6/9/69

Dear Gary,

Your letter of 6/6 with the Edelman memo and letter to Paul arrived this a.m, as did the copies of the Sirhan clippings, which I look forward to reading. Many thanks for both. Some of the headlines fascinate.

National Insider: You'll get nothing more from them but a waste of time. They should have what you suspect. Edelman: I think it highly unlikely there is anything wrong there. Just recently the papers darry stories on the planned memorial. Grading alone is enough to foreclose earlier use. That is by no means a level area. It is very hilly. Paul may be interested in deM because deM is a liberal and Paul thinks he may be Israeli intelligence.

There are certain things that are quite clear to me about when I saw Garrison's copy of the Z film. One is the presence of Jones Harris. I recall only one time I saw much of him in N.O., and that was in early April, 1968. He was there with a boxer in whom he has an interest, who boxed that Saturday night. By accident we were both in the same motel. I knew of his presence when he phoned me Sunday to ask me to get together with him that night. He goes to bed too early. I got him up next a.m., a Monday and, I believe, my birthday, we walked to the office together and talked aboutxthose things I have already reported to you, and in the office Louis showed us the film together. Now Jones spotted, or said he did, what I did not, a few missing frames at the very beginning. I noticed what to me were the abrupt changes in color I did tell you about. Jones and I both said, right or wrong, that this film had been specially prepared to trap JG, as who should know how to better than LIFE, which had been inside for so long?

You are also right on Mark. That was right after his LAFree Press story appeared, in which he inflated the incompetent Gary Sanders, who was no good even as an apprentice cop, into an "engineer", as though engineering were a founding for photo analysis. We undoubtedly did discuss this verbally, but I am certain I wrote you and I'd suggest you check beginning after 4/8/68. Lifton is raving because he is sick and frustrated and because at every turn I have boxed him. As I have made clear, I think it is wrong to have anything to do with those sick people. However, I also think that you should decide for yourself what you believe to be right, and that you certainly are not obliged to agree with me. We all grow a little from each mistake we make anyway. There, with strict restrictions, I herewith lend you something for your project of showing Lifton up as the liar he is (wondering, as I do, whether another liar will be sympathetic or unsympathetic). Lifton has been inventing and spreading libels about me, some of which you know. You undoubtedly have his vilification about the cancelled Reseda debate with Liebeler. Much of this was by phone. Understandably, they had set a specific date. I do not now recall, but I think it likely I told them I coould make it earlier and they said they had a schedule to fit and they had to have that certain date. In any event, as you know, it is not porfitable to fly accross the country and backf for an unpaid appearance. Having just then returned, I certainly had no need for being in Calif. again. Especially with Lil's ankle in a cast and not being able to leave her alone (the only other appearance I kept in that interval included a fee for a sitter, for she could not be left alone). Lifton says all sorts of things these letter prove to be false, like I was trying something phoned (note I asked that they arrange for the ticket, not send me the cash), that I wanted cab fare (the opposite is true and I specify). I said all I wanted is much less than the minimum: actual transportation andonly part of that, for the rest I anticipated involved no cash cost (like meeting me at the LA airport). No food item, no housing, no other expenses, not even tips. And, despite Lifton's lies, I waived any honorarium if Liebeler would. If there was a cost for honorarium, I am the one person not responsiblex for that cost. Now the restriction; you are

not to copy and send copies. Instead, you may quote what you consider you should. You have Lifton's original mailings on this. You might recall to Fred that Marilyn answered the phone when Lifton called me there to tell me the debate had been cancelled (do not nudge him about that crap about being afraid to leave her alone with me, but this was right before I left and we were alone). They should also recall our wonder that Lifton knew how to reach me, because we were keeping it secret for some reason that struck Burton as necessary.

The real truth about my trips to California, Gary, is this: after applying the honoraria, few and skimpy as they were, when there were any at all, to the actual transportation cost, which in each case I was guaranteed, I am out of pocket more than a thousand dollars, despite the kindnesses of the various people who house, often fed and often transported me (like the Newcombs, who provided what they could). In not a single case did any of the people out there arrange a decent appearance, despite the interest in the subject, and I believe that in all the many, many speeches I made, the total of what they got is about half what you got for me, apologizing for the fee for that single speech. I worked for and with those people, promoted them, there and elsewhere (doubling the San Diego list at one swoop, they told me), trying my best to keep them out of the forseeable (and predicted) trouble. Neither Burton nor Hal could keep up with the pace I kept, and my age equals theirs combined, and I began pooped in each case. I really worked; I did everything they asked; I left everything up to them, carte blanche, and never cancelled or griped about a single arrangement (and you should see how I slept sometimes). On several occasions I didn't even get in bed. Hal will tell you I didn't average more than 2-3 hours sleep, and it was not social, for there were, in all my many trips, only these social arrangements: once Maggie had Steve and two boys from the committee there to meet me (a sandwich); George Abbot had a nice little buffet the first night of my two speaking nights there and after the second Prescott Nichols had a small a party at his place, all strangers (and to help build their committee). If there were any others, I do not recall them. Now this is not a complaint, for I live this way, as you know, and demanded and expected nothing else. But need I tell you that it is neither normal or what these same people did for Lane, for example, or Garrison, or almost anyone else? Worse, on the last trip, I got to LA and there had been no arrangements of any kind made. Burton merely lied about everytjing, dumping it on Charlie Brown at the last minute, and way after dark I arrenged to sleep on her couch, for he hadn't even found a pad. He took me to supper, apologizing that there was no money to treat me, and I said okay, lets go to a cheap place, because I was both broke and ill. So, he took me to a place he liked, with his kind of atmosphere, and I had a hamburger- for $2.75! He still owes me money for books, Hal will tell you that they have repaid little of the cost of my 1966 trip, San Diego has not paid the cost of my last trip (they promised me another $100 on it after the first of this year but it hasn't yet arrived), and Jonn messed into the 2/68 trip and I wound up stuck for 100% of that, not getting a single cent back. This is the one Lifton makes cracks about, the time I stayed with Fred. Hell, rather than the way Lifton puts it, none of those people ever took the time, when I did have a little free time, even to take me sightseeing. Abbott wanted to and he tried real hard-did take me to Mexico for less than an hour so I could cross the border, etc. Does this sound like what Lifton says? But in any event, I do not want them to get in a position to torture this Reseda file, as they can. This is not frivolous, for "Counterplot" has a garbled version of the memo Fred for no good reason and knowing full well he shouldn't gave Lifton. The garbled version is in quotes, too, and with Fred's name attached. I am not saying he did it; I am saying it happened.

You see what I mean when I say that fooling with these sick people at all takes more time than their best effort can replace with anything of use? But, you do your thing, for that is the way it should be.

Wjat kind of Z discoveries am I accused of stealing from Fred? And how am I supposed to know of them or what they are? May I also suggest to you that I told those people out there what I observed in the JG Z version, so if there are ~~legitimate~~ legitimate discovaries (of which I am by no means persuaded) might I not make claim to them (which I do not)? I told them both in writing and by phone, and more than just Burton, probably also Fred, and I know the media friends. Fred should know that his idol wouldn't even write a letter of thanks to the photog when Fred asked me and I asked-Jim! I never told Fred this because I didn't want to hurt him.

As to my stealing from Fred, look at the letter I sent you, to him, misdated 1/11/68 when it should have been 69. On 9/23/68 I sent him what I had learned of the figure in the rifle picture (and also earlier, I'm wroking backward in that file). He (9/18) couldn't see it (!).May 8 he told me Lifton told him that "he (Lifton) had first arranged for Kerry to testify before the grand jury..." Le his ask Lifton for a copy of the Thornley affidavit he birthed and compare that with "Counterplot".Especially the date and content of the affidavit. Maybe you'd like to remind him of the enclosed undated note he wrote on the back of a copy of a letter from Thornley's layer to him, 5/68, about Lifton and Fred's then attitude to me, well after I had been there. No restrictions. I'm sending him my pictures and I'm stealing from him?In response to his undated letter enclosed (and read carefully, including for signs of the state of his knowledge (Stemmond), I did tell him 5/10/68, clearly before he had seen Z, that I had seen JG's and "it is not a print from the original, is not good and clear, is not even complete." And note I offered to work for him on this! Now his reference to credit on the Ray-Galt pictures itto my reporting to him 5/3 what I had tried to do with it in his name (as you may recall I did in Minneapolis right afterward). Rather than stealing credit, I volunteered it, without being asked. You should hear Lane's defense of stealing when others did steal Fred's work here and I exposed it on TV. I have it taped. More on my "stealing" from him: I borrowed the Bond pictures for him. His undated acknowledgement enclosed. I loaned him my rifle and it took a year (not all his fault) to get it back. More "stealing"? That slowed down the work you are familiar with quite a bit. More on my stealing Z stuff from him is the attached excerpt (saving costly paper-you can have the whole thing if you want) from his undated, about 4/1/68,"Hey! Great! Your work with Z335-343." (I told him 3/29.) 3/26 he informed me he had "already worked out where in Zap. movie Willis took #5...had to be taken at Zap 205". !!!!! He then didn't know Clint Hill's name but had read WWII! And it is at 205 that W disappears, having taken the camera down from his eye earlier. Even on spotting Rose (his undated to which I replied 3/28, says Jaffe had brought Rose there, that he had the shots I had gotten from Larry Howard, and "I didn't spot him until after your letter mentioned this." And on 3/22/ about the Thornley picture,"first, what is your opinion and second, my apologies for not being more clear. I did not intend a bearded Oswald. I meant how much could Thornley have looked like the customarily neat Oswald?" This should end all crap about the purpose of that picture makeup. On 3/19 I pointed out Rose's resemblance to "Wilson", said "Jaffe was to try and get a contemporaneous peiture nut hasn't." Here I asked him for tracings of Willis beginning in Z199 "to show the motions of his feet and arms to show he has taken his picture", which he neither did not understood. At this pojt in the file is reflection of his failure with Dean, who I turned over to him, with his complete file (none of which we thereafter got). He was flabbergasted at what I did, right in front of him, in his own home, then personally used it up. Throughout all of this you will find, if you look at the entire file, my repeated concern that he get credit for what he did and suggestions on how to keep those who were taking it from doing that. Me steal from him? He has these letters and should know better. His first letter to me is dated 2/27/68, right after I left. Like the rest, it is contrary to the recent addition to his complaints about his wife. However, again on stealing and who is doing what with

whose ideas and meterial, I include his handlettered PS, which shows that I not only interested him in the 133A and B work but gave him my pictures. He did this work for me, though now he forgets it. I asked it and made it possible and gave him the wherewithal, and I do not say this to make an issue of it, for I really do not care. My 3/2 response refers to out working as a "team" on this. I wrote his artist friend Watson 3/21, sent Fred a copy with a p.s. with, among other things, suggestions on Altgens, an effort to get his work on Willis 5 published, Odum 1/CE237, Harry Dean, etc. Matter of fact, these earlier letters are address to both of them.

In thepast, when you wrote me what they were up to, I'd often said, "you s should see the file". Now that there is no indication you'll be coming here this summer, though we wish you would, I've taken the time to give you a fair sample. The answer you want for Lifton is specific and in several areas repeated, at least three or four. As you can see, I'M giving him stuff, borrowing things for him, helping him in every way possible, and especially on the point of "steeling", warning him that it being done to him, telling him how to avoid it, asking him to funnel to N.O. through me so I can protect him and spot any errors, etc. Now all of this could not have been personally rewarding, was designed for his good and protection, and is the opposite of Lifton's accusation. However, I ask you to consider what this means about Fred and Merlyn, not just Lifton. You see, Fred has my letters and he wrote his, so he also knows all these things. Do you think this files shows him to be honest? Can he be any better than very foregtful? Can he be trusted?

I do hope we can now avoid added expenditure of this kind of time. However, I do want to know whatever you learn, for this may not be just nutty.

Specter: clipping enclosed.

Kilgallen: I think peripheral. It is I who gave this to Penn. I got it from her makeup man when he made me up for the Alan Burke show, before Minority Report. But if he does work on it, I think most important are the missing notes.

Your reference to your battle with the neighbors apparently refers to the investigation which you reported you'd heard of and nothing else. If you explained it, I never got that letter.

I think that except for an historic record and anything it would reveal of those responsible for the diversion any time on Crisman is wasted. But, thesepeople have never done anything worthwhile, so they waste nothing.

When did Bud tell Rennar what you report? After I had exposed Turner and Boxley? I am not as familiar with the file you refer to as I should be. I got it, and because I did not consider myself dispassionate (and also because I wanted to do the analysis of Boxley's work that Vince found so brilliant, I gave it to him to copy and read. I had no need to afterward, as you know. But it is my recollection that the original lead on Bradley came from a former political friend who tangled with him in court, that both T and B were in it in Calif from the first, together. I have no idea what to ask Bradley, for I would ask him nothing, considering it a waste of time, therefore I never gave this any thought. Again for the historical record (and perhaps Penn, if you want to fool with that), where he was in the summer of 62, at the time Perrin died. He can supply proof if he was abroad, which is Art K's information. And what he knows of those who might have had ulterior purposes in fingering him. My recollection of the memos may not be accurate, for I just skimmed some o them before giving it to Vince. When above is very important. Let me know as soon as you can. Was it before this exposure or after? I agree that Bradley could be a good source on the radical right, but I also think he is canny. Penabaz, for one; Bonguier. Sorry to inflict typos on you.

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

June 6, 1969

Dear Harold,

Not much has happened recently. I got a return of my letter to the National Insider with the last papagraph circled and a handwritten note: "answer is still the same--for the 3rd time--we don't have any--Roland Forte." I am quite anry about this and would appreciate ideas as to where to go from here. It is hard for me to believe that they have no# files of either back issues (like an archives) or of photos they have published. I just refuse to believe that even a crap sheet like that would not keep file copies of at least the photos. This guy Forte, however, seems useless. Who should I try to approach--the publisher? His replies, as you know, have been totally unresponsive to my requests for a copy of the photo in their files. This could be important--one never knows. She is described as a "mystery woman seen in Mexico City with Oswald."

Enclosed is a letter to Paul Rothermel. I sent him a big pile of things, hoping to get him thinking about some of these people, and perhaps supplying some information.

Also enclosed is a short memo which has nothing of importance, but which sets the record straight in one area. It is always good to have negative reports as well as positive ones, if for no other reason than to help rule things out and then be able to focus on important things.

When did you first see Garrison's copy of the Z film? I remember you mentioning to me that there were color changes in it and that you suspected that LIFE had spliced several parts of different copies of the film together and given Jim a rotten version of the film At the time, you make a comment about the fact that the N.O. people hadn't even realized the low quality of the merchandise they had been given. A little later, when telling me about how Mark had added to the public record proof that Jim had violated the agreement with LIFE by saying that he had seen the film and saying that it was clear, he had badly misdescribed the film and said that it was a good copy. Did you tell me about this last summer, last Christmas, or in a phone conversation? Do you remember when? Also, I thought that you wrote me about this in a letter besides telling me. Do you have any idea when this could have been. Did Matt see or observe any of these things, or did anyone else?

The reason I have posed the above questions concerns a recent dispute. In a letter to Fred at some time or another when we were discussing the Farewell America copy of the Z film and its possible source, I noted that it should be easy to tell if it were Garrison's since you had spotted ##########color changes in it and suspected that LIFE had made a composite film for Jim. Dave Lifton, who at present is raving to an intolerable degree, decided that I was repeating a lie of yours which was fabricated after you hearing about Fred's "discoveries" from me, in order to enable you to take credit for things. Besides the fact that this is craziness and exaggeration of psychotic proportions, it is patently false in its initial proposition anyway. I would like to be able to lay this out clearly for Fred and get him to further dissociate from Dave by giving a complete expanation of when you saw the film, when you told me about it, etc. I hoped to do this easily by locating a letter you, I am certain, wrote me about it, but going through your letters during late 1968 and early 1969 (not an easy task--you sent me much info and long letters) I was unable to find it. Instead, therefore, I would like to just given an explanation time-wise as to when you found out, when you saw the film, and approximately when you told me. Dave has really gone out on a limb on this one and has staked his own reputation against yours on it, and I would like to dis-

credit him in front of Fred in a clear cut fashion. I know that you feel that it would be best to dissociate from Fred as well as Dave, but Fred does much work, and has the technical skills to do much work and apparently the time also. Some of his work, whether he uses it correctly or not (i.e. PROBE) is very useful, both in terms of what he discovers, and more important, what he shows and proves (ie. 133 A and B in slide form are excellent for public appearances and TV and convincing skeptics). Dave has already hurt his case against you and me badly by charging that I let Fred know about there having been an Army Intelligence man in the TSBD, and then asked if I had also violated confidence and told you, and if you would claim credit! I ripped him to pieces for that by pointing out that I probably found the Powell reports before he did, both Sprague and I have been investigating and trying to locate Powell, I have it on a slide and have used it publicly for at least two years in that form, and even Tink printed the initial SS report in the appendix to his book (for another reason). Dave's claim that he told me about an Army Intelligence man (no name given, but it was Powell he meant) in the TSBD on the phone and then I broached confidence was out of hand. So what he had to do was to withdraw and throw everything into the color change thing which even if he was correct he had to blow way out of proportion. So, I hope that you will have time to jot down when you saw Garrison's film version, and about when you might have told me about it. Fred's beginning to realize a few things about Dave, and also I think that I am much more rational than he is, and the final coup would be to shoot Dave down on this.

My parents wrote that they have seen nothing about any lawsuit against Spector. Can you give more exact details as to the time. I will write Vince about it.

I have a guy who I think is going to begin looking into the Killgallen murder soon and get the news accounts, plus try to see what else he can find out. He is interested in it, will be in NY City, and doesn't know the case well enough to do too much else. Besides, it is sometimes better to give someone who might get more deeply involved in investigating something he like to do first.

It looks like we won our little battle with the neighbors. Based on my arguments and letter, they have dropped the charges, and in fact, decided that charges based on an incident related to the charges of public nuisance concerning someone riding a motorcycle on the sidewalk will be dropped, and think that the neighbors are the public nuisance, not us or the other students! Things are a good deal quieter now.

I am getting the guys in Seattle to put together a Crisman memo so that well will have a record of all that tripe.

I got a bizarre post card from Bud from Dallas, showing a picture of the wax museum statues of LBJ taking the oath of office. It reads: "Great spot for a parade." George Rennar of the Washington State CCI told me that Bud swore up and down to him that he believes that Lawrence, CRisman, Bradley, etc. are important in the assassination. He also said that Boxley was OK which is something new for me. Naturally, Turner is 100% OK. The Boxley thing is surprising to me at least.

If you were going to interview Bradley, what would you ask him? In strictest confidence I tell you that I know someone who is able to but who has requested that his identity or his contacts with Bradley be concealed. He has run out of questions. This would provide info as well as provide at least a weak test for Bradley. Personally, of course, I assume that Bradley is probably a Turner-Boxley frameup, and the memos Vince got from the staff in NO suggest it strongly. But he could be the source of valuble info on the right wing.

Well, I'd better go now. Best wishes.

Gary

PS. I wrote Paul for CD 1330 on Kara Patnitski