7/3/69

Dear Gery,

Your letter of the 26th, with enclosures (many thanks, esp for the defense) arrived today. Kid of long time.

Because I will be taking Lil into town and can then mail, this will be brief.

To any reasonable person, there can be nothing left of that slander and the question why it was engaged and persisted in now looms. I have only one comment, other than appreciation: If I didn't send you a copy of my letter to Fred telling him of the color change in Za, I can. He then had never seen Z.

Olson and the boxes: refer him to WW, under Day in the index. I spotted this that far back and to the degree I then could, went into it. Day was asked to account for the disappearance of a stack of books shown in early pictures and couldn't explain how they were removed by the time he got there. I believe among the sources then available that I checked was Willis 12.

Olson and 226-8: I may well have been wrong about tampering with the film, but the distance the camera moved without blurring, which, as I now recall, was part of my point, has yet to be explained. I hope he recalls the date of this work-May or June of 1966, when no other book than Fox's was out and I was so all alone. If he goes into Alvarez, he should compare his and CBS' claim again WW, I believe about page 39, where I report having discovered it. I have every reason to suspect this, reported by one of his students (Paul? innocently), is what first interested him.

If Renner can get that tape he has a major thing and I'd very much want a copy for comparisons. I'll be writing him. Had letter from him today. I'll be writing Paul, too.

Crafard: do you have CD1472? He was originally hired by Robert Craven and had been with Ruby very short time for trust Ruby imparted. Recall also my memos on address book and missing O page. He had it, too.

Do you have a good, all-speed tape recorder? If not, you must have one available. Perhaps one of your new crew could undertake word for word comparison if George gets radio tape. The should like you should be encouraged.

Ferrie: check this out carefully for a former NO cameraman I'm reliably told weekended at a camp, possibly Ferrie's or Ferrie-connected, married a Minn. girl, as you should recall. If you cannot recall, dig out my memos, letters. You tried to find his studio, remember (was it called 120?)

If you make further reference to Lillian, you can add that after her name was mentioned in public, out of context but in an effort to record credit, as with Fred, I dragged it into one of the books, PM or COUP. This was long ago, from a year to almost three. How time flies! If Lifton makes any factual response, I'd be interested. I wonder how much can be attributed to his erroneous concept of self and what he calls "logic"? He is bright, but not nearly as bright as he thinks. He understand less yet considers he does understand whereas others, lesser endowed, do not or comprehend less. I think it has progressed to the point where he ignores fact inconsistent with what he wants to believe and winds up regarding anything else as unfactual. And above all, I believe he years for the recognition his own work has not earned - therefore gets even wilder. I agree with your analysis of the impact of your letters on him, from the sample you sent.

Take his advice other than he intended. Cool it, but with him, and see the result, if any.

Your suggestion about his deviousndss may be sound. But I sent copies to you and Paul only. (Nichols). My reference to the absence of Z splices refers, as I recall, to what has been substituted for the official exhibit, the FBI copy of the original SS copy. If I can sue, this is one of the thinks I'll want, the real exhibit, which is required to be in the Archives and isn't-or wasn't on my last request.

I have asked Bernabei and he hasn't responded, re Dave. It is possible I did send him a copy. And he has read my books. Sylvia says she has been almost out of contact with Dave. I'm inclined to take her word.

My request for a listnhad to do with my lack of trust of my own memory now. Perhaps I exaggerate this because it has been so dependable. I just do not want to fail to return anything. I appreciate what I get but do not want the dispenser of kindness to suffer.

Glad you found my letter to Paul interesting. I hope it was also the correct approach. I have, as you now know, since be straightforward about wanting not even indirect contact with Dave.

Not the ONI file, but the other things you get from Dave, from what he has no interest in keeping to himself only of the Archives material only, please get two copies and I'll pay you for the secoonf. This makes it possible to get what otherwise cannot be afford. It means five peges for the cost of one. If you want any of the ONI stuff, of which I have a printout, I'll lend it to you. It is all pretty much duplicated elsewhere. I have many Gemberling and quite a few Clements interests (going back to WW, is you recall), so use you own judgement. Almost anything on G, and you know my writing interests and plans. There is the further advantage of getting around the Archives barricades against me, one of the reasons I spend so little time there. Four cents a page is approximately Paul's very low price and it would be at least one step clearer.

I wonder if Dave's concern is not less over being exposed and more over being exposed more or less publicly? At least subconsciously, unless he has an illness I cannot fathom, I'd think he has to be aware of what he s been up to and how dishonest and wrong it it. If he hasn't, he is really sick. Or really worse.

By the way, the Jernigan stuff originates with Penn, not Mark.

Thanks for the Penabaz book. George writes of more.

Relet to Paul:I think Forman is a waste of time. He has added one think to what we knew and only that: the use of the skeleton, and he didn t use it well at all. Please be certain to limit access to NO files.

You earlier sent me you 6/18 to Dave with the request I copy and return. I did, so if you need the carbon back, let me know. The copy is far from clear because it is on both sides of tissue, but it will do if I ever need it.

If Olson wants my opinion of who was really and immediately responsible for the needless rush, I'll be glad to tell him. I agree it wasn't Warren and never believe it was, as the introduction to WW shows, and that was before anyone wrote anything. His last sentence on this is at best inadequate and possible wrong. He is right on the film movement out of plane. It is not uncommon, esp. in home-movie cameras. His illustration is excellent. But he, while right about the lateral motion, ignores the point I was making, horizontal motion, <u>vertical</u>.

His formulation,"...first shot hit the President and not the street" is imprecise, for it is my recollection that some said or their testimony means one bullet did both. He should cover himself on this in his final formulation. He need not depend on Thompson for Augiest position. I have it from the FBI, at Main and Houston. If he want to check further, one of the possibilities is the natural distortion in Hughes' lens, esp at that distance. He realy should begin with WW on this and then go to my citations. More is possible, but I do not now recall what, if anything, I considered unessential.

Hal says he has some Dallas chores for you. I suggested he restrict to two: what may be really valuable and what there is prospect of accomplishing. He is inclined toward imaginativeness and romanticizing.

Reading the excerpts from my letter impresses upon me how desireable it would be to read and correct before I mail, but the other things I do with the time press upon me more. Apologies.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

June 26, 1969

Dear Harold,

George Rennar just wrote me that he just realized that he was supposed to do something for you and forgot, and that he will be writing ;you soon. He may be getting his hands onto a tape of police radio broadcasts made after the assassination. An uncle (eccentric) of a friend, as soon as he heard the assassination broadcast, changed to the police band and began recording! You should be getting a copy of his memo on the Alvarez stuff (which I earlier forwarded to you) from him in the near future, if you don't already have it. Olson also got a set.
As for my inquiries about people in touch with Dave Lifton, George replied: "A year ago Fred had the impression, the source of which I do not know, that the Bay area people were putting him on. Dave, and object of scorn in L.A., told me, 'They take me seriously up there.' Last September when Larry and I met Hoch and Verb at Hoch's apartment, Dave called, and he and Paul spent some time on the phone discussing documents. Hoch and Werb do, indeed, take Dave seriously, at least to the extent of meeting his points intellectually. Essentially, it seemed to be just a recognition of his expertise in certain areas." (letter of June 24, 1969)

The Christian Crusade offers a book called "Red Runs the Caribbean"by Penabaz. I'm getting you a copy. The newsletter (Christian Crusade, June, 1969) for this month describes their upcoming eleventh annual National Convention as "America's largest gathering of partiots." Inside of the back cover is a photo of Hargis shaking hands (in private) with a jovial Chiange Kai-shek. Their oriental tour advertises a meeting with him and Park of So. Korea (at the bargain price of $1,197!)

I am excited right now because last night's meeting of my new committee went very well. It looks like I may have some good researchers. And, in addition, I have a housewife who knows the volumes almost as well as I do! It is a joy to find someone with whom I can talk about such things. In addition, she shares my suspicions of Crafard, and is now hard at work on a memo about him. She has discovered some interesting things, which I missed, which could make him even more important than I supposed.

I also found someone, who is very much on the ball, who found a girl who claimed that her boyfriend was a friend of David Ferrie, and that either she or he had some knowledge of Shaw. She does have a southern accent. I will let you know as soon as we locate them.

I got an indirect communication from Kroman's crew through one of my girl researchers with whom Kroman's Minneapolis girlfriend is in touch. T will send a memo on it to Hunt, since it is more framing of Hunt. A copy of the memo is enclosed.

June 30, 1969

Enclosed is a letter to the archives, and that Lifton letter which is a carbon for you. Also enclosed is my now famous 5 pager to Fred and Marlynn of June 17 which you will have to copy and return if you want a copy of it. Much of it is quoting from you. Then there is a copy for you to keep of my letter of June 30 to Paul.

Some new info before I finish answering your letter of 8/23.

George Rennar, although he can't find it yet, just remembered having a letter from Hal in regard to Turner. He writes: "I had asked what he knew about the charges and counter-charges. His reply was rather suspicious of Turner, based mostly on the allegations in the Overstreets book--the wrong reason to be suspicious of agentry by Turner, but as far as I am concerned. At any rate, Hal did not express trust of Turner, but rather said he thought that suspicions of agentry by Turner could be held by reasonable people." This, to me, is very encouraging, and I'll glad to be able to write you about it and hope that George finds the letter.

Fred's letter of June 16, which I only got on the 28th, included a discussion of Lillian: "She says Harold was familiar with her proof, that he had seen it at Sylvia's and that he devised another method to show the same thing. His method was not as good and 'took the teeth out of' her research. Otherwise she was happy to see this presented without credit, but unhappy that when it was presented, it was badly done. The point she made to me at one time, was that Harold could have used her stuff without credit, but instead, after first seeing this, he changed it so that it was original with him, and in doing so, hurt the concept. As you say, though, she would have no cause to say that Harold stole her research only that when he did use it it was greatly weakened in the translation. This is a minor point, but I think I'm presenting Lillian's views fairly here and want to assure you that she is not angry with Harold nor is she quite the fool she comes off when one reads your June 17th letter." I replied to this, and pointed out that the charges made were false, and whether or not Lillian is a fool, Dave was a fool for making those charges. Further I noted that I think little of elaborate theories of stolen work, when it is possible that two people independently discovered something. Fred further says: "Harold and I pretty much agree on Ray. There was some pretty interesting stuff on Lifton in that June 17th, he called and wants to see this, so I'll show it to him." He also took back charges made against you and also indicated realization of exaggeration of his part, something unusual for Fred. The tone of this letter is very encouraging. My last letters to he and Dave, which I have loaned my carbons of (I foolishly forgot to make more than two) to George Rennar, and which I will send you in a week or so, indicate that Dave's most recent letter to me reveals his motives in this, and continue to put him on the spot and focus on the fact that it is he that has caused this trouble.

Dave's last letter to me, of June 25, is fascinating: He does some backing down, and then sort of reverses his field, and as usual, calls my logic full of holes, and promises a reply in the near future. As usual, he skirts the issues and makes provocative statements. But, listen to this: "Is it necessary for you to be sending copies of this stuff to Paul Hoch? He told me yesterday he wants no part of this dispute, and I don't blame him. If when we have both had our say, you want to send him a summary if any of your views have changed, do so then. Must he be in on a blow by blow account of all this? Are you trying to fan flames, or put them out? Or were you so convinced of the logical and factual validity of your last letters that you consider them the last word?? Cool it, Gary. Also, Re Fred. Decide who you're having your argument with. If its Fred, then write him. If its me, write me. If its both, send cc right away, or instructions to reproduce. Intentionally or not, when you give Fred a one or two day lead time in a letter which I have to scramble over to his house to read, when I finally find out about its existance, and which contains much loaded anti-Lifton propoganda, I wonder whether you're interested in discussing these issues, so we can possibly both learn something, or creating a triangle. I don't suppose you want to do the latter, so lets use some discretion and common sense. You're the one whose esteem will go down in the eyes of others if you act recklessly regarding my long relationships with either Fred or Paul. Keep Paul out of it, send CC if you write me about Fred or vice versa, and everything will be all right." I turned everyone of his claims and statements around and showed, through his own letters, that it was he that was guilty of them not I, and then indicated that I would be only too glad to let an impartial party see all the letters and judge whose logic was flawed or immature, who answered whose questions, who had the evidence, who was excessive, who started the fire and fanned the flames. It sounds to me like he is really shaken up now. If so it is amazing given the fact that I must counter all of his hard propaganda through only letters.

Re your last letter: Don't be so sure of your analysis on the Nichols quote--bear in mind that while perceptive it assumes one thing which we can't with Dave: that he isn't purposely giving us a watered down version of what he knows. While I don't want to raise any suspicions, bear in mind that he sometimes lets onto only what he has to in a given context. His emphasis which you couldn't understand, on examination of the Z film, I should have explained. The reason for it is that Fred's "discovery of splices" is contradicted by it, according to Dave, since you mention there being no splices in it. So John, although probably not, could be the source. I am trying to find out if Dave is in touch with Dick Bernabei. Paul seems out of the question to me, from what I know of him. He is careful and methodical. I don't know Jim Schmidt, but as much as I like Hal, I fear that he is the weakest one out there. In other words, despite what a good guy he is in both our minds, he seems from my limited knowledge to be the weakest of a good group, despite the fact that he is far above average in just about everything. But we must be sure to eliminate all possibilities, including people like Sylvia, whose contacts with Dave they have both kept out of all conversations with me, even when I provide an opening which would require some sort of a statement.

I will pass on ideas to contact in England and see what he can do. I just got a letter from him today and he offers all help.

I would like to make you up a list of what I have sent and what I need returned, but I am afraid that I don't know what I sent, exceept for a few items. All magazine and newspaper items are my only copies I am certain, but for the rest, you will have to refer to notes on the envelopes or in my letters. Sorry, but I send stuff to you whenever I encounter it and whenever I think it will be of some use.

Going over your long letter to Paul was interesting. He, like Hal, and perhaps Jim, is in the position to get more charges from us then evidence of the basis for them. For instance, they were suddenly hit with the stuff on Turner (except Hal who heard my suspicions last summer) of which we were certain, but of course, could not know in detail all that had gone on in N.O. before and during when you and Vince were there. Paul is meticulous, careful, deliberate, etc. to the degree that one would have to present much evidence to back up such a claim, and that is the probable basis for his cold attitude towards the charges made on Turner and Boxley. On Lifton I doubt if he has examined the record, and I imagine that Lifton has kept it from him. In fact, I wouldn't be surprised if Lifton was most upset by the fact that my carbons told Paul, maybe for the first time, that Lifton had called you outright a liar and a theef and had insisted on it. I will bet my bottom dollar that Dave has been very cautious with Paul, and that Paul has heard little of what has come over the grapevine. Hal, by comparison, is more out in the field, a traveler, on the grapevine, and less meticulously objective, from what I know of the two of them.

I agree on the chance that Hal and I missed something in those important GAI files, and would mostly like Paul to check on on them. In the ONI file, however, I am sure I missed nothing. (That is whose copy Paul has.) For your information, the guy who is arranging for the printing out is Dave Lifton, since he just wrote me and offered them for sale at the 4¢ per page rate with postage paid (his letter of the 25th--the price may have changed, since it was not 100% certain). I don't see anything wrong with utilizing Dave's ability to have this done at a low cost, although the only items I want from it are the synopses of the Gemberling and Clements reports. The ONI file is tripe mostly, and I have seen the other files, and they are mostly tripe. This, by the way, shows how little archives work Dave has done. I make brief reference to this in my letter to Paul, and indirect reference to it in the letter to Dave which George Rennar has the carbon to. So, I suggest that you just let Paul order these and see what he finds. I want the Clemmons and Gemberling stuff for my records, since the price is low.

Enclosed is a copy of Don Olson's last letter to me for you to keep. It has some interesting comments on the Alvarez correspondence which I sent him copies of since that is his dissertation topic.

Well, I've got to go now. Take it easy. I am still excited over how cornered Lifton seems to be, and how careless he was in giving me so much ammo in his last letter. Best wishes.

Gary

PS: Bud's note to me of June 22: Dear Gary: Many thanks for your letter--The trip was most successful--Saw almost everyone on my list. I didn't see Penn Jones; he was away from Texas. To my surprise, Fred Newcomb was most cordial and helpful--We have a good working relationship now, I believe.