

4/18/67

Dear Paul,

Today is the last of Bill's employment, so from now on by day will be less broken up, more conducive to continuous work, as in writing, where I subordinate the priorities of my work. I have pending, also on bits of time today in trying to integrate some of the unclassified files into the primitive classification - improve as I go, with carrying on such. Imagine early this a.m. I went over the file of correspondents with you who received your orders, etc, and filed them by subject. I will refer to some below. If I fail to mention any, I hope you can let me know that you will send me a copy of it, or them.

It is agreed already that we had an integrated Bill's system available to us, for the purposes of the project. I have a list of names of those who were in the area on various dates, etc. I am in the process of looking up the names of those who were active. I have often referred to this or glanced to see this file.

For example, I brief Robert on Gaudet: I had seen some and noted that Gaudet was the source on the Ruby jewelry purchase from Harry Horowitz. You have or were on my interview with Horowitz. Then months ago Carl and I and you both asked me to see Horowitz. First I asked to get all, but he said nothing from me, you asked about Ruby jewelry. I finally got all by accident. I wish I had been able to see him alone. However, including Horowitz, was a separate one. See it was a friend of Horowitz's, who I know fairly well and he has been, in some ways, for this reason. His name is Jack Horowitz.

Digression: Horowitz was a close Trotsky's neighbor and possibly he is still in the city. I say so, as indications are as to this fact.

For the last words, I found out I sign either you are to be friendly, I learn that Gaudet has seemed to be a "softener", who failed his previous test so to. He apparently was able to get support (including financial) from Latin American governments and other sources enabling him to survive previous financial crises. I had not known of the production of Horowitz's cars (Times - January 8/26/66) from that point) but there are two similarly-named Gaudets in U.S. and when you see the complete version of G.M. you'll see the address of the right one. I have asked about him. There is also a second but identical with the same name as his (source ibid), the second of the Citizens' Committee for Free Cuba and Bethel, editor. Formerly U.S. Embassy lawyer. Further digression: some source says Nixon's present and good friend Herb Cohen (p. 100) is a Cuban who fled 1963 with family from Havana, is pro-Trotsky (strongly). Cohen lived with him briefly on return to U.S. Nixon was good connections, especially if he consults on policy!

In one of your unnumbered notes you refer to one wearing spectacles, from "Raymond" Cohen's book (or so it is) - Cohen is probably correct, as one of interest. He gave the wrong name when captured fearing the consequences of his past of his connections. The source, who was with him. He is still of interest, some reason.

Your 3/7/67 note on literature distribution: per S., there is another alternative, that it was physically impossible, as if the informant were in a car, out of bus. I seem to recall one report in which an informant was in a bus or car. The trolley could be quite limiting, since there is but one in U.S. today, the t. Charles.

At this point, while I was changing paper, I got a phone call from Joe. In a way it is encouraging. He is going over the files, weeding out all the leads to contact people, Gungor and all the other things outside of C. . . He is not interested in these very leads they do not seem to be followed because of all the witness paths they tread. I suppose this means whether in our actions. Anyway, they are finding interesting things, some possibly wrong or unimportant (like a reference to real civic and legislative on Grevier street).

10/10/87 is not much more than a few minutes. Some time ago I had to get back home whenever he was after his secretary report of the telephone of the talking, and spend an hour or so thereafter. He and DeBruyne were friends. Have you any further photographs or evidence on this personal viewing of situation?

With this was an archive XXXXX reference, an alleged report. My I have a copy. I think that is quite significant for a number of reasons, only one of which is that he is related for the ITOM interest. Another is the peculiar content of the cited reports, whether in its out-of-character nature, for example, in that the report that it had been mentioned there, as well as the fact that it is far out of its way to avoid giving his name as in any way identify him, as in the legislative report (No 11, 1) - stage our interest.

10/14/87, the information of someone in ITOM. In the sense of someone regularly working with/for them or someone who has had contact, like Butler undoubtedly would if not him, so you know what.

Your reference (17/7/84) to someone in ITOM. I think that he is not readily identified. It would be about his name in the report of when he was later reinterviewed by GUY.

12/12/87, your thoughts about the Allen-Gault report. They undoubtedly have some sense of personal familiarity, hence the reference to GUY. They have had GUY staff and those.

12/21/87, Chris still hasn't shown your letters on this. If not, say I, please!

12/19/87, GUY's report on the main. It is agreed that the only part from it that will be significantly important is the part of the Commission's life. Is there anything that you do not recall? Very sad, if you do not recall of the report itself, it is to be read carefully. I think a writer by that name, but not unfriendly when we met. In connection with this name, you may want to recall one I sent you after speaking to Barbara Leis about her interview with someone who knew GUY's well and a comparison between it and the report Holley gave. She took his along. His was entirely inaccurate.

11/20/87, GUY's report. This message, as I believe I have wrote you, was not likely by the Government printing office. I have dealt with them extensively. They take no liberties, insist, then at least, on having everything in writing. If only the fingerprints that might have been on it, I tend to favor the view that there may have been something a little different about that particular leaflet. The GUY would not have been in a position to give out the kind that disclosed the switch.

2/24/87 DeBruyne. Do I have a copy of that 10/10/87 reports I think not. I'd like to go over it carefully. (GUY's) When you work about him, say I remind you (No. 3) that he regularly attended with N. . . meetings, mentioned here after GUY's testimony. He is taken in part, with other individuals' specific mention but no affidavit from him; best likely, I think, printed out to him by GUY. . . I don't dig

if this conjecture is correct, I suggest the fact that meaning to Richard other than as imparted to E.

10/22/37, Father: May - have the surviving letter that list of air my have had no more significance. If you can spare me two copies of the partial transcript, I'd like to file one with Boggs, one with Schaner. Do you have anything "Special Books"? If you can send me these, two, could you please write these two names on the back, for by the time you have time, - you have forgotten my name.

2/23/37, Wendell - all foundation. Everything you say here is correct. However, there are some of the studies as there were some personal dislikes and antagonisms. John, for example, was known and was (and perhaps) was have been less than honest and the various seems to be the case. There was pressure against former - I'm in the, I'm not. Was and is seems (inter) estate only.

7/16/38, Father: I'm sorry. Do you see the 23 article saying these were some of the things that were not a successful representation of what I'd say, and I'm sorry that I'm not in the article, please.

Another subject, somewhat is a very excellent thought on the rifle and ballistics. It was still can be traced, I believe. My own rifle still does not have the right counter because, separately, it required a special screws for the counting screws and the counter as we determined to make it exactly the same he was reluctant to use different screws with different threads!

Sincerely,

Wiborn - interested in your participating in it (about 1937, 1938). Within the last 10 years, I've been very interested, and have a lot of time to spend the requisite as in it. . . . but I don't know how the way it was of the parties and the things that were done. He was not very interested, and if we were far from him, he would really looked out to see the way of that one. So, they have been quite about it, Fred. I was not there when he arrived.