4/11/69

Dear Gary,

Thanks for your letter of 4/9 w enclosures. Also heard from Paul today.

I've heard nothing from Urr for months. He wrote me after Trent was there, saying he had given him 20mpounds of clippings for all of us to use, and Trent has also made no mention. Whatever the material Bud returned, I've heard nothing....Bud did see Hanes. He got snowed. I tried to get Bud to arrange a competent, honest Memphis lawyer, with himself as co-counsel. I have begun to ntoice he does not consult. We'll tange, meeting the requirements... I've had enough of that.

On the Sirhan testimony: we are in accord. Thought I'd said that could be handled briefly. I said it all in the original text: no conspiracy had been ordained, so none was investigated. I wanted someone to quote or some expert opinion to paraphrase, not to present myself as an expert saying that psychaitry can be an art as well as a science (you misunderstood) and that such performances put the science and public trust in it back for years.

I'd like to see Lillian and Fred's stuff but I have not the time, cannot afford to phone her, and find them both as undependable as they are sincere. I'd be inclined to use their sources, not their interpretations or conclusions. But I doubt if I'd add anything on that anyway. I want all the space for Ray, where I'll have more than I have room for-have already. I hope your mind blew when you got the judge's letter!

On Reed: I still recommend writing when you can. He'll know of your interest, know you regard it as important that he not wait, and you'll get him to thinking, which is important, for he has had no reason to make notes or anything like that. This is independent of what he has on film.

I recommend against your going to Dallas this summer. The most important work is still in DC, at the Archives. After we thoroughly ransack that is the time to go to Dallas again, save for specific, immediate objectives. Paul has developed a real liking for you, by the way. He wrote a very nice letter to me. Hope you do not mind the unsolicited advice. If I have not sent you a copy of a letter to Willis soon, jog me on it. He has already promised me access. I was to have got them in N.O., dyring the trial.

Lifton: if he didn t get shaken up when I had a two-hour conversation with him in LA (phone) end 10/68, he'll never shake. This, I believe, is what has subdued him more than anything else. When you are here again and have time to hear it you'll understand. I know he tapes everything, so I did. He has not sent what he promised to and I do not really care. I do not trust him at all. I'd like to see the KT article some time. No urgency, no real importance. Merely to have the most complete file possible. And to know what he said.

You did send me a copy of that Penn letter, but nothing else. Waste time to phone Barbara. And money.

I will not dispute with you about Fred. If he has matured and improved, fine. I hope so. It will require more than that. For example, after what Kifton did he still associates? But on Z, it is not possible to make any analysis of his beliefs or what he thinks are his findings by comparison with the Farewell copy.

I would be so happy if his stuff proves out. Cannot some of it be done with 885? Splices must show there for each individual print has the connection between adjoining frames. It is best done on the Archives slides. If he can get anyone to do it, they can borrow my editor. However, you recall you had a good viewing with me. You saw no sign of any splicing others than at 210. Id like to see his 133 A and B work. He didn t see the woman in the background when I called it to his attention...A passenger train rules out his theory entirely. I know there was one passing through. I have it in the first book. He requires two freight cars parked behind the pergola for his theory, as he explaijed it to me. Nor does the Sprague theory (collapsed long ago save for the hot air pumped in) help him, even if it were fact. If it is later that day it also is without meaning. The question is not simply of the presence of a train, but of when, what kind, making what possible- and impossible.

In confidence, the original of the Z film stayed in Dallas for a long time, according to Z, who told me he showed it time after time after time, to many people. If it didn't, then one of the original copies did. Either way, after so many people saw it, there was great hazard in any substantive changes. Perhaps it happened. Because this could not possibly have been done immediately, at the plant, doing what Fred suggests requires an enormous conspiracy. I just do not go for it. Remember also the film was shown the media, immediately, Remember Rather's broadcast of his recollections of what it shows? There is still the possibility of a clandestine copy at the plant....Now the FBI was not at the plant (only Sorrels of the government people) and the Willises, Z and Reporter McCormick were with him. He was not in the lab, from Willis' letter to me (PW). He had no basis for any editing then. At that time copies started getting separated. One left for DC that night (PW). Life rushed a copy out, stopping in Chicago for a black and white print. Whether Shaneyfelt numbered the frames from the original I do not recall, but I doubt there will be any conflict in numbers....I agree I not only showed you those spots in the film, I wrote and published. This is what turned Fred on. He told me that. I am unpersuaded he has the answer, that is all. From what I have seen of his 133A and B he has missed the most solid scientific evidence. And it is pretty obvious. He is too conspiracy-minded and confabulates. This does not at all mean none of his work is good. Some I have seen on 133A & B is fine. It does mean he requires more checking, more authenticating, than anyone else. What experts will he consult who know enough about the subject? Unless he has gross and overwhelming evidence of splicing, which I doubt, this will be required for proper analysis. Ray has wonderful experts on Moorman and nobody believes it....On Willis, perhaps I can put it this wey: he originally convinced me he had proved what I suggested. I am not now convinced, for I've had time to do some of my own checking of his work. I'll show you when you are here. One of the things is the mullions.

We agree on Bud and the others. I am unaware of the screwup with Murr and Bernabei. I am very fond of Bernabei, full of respect for him. And he is solid on the rifle and ammo, I think. And Frazier. However, not for discussion with anyone, he is the one who breached my confidence on the destruction, one of the very hottest things I have and am holding for very special reasons. Not only to Sylvia, who would likely have kept my secret, but much worse, with Turner. I have not decided whether to confront him on it. He and you and Paul were the only ones I told. You and Paul said nothing. There were witnesses when he told Turner. It may be nothing but bad judgement, but need I care <u>how</u> the road to hell is paved?

This does not change my appraisal. It troubles deeply, though. Perhaps you better understand my apprehensions about sharing with everyone.

I have taken from the files a complete 544 set save one thing I'll include when I find it. I'll ggt it out in the next few days. You can keep the Xeroxes of the documents. I an sending the originals of the two reports, those we pasted to get them on one sheet, thinking they maye be a little clearer. The angle picture of the building is an extra, You may keep it if you'd like. It is the one taken from Lafayette Park, a little overexposed. What I seek I cannot find by artificial light. It is a map of the area. I am including the Jones stuff, too. Do not mention the identification I got from him and Myra. However, if youxwant to say that Newman told me Banister personally arranged for the space for the CRC, okay. If you want to say that Bertes personally confirmed to me that he flew planes in the Congo in 1965, that also is okay. I learned this from Cubans.

On the destruction, youxxpresume correctly. I then tried to trace it, getting a letter from the Archives saying there was no such transcript. Then, remember, when I asked you and Hal to check CAI-FBI, you got me some of the missing links. I have it now from two sources. They check each other perfectly. There definitely was the meeting Ford reports, when and where, etc. It was touched on again 1/27 That is withheld. Please say nothing. It is in this connection I want the Goulden writing. I even have a receipt for the destruction, complete with when, where and how destroyed, and by whom. Bud got me the stuff from the reporter(s files. I did not want to ask him (I knew him well 30 years ago) for personal reasons. But that is mere confirmation of what I already had, from the official stuff. They do not understand what is there or it would not be.

Check on Sylvia. This has been my analysis since 10/67, when, in milder form, I began giving it to her. She did not welcome it. It is more than that, thought. Her sex and her job freeze her to the past and deny her whatkshe otherwise could and would do, And check on the separation of the Jaffes.

Again unsolicited advicek if you have a choice on your internship, take it where it will do you more professional good. I suspect that is Mayo. I am confident that whether it is or not it will mean more, including in applications, etc. The solical and cultural deprivations will be minor and will give you time you will use well for other things. Lets talks about the disturbed kids when we are together. It had to do with reaching them through the unusuals of life, like hatching eggs, baby chicks and ducks, tame fowl, etc.

Paul is negative on Mark Holean. I hope you are not. Could be important.

If you have good pictures, charts of King murder scene, first pictures taken on, of and from balcony, I'd like to borrow. I was then in NO and have inadequacies. I have also lost the first LIFE story, which is important to compare with the Lyles tape, as you may remember. No copy COUP yet...I sent judge's letter to you and Paul alone....Note your Vince comments without disagreement but do not regard it as adequate explanation. He has abdicated and worse, for whatever reason, good, bad, medical, personal, and has done serious harm besides, esp. in N.O...Bud says youand he have arranged picture exhhanges. You should see his, for he copied much here....If there is anything else I have you want, ask...Please be careful with some of those you trust and I do not. Do not tell them anything it would hurt everyone to know, for everyone might wind up knowing it. Let my burn suffice to inform your nerves. You have not yet found my judgements badly wrong, have you? Have a good trip, business and pleasure. I wish I could show Edwards what I sent you marked "strictest confidence" today!

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

April 9, 1969

Dear Harold,

Thanks for all of the stuff. Thank God we have you around to keep the public record goigg on this thing. You are the only one in the world who is doing this. True, Paul, myseèf, and several others occasionally do so on an individual item, but you somehow manage to do this in all areas of the case.

Enclosed is the copy of your letter to Russ which you wanted mailed back. In regard to the psychiatric testimony at the Sirhan trial, neither myself or any of my colleagues is following it closely because it is do disgusting. Your point about psychiatry being an art is somewhat correct, but there are some very objective items which can help evaluate mental status. The lawyer has the function of keeping the psychologist honest by challenging everything he says--a good lawyer will even ask you to define psychology. I know this all to well since I will be an expert witness in a mock trial in the law school on May 3. But, there are things more important and more objective than our opinions about the psycholggist overstepping his limits, and they are things like the playing of the hypnosis tapes of Sirhan on TV, the use of hypnosis to help hang Sirhan with no complaint by the press (after they went beserk over the hypnosis session of Russo's), etc. I would strongly advise against going into the straight psychological stuff because it would needlessly lengthen your book. Perhaps you could mention the fact that many psychologists and psychiatrists have be disturbed by the low quality of such testimony, but that you have no time to discuss it for reasons of length. Newsweek, in a recent issue, raised some serious questions about it which could give some ideas or brief material. More important, do you have the stuff that Fred and Lillian did on the guy who worked in the kitchen, who may be on the SS# PRS list, whose car# keys were in Sirhan's pocket, and whose car was out in the alley? Remember the testimony at the trial about Sirhan saying that it would be easy to do because he knew a guy in the kitchen. What more do you need? If you don't have it, I suggest writing or phoning Lillian Castellano, asking for a set of the stuff, and asking for permission to use it. I doubt if Fred would give you permission to use it, but she would. It is primarily her work anyway. I thought I mentioned it or sent you some before, but things have been so confused I might have forgotten. Lillian is bad about writing so if you are interested a call would be well worth the money. With the time change you could call her after 12PM your time and be reaching her in the middle of the evening.

On Reed, I have no way of contacting him, except by sending to the Canal Zone address and having the stuff forwarded, but he is on tour and it wouldn't reach him for months. I might do better not pushing him. His eyewitness account is probably not as important as the photos, since he was outside and across the street, from the photos. I will mention it in my letter, however, and suggest that it might be good for him to write it down.

If and when I go to Dallas this summer I will ask Willis for prints or slides. He doesn't seem to be interested in making a set up though. Perhaps you could be able to convince him since you have had contacts with him. If you fail, then I will try the student approach this summer.

On my Barbara Reid letter, I sent you a copy to given you the same KT-Lifton info I was giving her. All I know on Billings was a short sentence or two on the phone. I am shaking Dave a bit on KT, but don't know what the final result will be. He is not as confident as before as you note. As far a circulated items, all I have is the Open City Stuff and all of that which you also have. He just sent me an argicle KT

wrote which challenges Lane on the story of the emissaries, and is an attack on Mark. I sounds like Sylvia wrote it and is very much her style, and probably represents his using things she told him almost verbatim. Fred told me that Dave is very cautious with me because he knows I know enough about the volumes plus the archives to spot his work and possibly guess some original things he knows--the same goes, I guess for the KT stuff, although even under duress, all that has come out from Dave when he is excited is the Billings reference and his own opinion and his own claim to have been originally angry and excited about KT and his obvious suspicious activities like the Oswald book.

I am certain that I sent a copy of the Penn Letter to you. It would have been months ago. Penn mentioned, in the letter, knowing a Wm W. Wood who was CIA, and asked if I was confusing them. He ended the letter with: "Gary, let's stop kidding each other. WE both know what is bothering you." Then I wrote back a letter suggesting that if he would like a bit of candor in our correspondence, that he could start by indicating what it is that "we both know is bothering me." I suspected, at the time, that Boxley told him I was an agent, and what was bothering me was that Boxley was still able to conduct his investigations which were ripping the government apart. If Barbara doesn't answer, I may eventually spend a few dollars and call her and tape it.

I'm afraid that I can answer only a few questions about the office, and none of the ones you need answered. Vince is the only possible source for such info. I will try a few of them on him, cautiously. Jaffe's story about Ivon beating him up, although possibly exaggerated, is apparently true according to Vince. Ivon was pissed off at Jaffe's pretences at paranoia which were bringing out Jim's paranoia, and grabbed him and roughed him up, demanding to know why he was doing it. Jaffe, according to Ivon (via Vince), said that he was doing it to build himself up in Jim's eyes.

On Vince and Coup, his estimation of the book went down as he drove home with Chris. This is because of his view that we have solved the case and his interest in the big things, and theorizing. Vince still views it as your best and most important book but doesn't think that there will be a market for it in terms of getting it published. Vince, with whom I have had similar experiences, despite my close friendship with he and Livy, unfortunately, has a life style which leads to rarely coming through with things without some prodding. Partly this is due to his 8 hour day as a labor arbiter followed by many long evenings of weekends of law practice, plus thousands of people who drop by and make his home a focal spot of political discussion. His files are a mess and he often loses track of things, including books.

I too am disgusted with the failure of the blacks. This is nothing new. If you get a copy, send C/O Mr. George Schuler, 4 Candlewyck Drive, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850. I will be able to do a pretty good job with the Miami tape and Milteer documents which I always use with blacks to plug your work, and link the two assassinations. You know what else I use--a slide of Huie's conclusions (which he now disowns) from the second LOOK article. They are pretty good.

On my LNS friend, I will try to find time to write him. Bear in mind that there could be interdiction of letters there. He has not answered me either, which is unusual for him.

On Fred and the Z film. From what I have heard from many sources, both accounts are, of course biased. The final version is more like Fred's than Ray's, but bear in mind that Ray gave me an account of it much morelike Fred's than he and Vince tell others. Fred saw the chance to get the film, called Ray (although almost called Perry Adams), Ray and Letha took the film, the copy came and Fred had to go to the station, but didn't sign a complaint and the matter was dropped and Ray had the film. Both parties took risks, and both thought up the idea, and both did the right thing. Ray doesn't owe the film to Fred, but certainly does not have exclusive rights to it. Fred should have the opportunity to document his work so he can have it checked. Ray should make good on his promise to make copies available to the critics. So far, he has done nothing but promise.

On the 133A and B thing, he has a set of 30 or so slides, for $6, which lay it out nicely and point out a number of things. The only thing I saw which he didn't

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

was that the photo with the rifle in the right hand has very sloppy work around the neck, which I have in blowups, which emphasizes the doctoring. In addition, I add that not only did LIFE doctor, but so did AP, Paris Match, etc., and have a slide of that of my own.

The existance of the train is proven by Itek in their analysis, and it shows on the Bond and Cancellare photos, and probably on Betzner 3 also. It is clearly there and is a passenger train. An aerial view that afternoon shows it behind the TSBD. A photo of the knoll after the shots (minutes) shows no train but does not appear to have been doctored. This work is not highly speculative, except for any conclusions drawn about the use of the train, and seems very solid. There is no question in my mind that the train was there--### none whatsoever.

On the Z film stuff, bear in mind that there was no reason anyone outside of LIFE or the government would ever be able to see it, since one needs to be able to examine the original film or a copy of it to spot it. That is why no one, although everyone has noticed that there seems to be film missing due to the jumping of the car, has seen the splices. Who could know that we might one day have a copy of the film. Also, what in the hell could we claim was removed up on Elm Street? The latter is the biggest problem If the splices are there, it can be easily checked and verified or disconfirmed by an expert. But bear in mind that we have every reason to believe they are just from viewing the film. In regard to the other questions you raised, besides the fact that we haven't seen all of the copies of the film, bear in mind that what is hypothesized is that they were edited prior to anyone getting a copy--in other words, the first copies made were fixed (meaning the first copies to get out of the lab). ## Since the FBI numbered the frames according ### to the original in LIFE's possession, even that must have the splices. The latter is the key to the whole business--the splices are self-authenticating according to the way the numbering was done. So again, I can not defend and do not want to defend Fred's work on this, but only say that we have to get the documentation (from Ray's film) and have it checked. I would be quite surprised if Fred is wrong only because of what we all know about the Z film and the unusual jumps the car takes. Again, remember that you took great care to point out the exact two spots in the film where this happens on on which Fred's research is based when Chris, Vince, you, and I were in the Archives. I likewise agree about the danger of such work if unchecked, and Fred has no intention of using it until he has a stack of experts who will lend their opinions and names. I agree on Willis also, that Fred only proves what you suggested. All I can say on Willis is that you would have to see about 60 slides of the 75 to have it illustrated but that it is well done, carefully mapped out with aerial plat maps, the Itek analysis, blowups, comparisons, etc.

Thanks much for taking the time and patience to spell out about Bud's paying for your way to N.O. This makes a great deal of difference. Unfortunately, however, although now I see why you feel that Bud is very likely not on the other side, we are faced with the irresponsibility and carelessness and publicity seeking of the CIIA. Sprague and Turner are key figures in the work and press releases, as is Trenk Gough who I don't know and for some reason am quite worried about due to the things he did for and with Sprague and the screwups with Bernabei and Gary Murr. It's funny, but just a short explanation of the kind you offered makes the whole thing a bit different. I guess he's just someone with bad judgment, as Sprague could well be. But, we are still stuck with these guys in the public eye, claiming to represent the independents, and doing things which could be ruinous and are very Garrisonian, without Garrison.

I would greatly appreciate the Wall reports and 544 camp photos. My new photo helper can make slides as cheaply as duplicates, and get discounts on duplicates, so

it would still be better for me to do them myself father than getting them from Bud. I will, by the way, be putting your books on slides to introduce this stuff. The best way to plug a book and not have people forget it is the same as the best way to present the case and have it burned into people's minds--slides. ### Photos are necesarry for press conferences and talks with reporters or congressmen when no projector is there, but nothing beats slides.

No rush on the Thornley stuff.

On the destruction, I assume that you spotted it due to Ford's book's mention of a session of the 22nd. It is really significant if you have confirmation from the court reporters files. I had always assumed that it might have been a printing error or an error on Ford's part. i.e. I would never want to base an argument on Ford's accuracy and secondly, a 2 is much like a 7. I think that you did, in fact, mention this to me at ### one point, but am completely certain that I never mentioned anything to Sylvia. Bear in mind, that when I stayed with you I was swamped with material. I read your three books, went through Hal's notes, some of your files, discussed many things, and all at a time when I was still recovering last summer. Last Christmas I don't think you mentioned it, but I was working day and night and was exhausted. Some of what you told me I remember only vaguely and therefore would never have occasion to repeat, not to mention the fact that I tell Sylvia little since she, very frankly, scares me. Her psychological involvment in opposition to Garrison is an obsession and is an important part of her existance. When we had a coversation of several hours last Christmas, she found that she couldn't get away by outdoing me with knowledge of the volumes and in fact got reminded that she didn't know the Archives and eventually, after having some of her bad logic fail, and being confronted by someone who agreed that Garrison was nutty and that he and Mark had done some incredible things, she ended up practically raving at one point and calling me names--like immature, etc. At that point, I was very anxious, as I aways am when I am resonating with someone who is that anxious and had to adopt a clinical mood and relate to her as someone seriously disturbed. She showed more anxiety than the average person we see, even on the inpatient wards. Generally her facade is excellent and she is OK, but I guess I inadvertently broke through the defenses. Please keep this entirely confidential. Sylvia has a fine mind, and in terms of the early work on the case, is someone to look up to, except that at times she got a bit too wrapped up in understatement. Now I still respect her intellect and knowledgeof certain areas, but in the domain of Garrison and such things she is off the deep end. Such an anxiety driven committment to a position makes me worry about her honesty and reliability in that area, and that's why I have make a number of comments suggesting that I do not trust her in that area anymore than I would trust Lifton on the Thornley thingm ###### In fact, I distrust her more than I do Lifton on Garrison, and feel that she would do worse to Garrison than Lifton ever would, despite the fact that he is angered #### and feels that Garrison framed a friend of his. I am not defending Lifton but trying to indicate, by comparison, how I feel about Sylvia.

Dan Jaffe's father is an asst. attorney general. We are mixing up Jaffes. Dan is my source on the justice dept. procedings, not Steve. The name coincidence is unfortunate. I have no dealings with Steve.

I am quite busy now trying to arrange for my internship next year. There is a chance of going to the Mayo clinic down in Rochester, but it is very socially and culturally isolated, even more so than here by a lot. I would have to find a place to live, move down there, and therefore move out of my inexpensive and comfortable living arrangments, office### up here, etc. I will probably stay in MLPS, hopefully at a private clinic where I will be guaranteed good supervision. I would be interested in hearing your views on disturbed kids. I am also doing hypnosis research. I will be at Cornell from the 16th until the morning of the 21st for sure, possibly the evening of the 15th until the 22nd, depending on many things.

Best wishes to you and your wife.

Gary