

# *Johann William Rush*

---

December 1, 1982

P.O. BOX 563  
HATTIESBURG, MS 39401  
(601) 545-8789

Harold Weisberg  
Rt. 12, Box 100  
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Harold:

Sorry for the long delay in answering your last two letters, but I've been busy working on a new project. I'm now publishing a newsletter. Also, I've spent some time in New Orleans and I just got back from Dallas where I met with the usual fruits and nuts in Dealey Plaza. Several people told me that Earl Golz was fired from the DMN for "inaccurate" reporting on a subject not related to the Kennedy case.

Gary Mack's latest newsletter has a great photo-montage showing a man in a "Dallas policeman's uniform" shooting at Kennedy from behind the wall. He got the photo from Groden, but I was interested to see that the figure was about three feet to the left of the man in the Groden video tape. It must have been crowded behind that wall! I'm surprised that the man by the car in the "classic rifleman pose" didn't blow their heads off when he fired from behind the fence. Funny that Zapruder didn't hear all those shots. (Well, I guess that's enough sarcasm for one letter.)

Regarding that last document you sent: I think you are sometimes overly suspicious. To me that document suggests that someone was trying to get information from the FBI rather than give information to them. I suspect that they had no routine or formal procedure for handling such an unusual request, and Harter probably made the phone call very casually thinking that the affair didn't merit a memo or teletype.

Branigan at headquarters probably wrote up the memo to "cover his ass" (as we say in the TV business) just in case some big deal ever came of this. I'm sure he didn't want to wind up in Butte, Montana. Since he seemed to show no concern about Garrison having a copy of the film, this suggests that the FBI didn't have agents lurking in the shadows, and of course this would have been a very good thing to know in 1968. Very clever of that "informant" to find this out since as I recall there was no FOIA back then.

Let me point out something very interesting, Harold. Someone with a paranoid mind could spend years trying to track down those representatives of the nonexistent "International World Trade Center" and could fabricate

all sorts of phony stories about them. But, as you probably know (and as I suspect) those men were working either for you or for Garrison. So, a simple explanation fits the situation. Why, then, do so many "critics" worry about whether Oswald's New Orleans "chapter" of the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee" had any members or not? Does it take the FBI or CIA to set up such a one-man organization, or does it require just one very unsuccessful organizer? The "IWTC" was expedient for two men, the "FPCCNO" was expedient for another. Just as it didn't require the KGB to set up the "IWTC", I don't believe it required the FBI or CIA to set up the "FPCCNO."

Harold, I can understand why you could have suspected a conspiracy years ago. That was back when you were only a simple Maryland chicken farmer. But today you are one of the World's foremost experts on CIA and FBI clandestine activities, and you've nearly mastered their entire elaborate filing and coding systems. Somewhere in the long process of acquiring information you surely must have come to the realization that none of our government agencies were capable of pulling off such a massive "conspiracy" that would have been required to invent and control all of the mysterious, but random, circumstances of this case. They just weren't that good.

Would the government set up a "leftist" "FBI informer" with an "inaccurate" rifle that fired "impossible-to-get" bullets, from an "incredible" distance, for an "unknown" motive, in a "right-wing" city, on a day when there was a 50-50 chance of rain? Harold, the "conspirators" can't be both clever geniuses and bungling fools at the same time.

Let me point out something else. Remember that I gave a copy of my film to Bill Turner who later gave it to Garrison. I could have charged a substantial fee for the film -- Garrison offered to pay -- but I gave it to Bill at no charge, and I've continued to offer copies of the film to other researchers at no charge. Several "critics" obtained duplicates of Garrison's copy and began selling those duplicates of my film.

Years later I would read material published by the "critics" who told various lies about my film such as "Shaw is in it," "scenes are missing," and "it was part of a CIA plot to build a legend for Oswald."

The "critics" are suspicious of rare films that weren't properly taken care of, yet they complain about my film because it was properly taken care of. I am probably the only cameraman in this entire case who maintained a proper "chain of evidence" control over such important material, yet even this does not satisfy the paranoid "critics."

And now, when I try to obtain a copy of the innocuous "Martin" film, I locate several "critics" who have copies, but none will make a duplicate for me! This is outrageous! Step back a few feet, Harold, and take an overall look at the situation. Then tell me who has been honest and fair and who has been lying and covering up?

