

3/21/69

Dear Ross,

Too bad they gave you such a rough time at the Archives. But, you did learn for yourself just how open with its information the government is, did you not?

The Miami papers were about like the others. You could not learn much from them.

C
O
P
Y

Your questions about the trial are largely self-answering. "ovel and Arcacha were not called as witnesses because they were protected against sub-pena. Unfortunately, those multitudinous leads in O in NO, to which I added more than you will ever know, in some cases, complete, packaged cases, were never followed. Right before the favorable Supreme Court decision, it looked like finally they'd get to work. They didn't. And in my opinion they did less well than was possible with the minimum to which they restricted themselves. They had a bad indictment. No one took the initiative to change it when they learned it was defective. This they have again duplicated with the Shaw perjury indictment. I guess they have a tendency toward self-destruction. But insistence on Oswald as a ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ conscious conspirator and refusal to use the "and others unknown" part of the indictment to cover "False Oswalds", as I told them, cost them the case. What I was told, that it would be too complicated for the jury, I did not believe.

Those clippings that are duplicates are still useful. The Hall story is but a small part of what he confessed to me when I turned him on in February 1968. The NYFree Press-Mark Lane story is raw plagiarism-distortion. That happened to and with me when I was in NO April 1968, there were no emissaries to Garrison, and Bobby had not promised to reinvestigate. Even the WFAN-TV show was mine that I'd shared for Mark to introduce his new book. This story is no reflection of what happened on that show, when he stole this material, very irresponsibly. I was keeping silent in order to develop a profitable relationship with Bobby people. Mark ended that forever. You will find the full story in COUP D'ETAT. So, now you have a faint glimpse of another, and a real whore. Even those dubious pictures, which do look so much like the sketch, have no meaning because the entire story is a misrepresentation. I am satisfied Bradley is innocent of the charges against him, that Garrison's own friends booby-trapped him into this because Bradley is of the right. Broshears was another phoney. You will note that no such stories have appeared over the names of responsible people working in the field (Mark did take Broshears and Jaffe to N.O., where Broshears promptly made scandal after scandaa until they eased him out of town again.)

The Crispin Curriel Gonzalez story seems to be as in the clipping you sent. I have it also, in some detail, in COUP D'ETAT.

The truth is not always pleasant, Ross, but I give it to you as it is.

Best to you both and thanks,

Sincerely,

March 10, 1969

(1)

Dear Harold,

Thanks for your reply. Regarding the information I received about the trial from the Miami papers, the Miami News gave no coverage and the Miami Herald gave incomplete infrequent, and biased coverage, sometimes buried in the sports sect. I am surprised to hear that Finck testified. As for ^(Robert) Trayner all I heard was that, in his opinion, all shots came from behind Stone. In a Herald article, it was noted that 34 witnesses had testified for the prosecution so far. I'd be surprised if I know the names of more than 15 of them. The Herald did find room for the 2 articles I'm enclosing in an envelope. This garbage they always make room for.

There seems to be so many people I would have expected to hear of appearing at the trial. What happened to Noel Andrews (or at least his testimony given before the Warren Com.) Arshaka Smith etc. What happened to all the leads and evidence presented in "Oswald in New Orleans" why wasn't that followed up or

②

utilized? Why did Alcock say Oswald
fired from the book Depository after listening
to Garrison's constant denial of that possibility,
it came as quite a surprise. What happened
to the "false Oswald" etc. I am also
enclosing a few articles which I
expected to hear more about during
the trial. I think you might be unfamiliar
with some of them. They may be of
interest.

I was working as an accompanist for
a singer in Washington at the Carter Barron
amphitheater. I took advantage of my week
stay by going to the Archives. Basically,
I accomplished very little regarding acquiring
any new information. All I researched had
been clearly and previously laid down
in your books. ~~At the time~~ I did
however want to see the Zapruder film
and also examine the Bell & Howell
Camera, so as to satisfy myself as to its speed.
I eventually accomplished what I set
out to do. What was of most interest
however, is the way in which they tried
to prevent me from gaining entry to
do research at all. I knew nothing
about qualifications for researching etc.
I simply assumed that if you could
get in so could I. First I was lied
to by ~~the~~ people at the main desk
on the floor open to the public. They
told me everything was classified and
that there was nothing I could examine.
When I argued they played dumb.

after some time, they³ referred me to
someone else, who also stated that
I should come back in 75 yrs. I got
disgusted and took an elevator arbitrarily
to some floor, I believe it was the 3rd.
I got out and saw a sign that said
no admittance personnel only, ~~stood~~ in front
of a roped off hallway. I disregarded
the sign & the rope, and walked
into an office. To make a long
story short, I was shuffled around
indignantly from office to office.
Until ultimately a very sweet woman
in some office told me where to go and
what to do. I ended up obtaining
a researcher card, and speaking ^{with} King to
Mansion Johnson Room 6W3 STACK AREA.
He came down and greeted me. The
Camera was brought to me to examine
When I asked to see the Naprunder film
and slides I was told that I had just missed
a showing. So I said "um another one please."
They did. I had a private showing. After
that I asked for a certain file I was
told it didn't exist. I know it did
because you reference it in "Crawford
in New Orleans". I can't remember which one
it is now. I did however, get to see
another file I was interested in Commission
File 87 Folders 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. It amazed
me that it took them about an hr. to
get it together. I spent that hr. waiting
outside the stack room. I came back
about 4 days in a row. Once I had obtained
access there was no future brush off.
Ross