

Hock, Schoener

2/1/69

Dear Dick Bernabei,

That I stop to write at all today, when I began in 4:30 a.m. to complete what I was working on when I retired, is a mark of the importance I attribute to your letter of 1/23, postmarked 9:30 p.m. 1/24 and showing superficial signs of being opened (if it was and your men is for real you'll soon enough have a measure of it).

I am sending copies of this to Paul Hock and Gary Schoener, for I think they should be cued in. Each has good judgement, each has excellent applicable knowledge, and each may have specific knowledge as what you learns develops.

Like you, I dispose of the other things first. On Frazier and the rifle, please put everything you have in a memo to Alvin Oser and Bill Alford c/o DA, 2700 Tulane Ave., N.O. Attach a little slip or use my name on the return address so they will pay attention, for as the days pass they will be busier and busier. They have called Frazier as a witness. Give them all the fact, with citations, and, separately, what you think will prove Frazier a liar or break him down in the stand.

The new developments on the autopsy are sensational, like nothing we have ever had. It is on that I keep so busy at the moment. I've a 30,000-word manuscript drafted. Clark lost his cool and blundered very seriously. That will have to wait.

When I sent you Jerry Hessld's identification and address, I was confident he had some knowledge because I knew, without knowing his name, that he had worked with Lady Jean Campbell, I am familiar with her writing, and I had seen a report or some reports on his several years ago. A good friend who is a British correspondent and knows her well put me on to her almost three years ago, I tried in every way to get her re-interested and failed (hence I suggest you hold off on writing her now. Drain Herald first. I'll get her current address with little trouble). Her first writing was skeptical. What Herald tells you about the "False Oswald" part is true and consistent with what the FBI report(s) show. I suggest you write the Archives (send a small sum as a deposit so you can order directly, by mail, and not have the delay in sending the correct amount in each case) and ask for every report about or of interviews with him. Let us know what they send you and sometimes when someone is checking the indexes they can include that and see if there is anything of which we could know not included. The cost per page is 20%. Lady Jean is quite a character, a relative of the owner of her paper (Evening Standard) and a pretty shrewd cookie. If she is in Washington, I'll be able to see her at the right time, which is not now for a number of reasons. It would surprise me if she were working for Reuters and not the family interests.

Separately, and not urgently, you should get the entire story of those misrepresented pictures and Schiller down in complete form, for use if Schiller again reises his ugly head.

Generally, about how to handle Herald: be optimistic. Do not be skeptical. Let him talk and talk and talk. This is, as I look at such things, important for a number of reasons. First of all, he has had quite a dose of skepticism from the Feebees. If he has any reason to expect the same from us, he will lack the interest he could have. Next, this way he'll give you much more. It is, of course, time-consuming going through it, but one little particle he might drop without awareness of its significance can, in the end, turn out to be quite important. We never know.

Where it seems someone might be an important witness, I like to give them free rein. This gives you more in volume and more in area to appraise for integrity and accuracy of recall and reporting. Thus, it is a better measure of the quality of the source. On the other hand, with a persuasive liar, unless really skilled, such depth ruins them. The exception is the pathological liar who knows something and you cannot or do not know the source. Even in such cases I have found that by taking the time to check out what seems most reasonable these people may well have valuable knowledge. I have checked out one person who does not know the difference between truth and falsehood and who may have no first-hand knowledge at all. It has led me to some of the most important info. I have. This takes much time, but unless they begin with something fixed in mind they soon cannot recall all the inventions and start tumbling over the lies.

I think Herald may be worth the trouble. If you do not check him, you will also find out the areas in which he has knowledge. You can later pick them, one at a time, and exhaust each. In limiting him to begin with you may not learn of some of the things of which he may know.

While some of the things he says seem credible if inconsistent with what has been reported, some do not, yet they should be explored. One of the possibilities is that one or more thought to have been Oswald may thus be identified. There are countless Oswald-Ruby reports but not one I believe. That picture, for example, may be of someone looking like Oswald (of whom Crawford may only be one).

Carter interested Penn Jones, who said he was brother of Cliff Carter. There has to be something wrong with a man who has a brother in the White House and himself lived at 1026 if this is the case. However, there are a number of things that do direct interest to 1026 and its residents,

Consistent with what seems unlikely, Oswald's use of Carter's car to go to Mexico, is the FBI checking of border points on wrong days. I ran into a case of this in N.C., the Norths. I also ran into accounts of his having an old car there.

After you get the FBI report(s) you can use them as a guide to what he told them. This may be a means of recapturing what he may have forgotten.

When he talks of "positive identification" of photos, get him to distinguish between his interpretation and what people actually said. Some of those are not likely Oswald, as with Ryder.

On the Sportsdrome, ask him about a large man with a beard and a pickup truck, if he doesn't go in that direction by himself. Try and let it come spontaneously first.

In questioning him about those said to be Oswald, do not lead him at first into consideration of the possibility of a counterfeiting. Get everything he may be able to say on this first. Afterward, try and learn whether he thinks these could have been falsifications, whether it then occurred to him.

I do not believe Oswald drove to Mexico, nor do I see any advantage in it for him. However, this is not the only possible Carter connection. The wrecked car could be of other interest. But Herald, unless he is adventuring, must have some reason for the belief, especially after Carter contradicted it.

There are a number of good reasons for you to have Herald to yourself for at least a while. In my own case, I am too busy now anyway. You handle it your way, but tell no one not necessary. Paul and Gary may have valuable information or be able to check things for you. They may also have significant questions. You

will learn how important this can be. After you have learned all you can and have communicated it to others is the best time for someone else to talk to him, if that then seems desirable.

You are right not to conclude in advance that he is stringing you along.

After we learn what he knows, perhaps, with his willingness, he can do some checking out for us down there. It is less difficult now than it was. People are changing in their attitudes.

I now expect to be here for the foreseeable future, save perhaps for an occasional day here or there on a short trip. I hope you can get her this month. Greyhound runs to Frederick. If you drive, it is about 3½ hours from Trenton.

When he sends you a tape, perhaps you can dub it and send me a copy. I can play anything except 15/16. I have a cassette machine also.

If he can get any of the pictures, that would be very good. Chances seem against it.

Paul's address, if you have not been in touch, is Paul Hoch, 2537 Regent St., # 202, Berkeley, Calif. 94704. Gary Schoener is Box 392, Mayo Hospital, Univ. Minnesota, Minneapolis 55455.

When you get documents, it would be a good idea if you could send each of us copies. They may fit with our knowledge or files. Use your judgement on his letter(s). We can also help you if he is a put-on.

Play it your own way. Do not be intimidated by your own lack of experience. More important is common sense and willingness. Experience is necessary for crossing up, for probing the unwilling, etc. but is no great liability with the willing. But after five years be on guard for confabulation. Also, watch for signs of the retailing of books. Try and get everything on paper. I see nothing wrong with telling him you work with others and you regard him as potentially important, therefore you would like to pass what he give you to us to see what it elicits from us. We may recall what can corroborate, or what makes sense of something he perhaps cannot understand. Again, use your own judgment. Your specific knowledge will mean more than any generalization on this.

It does sound exciting. Whether or not he pans out, and I think he will because I have crossed his trail before, it will be interesting to you. Good luck!

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Dept. of Classics
Queen's Univ.
Kingston, Ontario
23 January 1969

Harold:

I have some pretty exciting information, but I will get to that after I mention other stuff that is less exciting. Once I get on to the new material, I may not want to stop, and may forget the less exciting.

I am sure that you were not fooled by Ramsey Clark's recent disclosures about the photos and X-rays, but in any case I am including my two cents-- a letter to the editor of the newspaper in Kingston. I also sent it to papers in Toronto and Ottawa, but I do not know whether they will publish it.

I located Hoover's letter to Rankin discussing the defective sighting arrangement. It is CE 2724. The statements about the sighting appear in the next to last paragraph. It is dated 26 March 64; Frazier testified 5 days later, on 31 March 64. Except for this, I have not done further work on this issue. It really does not matter if nothing more turns up. Frazier covered the implications of this sighting arrangement by noting that the scope mount looked as though it had been removed, so anything we assert concerning how it was sighted in at 12:30 on 22 Nov may have little bearing. But this much is certain: both Frazier and Hoover (and the WR) lied by asserting that this arrangement would be an asset. I outlined the important points in my last letter, and as I reconsidered ~~the~~ them, I became more certain that ~~they~~ my assertions are correct. Frazier lied and he knows he was lying. That is evident from the knowledge that he fired the gun at 100 yards when it had the high-right ~~fixed~~ sighting arrangement. He did not show those targets to the WC; if he had, they would undoubtedly show that at 100 yards the bullets were striking about 29 inches high and about 9 (I think) inches to the right. He showed the 100-yard targets that were fired after they tried to lower the sights (and did in fact lower them somewhat).

From the source mentioned below I got information about the Paris Match and Saturday Evening Post photos taken from the Dal-Tex second floor. The P-M picture was taken by Jerry Herald and the SEP picture was taken by Larry Schiller. The explanation is entirely innocent. They were allowed in the TSB to take pictures on Saturday, but they could not get good pictures from "Oswald's" window. They moved to the Dal-Tex window of their own volition because it presented ~~much~~ a better photographic view. They knew that the captions were a put-on, but did not think it important-- it made better copy to indicate that this was the assassin's window. Herald rented the white convertible and let Schiller use it for his photo. It was the only Lincoln-Continental convertible for rent in town, and apparently the Secret Service used it for their re-enactment. Herald thinks the re-enactment ~~may~~ occurred on Saturday, but he says it might have been on Sunday.

By the way, concerning the SS re-enactment, in the photo section of WW (2, I think) you print pictures from the SS reconstruction. Look at the one that shows arrows pointing to the fire hydrants; it is on the bottom of the page. That picture corresponds very closely with the news photo that I mentioned in an earlier letter, and the photographer who took the news photo might even be visible in ~~the~~ your picture. The news photo also shows the SS man with movie camera sitting in exactly the same position on the trunk of the car as the SS man in your picture. The only difference is that the news photo shows the rear of a motorcycle that was located to the left and slightly forward of the left front bumper of the car. The background of the news photo shows flowers on the north side of Elm. It seems likely that the SS pictures that appear in your book were taken during the weekend, and not on Dec. 5.

The location of flowers north and south of Elm can establish the date of some photos, I think, but I have not ~~yet~~ tried to work it out.

Now for the real news.

Jerry Herald phoned me from Dallas yesterday and we talked for half an hour. He lives there now and works in real estate. He had answered my letter, but I have not yet received it. He called out of curiosity to find out about my interest, and to let me know, too, that he thinks the WR a fake. We talked at length about his experiences in Dallas after the assassination, and covered numerous topics. Forgive me if I merely outline some of the things he said, but we covered so much in such a short time that I did not have an opportunity to probe deeply into all the things we talked about. My own interest at the time was to get an idea of the range of what he had learned, but even that contained some exciting revelations. I shall now be in close touch with him by mail and may get a chance to see him when I go to the States in February.

Herald spent about a month in Dallas after the assassination, working a good deal with Jean Campbell (whom you mentioned earlier; she is now in the Washington bureau of a well known London news service-- he could not remember the name of it). He turned up a good deal of important information that he passed to the FBI. Some of it was used and abused by the investigators, other stuff was ignored. I'll outline the stuff in haphazard fashion, because that is the way the conversation went, and I made brief notes.

It was Herald who located ~~Dyal~~ Ryder and was the first to interview him. Also he photographed the tag with Oswald's name on it. Ryder positively identified photos of LHO as the Oswald for whom he had done the work. There was no doubt in his mind that LHO is the man, and that the rifle did not have a scope on it. He thinks it was a Mauser, but he was not sure.

Herald also turned up Whitworth and Hunter, the two old ladies in the Furniture Mart who identified Oswald and family. They too were certain that the man was LHO and the woman Marina.

Herald also turned up a witness at the Sports Drome rifle range (probably Garland Slack, though H. couldn't remember the name). Slack was certain that the shooter there was Oswald-- positive.

Apparently these witnesses were emphatic in their identification, for H. thinks that they are right-- that it was LHO. All this is material that was later used by the WC, and distorted, but H.'s account corresponds with all that I can remember about what those witnesses said.

He interviewed Mrs Paine and thought even then that she was a liar, that she had made up and memorized her story. H. questioned her at length and often asked the same questions from a different angle. Invariably she gave the same account in almost the same words that she had used before. He did not discuss many details of what she said, but rather described his own response to the interview-- he is convinced that she rehearsed her story carefully. The one point of substance that he mentioned was this: she told him that Marina never left the house without her. H. had already talked to the ladies at the Furniture mart and knew this to be untrue. Basically, however, he was impressed by how pat and how well rehearsed her story was. She seems to have lied too about LHO's capability as a driver. I'll explain below what caused H to think this.

Now here is something that throws me off, for I think that there is sworn testimony that conflicts with what H says about this. I did not refute what he said, for he seemed certain and I was most interested to know what H learned, not to debate with him. He said that LHO drove to

John(?)

Mexico using a blue 1955 Ford that belonged to Carter, the young man (about 18, H said) who lived in LHO's rooming house. As I think back I can kick myself for not asking how H managed to learn this, but he was so certain that I am inclined to think that he had evidence of it. I didn't ask, either, if anyone went with LHO on the Dallas to Mexico driving trip. Let that pass; I'll find out later. The car was wrecked about a week before the assassination, H advised the FBI to impound the wreck and search it for LHO fingerprints or other evidence that LHO used it, but they ignored him and did nothing. H asked Carter about it, and Carter said he did not know LHO well and did not let him use his car. H said that Carter lied; H was certain that LHO made that trip in Carter's car.

Here is more (and after this you will realize how well H must have enjoyed his work). In order to get inside information regarding Ruby H made up to one of Ruby's strippers (he could not remember her name; such is the course of true love!) and shacked up with her in her apartment. Right there/on her vanity was a photo showing Ruby, the stripper, a few friends, and LEE HARVEY OSWALD. Herald saw this picture. I believe that he took it and gave it to Paris Match with other stuff that he had (I am wild at myself for not remembering what he did with the picture, but I can find out about that later). I doubt whether H remembers the other individuals, but I'll ask him about them anyway. Into my mind pop people like George Senator and Larry Craford and a few others who said they never saw LHO.

That is chiefly what we discussed. It does not seem much for a half hour conversation, but he asked me a number of things, too. I was more than glad to display my knowledge of the published record, for he is now assured that I am serious and well informed. He must have a lot of stuff that we did not talk about, and I am very anxious to talk with him. He travels enough in his business that we may be able to get together, perhaps even here at my place. He has read the Report but is not familiar with the 26 volumes, or books and articles that treat the assassination. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

If you want to talk with him, I'll put him in touch with you, but I would like to have him for a while. Unless you say otherwise, I'll tap him for whatever information he can give. He seems to me to be honest and he is very interested in talking about what he knows. If you think that he might be stringing me along, then please say so. My impression is that he is for real, and I'll treat him that way until I get an indication otherwise.

He appears to be a first rate investigator, judging only from the things he turned up in Dallas, and his diligence in going after information.

I won't immediately make an effort to contact Jean Campbell, but may try that after I learn what Herald can give us. She is quite near you, and you may wish to get in touch with her yourself.

My interest is in seeing that you have as much information as you can, so if you want to see Herald yourself, then let me know and I'll put him in touch with you. Otherwise, I'll handle him.

Instead of writing letters, he records things on tape and sends tape; if he does that with me I can pass them on to you. It is an awkward way to do things, and I want to treat this in the way that you think is best, so if this arrangement does not satisfy you, please tell me so.

Another good thing about Herald is that he has good contacts with other reporters. He might be able to tap them for information. And he is in Dallas, a good place to be for information.

That's it. Please let me know your thoughts about this. I would like to act under your influence, and partly even to have my enthusiasm restrained, when it needs to be restrained. I don't consider it too unusual for Herald to have surfaced after so long a period of time; apparently no "buff" has approached him, and the times when he talked with his friends about his findings and his opinions, he did not encounter great enthusiasm.

What a blast if he can locate that picture that he saw in the stripper's apartment! You wonder how the hell he could have let it out of his possession, but he was on an assignment, and may have thought he was doing right by letting it go.

I have not heard from Lamarre yet. I'll write and let him again know that I am interested.

I wrote to Gillis at Haverford to find out if Thompson's copy of Zapruder contained Z210, and whether his Z210 shows the area between the sprocket holes. That was a few days ago, so I have not yet had a reply.

I don't yet know Herald's address-- his letter to me has not yet arrived. I will tell you when it comes.

Still,

Dick

Bernabei