, providing San Diegans an opportunity to study the assassination in depth and thereby form intelligent conclusions in the matter.

By working with the AIC Newsletter editors and helping in the creation of forthcoming editions, participants will also better understand the problems involved in communicating information to large numbers of people in our mass society.

Enrollment is free and open to all who care to attend. Course opens on October 8. Three weeks later, on October 29, Harold Weisberg will deliver a major address as part of the series. From time to time, other informed and articulate guests will appear as well.

See you October 8!

Proclamation Of Non-Affiliation (being an important notice)

This notice hereby and forthwith proclaims the independence and autonomy of the Assassination Inquiry Committee, based in San Diego and with chapters no where else. In particular, we should not be confused with the New York based Kennedy Assassination Inquiry Committee (G.P.O.Box 2691, NYC, 10001), whose initials we share in part, nor with the Central Intelligence Agency, whose initials we share in full.

CLOSING NOTES

This, your 5th AIC Newsletter, far exceeds in breadth and girth all previous offspring, being a full 10 pages wide. We apologize for the extended gestation period and promise to induce labor in the future to obviate similar occurrence. You will admit, however, that this issue heralds great promise for the future. We again invite your participation in the program outlined within.

Many have written us, inquiring where in San Diego pertinent literature can be had. We are pleased to announce that Blue Door Books (3823 5th Avenue; phone 298-8510) carries a full line, including Penn Jones' Forgive My Grief (vols.1&2), Harold Weisberg's Whitewash series and Oswald in New Orleans, Josiah Thompson's Six Seconds In Dallas, Mark Lane's Citizen's Dissent and Rush to Judgment, plus Sylvia Meagher's fine work, Accessories After The Fact.

While on the subject of publications, we wish to note that the lively monthly paper Books (published by Jerry Agel at 598 Madison Avenue, NYC) is publishing Harold Weisberg's reply to Epstein, in full with documents and pictures we were unable to feature in our "war" issue. This periodical has been interested in the assassination from the outset and has in past months presented the conclusions to Whitewash verbatim. Books gets our full endorsement.

School has opened, providing young people (and teachers) the opportunity to discuss these issues and gain understanding. The AIC intends to help in this regard. We will furnish speakers (free of charge), and our newsletter is available to all. Include zip-codes please with your request and specify also if you want back issues, our supply of which is dwindling rapidly. You will not receive back issues if you do not so request. Remember also to notify us of changes

of address. If you move, we doubt the post office will forward our mailings, sent at bulk rate, not first class.

For reasons outlined in our last issue, we are very pleased that Abe Fortas will not be Chief Justice. We also note with interest that our prediction regarding postponement of the Sirhan trial until after the election seems true.

Many of you, when first requesting the Newsletter, either asked to be billed for it or expressed readiness to cover the costs involved. To clarify matters, there is no charge for the paper, however we urge each of you to contribute in an amount proportionate to your resources and to the value you place in the paper.

Finally, to end on a different note, one of our readers would like to correspond with a young lady (age 13 to 17 perhaps) exhibiting interest in the issues we concern ourselves with. Interested girls should write us, and we will forward the mail to Wayne. (whoops)

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE

4718 Saratoga Avenue, San Diego, California, 92107

Newsletter Editors: A. George Abbott, M.D.

Prescott S. Nichols

Stephen Paulev, M.D.

Jon Olson

October 5, 1968

Box
for
90

313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400