Bernabei 1

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

May 2, 1969

Dear Dick,

Thanks for the loan of the photographs and the one I can keep. I will get them copied as soon as possible and then return them to you.

When you get the chance, I would be interested in exactly how Sprague's story checks out on Galt. I have heard several versions, and just want to know the final one.

Thanks for forwarding Harold's letter to the Times. I did not have time to write one since I was in Ithaca when I saw the Times and wasn't settled back home for almost a week.

How was the guy who Cragg said identified himself as an SS agent identified? Was it by Roger or someone else. If you know any details please relate them. I am very curious about Cragg and have been for some time. Harold shares at least a few of my suspicions, and perhaps all of them on him, since he has been very curious about some of Craig's story for quite some time. (By the way, I assume that you meant Roger, not Walter. Walter doesn't know that he is a lawyer, let alone details of the crime.) I have the Enquirer story on Tague with the photos but can't make out enough detail in the photos to decide if they match. Craig is very conveniently coming up with info which backs up any new area of the case which comes up. No matter how honest he seemed at the time of the WR's publication, we can't assume that he is today. In addition, his coming through with info helped assure him a job in N.O. I do not suggest that he is lying, but people do interesting things when they care about something--i.e. the murder of the President. It is not uncommon to find "honest people" actually conjuring up memories, swearing to them, passing lie detector tests, etc, and later having it shown that the story was definitely wrong. Consciously the person was not lying. It appears, for instance, that Craig lied about his testimony having been altered, or, if it was, the original typescript was changed, since it shows none of the alterations which he described. So, despite the fact that Cragg's aunt (who raised him and who is in the Twin Cities) says that he is honest, and despite the trouble he has gotten, and despite his original testimony I worry about what he now tells Garrison. Bear in mind the incredible inaccuracies which pop into Penn Jones work, and yet he is hard working and honest.

On Frenchy and Slachter, I agree to the resemblance, but would like to try some Bertillion techniques. One thing which already makes it look less promising is that the hair seems to be of a different morphological type. Color and the slight difference in hair line don't worry me as much as the different composition which is suggested by the photos. If one examines all the right wingers whose photos are available one is bound to find similarities, but each one should be checked out. Sprague just blows them up, then swears to them, then changes them and swears to the second or third versions. By the way, one thing about Craig's SS man--if that is he then it is interesting to note certain dissimilarities between his head and that of Bradley. Also, he appears slightly taller than Bradley who is 5'9".

On the question of my suspicions, I think that there are people who are just as suspicious as I am, but who don't say so, or say so only to certain people. Vince Salandria and Ray Marcus are far more suspicious by nature than I am. I work on simple principles--I trust people until their work gives me reason not to trust them. For instance, well over a year ago I spotted things I didn't trust in Sprague's work, so I began to try to find out more about him and his work. Then Garrison flew me down to see him last March and I became

Bernabei 2

aware of the fact that Sprague's work was playing an important role in the Garrison investigation. Garrison clearly was sure of himself on Bradley largely because Sprague assured him that it was Bradley in that tramp picture, and elaborated about a triangular scar next to the left eye. On seeing the photos I was shocked, and then concerned. Since that time a number of researchers, examining Sprague's other work, have added to the picture and the picture includes a number of examples which could have ruined Garrison, and a number which added to the inaccuracies in his public statements and writings. Sprague's carelessness and irresponsibility, for whatever reason, make him a threat as long as there are peopl like Garrison who are easily led and who gan get into the public eye. On Rose I had never even heard the name until I saw it in Hal Verb's notebook, and it was a one-in-a-million piece of luck that I got the McNabb info--but, Harold had been distrustful of Rose since earlier in 1968 just based on what little he knew of his work. With the Rose thing came Turner's lie. When I began probing on Turner (starting last summer when Hal Verb thought that I was nutty to even suggest it) the inaccuracies in his work, whichwere too systematic to be just carelessness, came up. Then Rose and the lie, and then Vince remember something about the Ray-Potem affair which should have tipped him off a year before, but which he missed because he assumed that Turner was OK. Boxley was spotted by Vince, Harold, Barbara Reid, etc., besides myself who had limited contact with him and limited knowledge of him. Farewell America, likewise, stunk even if all you knew was its history and who supposedly supplied it, but Harold got onto that one very early in the piece. Why do I trust you? Very simple. First of all, Harold, whose judgment I trust, and with whom I generally agree, especially on people, said that you were fine, and that would have been good enough. Secondly, your work, what little I have seen of it, is fine. If your work had holes in it, I would point them out. If the issue was clear and not a matter of opinion, and you still insisted, in spite of Harold and myself say, and if it had the potential of hurting the critics, then I would begin to worry. In other words, I tend to trust, not distrust people, but at the first sign of big trouble I jump into action. ## Turner, Boxley, et. al. were engaging in things which could have ruined Garrison and the critics both. Sprague's work, if taken at face value and not carefully examined, can still have some of the same effect, except nothing can have the danger value as what Turner-Boxley had Garrison ready to do which Harold and Vince stopped just in time. I do not like to judge people, but any of us can judge someone's work and actions. Turner, from his public writings alone, and certainly from his Garrison memos, has been throwing in misdirection faster than most of us can dig up good info. His imagination is amazing, and his ability to type sheet after sheet of horseshit and head them with the title "memo" staggers the #imagination. So, basically, I don't think that someone has to do things to merit trust, except of course, in the case of the receipt of confidential information, but that they must not do anything to challenge trust. When Harold sends me classified stuff, I discuss it with no one, not even some of those people who he already may have sent it to. Classified stuff never enters normal## conversation anyway, since it is normally too technical. I trust that you will be applying the same standards to anything I send you. This is a quasi-scientific investigation and should therefore imply some standards of rigor. Differences# in opinion and theory are OK, as long as there aren't enough facts to make the situation clear. But when Sprague said that he was 100% certain that Frenchy was Bradley, he hadn't even checked on Bradley's physical height which shoots his 100% down to 0%.

Best of luck with your work. Ihope to see it when you are done. I now have a copy of the Muchmore film and also the Gibbons remake of the Z film. Take care.

Larry