6/6/69

Dear Gary,

I did not have time to answer your letter of 5/3 when it arrived yesterday, and this afternoon we are going to Bill's mother for dinner, one of our rare goings out, so I've gotten up early for I want to respond without rushing.

Your accumulation of data on Fernandez is interesting. The subtlty was lost on Blair, but at the time of Fernandez' attack on Batists, Batista was of the opposite political complexion, posing and acting as a progressive. There is no indication of or any reason to believe he was opposed to Batista during his second presidency, when he was fascist. Consistent with this is the invention of the Wagnerian name for the girl.

These comments on your letter to Barbara: I have heard of nothing new on Thornley from Lifton since our October conversation, when I was in Cal. Have you? Dave then promised to send me certain things he was circulating and hasn't. This is not because of his continuing confidence in them. I have never seen the indictment. If it is as represented to me, it is consistent, entirely inadequate and perhaps enough to justify an acquittal. The significant things are missing in it as probably they were before the grand jury. On what score did Billings "investigate" Thornley? Lifton told me he was working with him and Thornley. (And that Bethell helped them, too.) He agreed with me that he had nothing but Thornley's word and I gave him means of evaluating it. You did not send me a copy of the Penn letter. Is there anything in it I should see? As I've told you earlier, I've not seen his paper since the issue in which he first attack Vince, Bud and me. If she sent you a memo on the Billings interview, which I also doubt, I'd be interested if there is anything in it. Barbara never answers letter, never provides what she can and should, and has become much of an enigma to me. This is not because of her conservative connections, as with the Courtneys. Nor is it from an uncritical dedication to Jim (amounting to jealousy- once she intercepted something being sent to me, something that I particularly did not want in the office files, with Ivon's approval, on the ground that I had much more than the entire office material anyway). It can be argued that she also wasted a large amount of office time. Nothing she worked on of which I have knowledge was used in the trial. She knew Shaw well. They hated each other. The last I asked her for is a memo on Gaudet, which she promised months ago (she has not responded). She worked for the artist who worked for Gaudet's Latin American Reports. Gaudet owes him much money. When you see Coup (aside), note new material on G, new handling. She promised me a memo on an investigation she was on with Boxley, of Quigley, and it is not forthcoming. She told me other than Boxley reported in his memo. Really, Boxley accompanied her. Quigley is not rich, well connected in business.

I think Eckhoff's estimate of 20% of the material still withheld is a valuable contribution to our knowledge.

I have copied and return herewith your Bulletin 3/17/69 clipping on Bevel. That Vince, without prodding, after reading COUP would not have sent me this should be its own measure to you. But he has never sent me anything, ever, including what I've asked him for and he's promised. I do not attempt to give any reason for this or any meaning, for I cannot, But it is a fact that troubles. His declarations to us when he read the book are inconsistent with his failure to speak to Bevel then or since this interview. Again, I cannot explain his failure-

amounting to refusal-to do the obvious. He early opposed any attention to WHITEWASH, going so far as to virtually blackmail me as a condition of doing the assigned review for "Liberation" (he praised the book in private to Dellinger), whereas I had introduced his writings in competition with mine to the London "Sunday Telegraph", which was considering serialization of WW. It troubles me, Gary, that he has never lifted a finger to help me and has never, for whatever motive, missed an opportunity to hurt. Today Sylvia even helps me, as you may recall,with some of her files she knew I wented for New Orleans. I still want very much to speak to Bevel, but I do not know his address and cannot afford to phone him. When I was in New York ten days ago I spoke to a Reverend Kirkpatrick of the SCLC. He was going to Washington that weekend (last weekend) and was driving. He would pick Bevel up and return via here. I hurried home. He had my address, driving instructions and my phone. I have not heard a word. This, too, is consistent with the absolute refusal of the blacks to do what so obviously is required of them in their narrow, personal interest and that of their people and their martyr if any white in involved. Have you any idea the number I have approached? Ewen "Ebony" and Nat Cole's widow, who knew and liked me. In this connection, please send me the address at which you may be reached at Carnell in case I get a copy of COUP back. I have only the ms copy and that does not have either the full excerpts of the documents or the full text. If I do not get one back (and I may get one this week) while you are there, if Edwards has a serious interest, give me his address and I'll mail him one. The man who was going to microfilm and make copies says the Xerox he has seems to be too pale. He was going to take this up with his plant foreman and let me know Thursday but he has not. However, remember that I have a souree of microfilming. Also, do not forget to tell Edwards I am doing an epilogue which will prove Ray was framed, that the evidence alleged to be that against him should have resulted in his acquittal, and that I shall show how the government engineered a condition under which there could be no consideration of conspiracy, among many other things. I hope to get to this in a few days. I have some medical appointments Wednesday, sobecause I have many things to do and like to write without major interruption, probably not until after that. I have gone a bit deeper in debt to get three 14-inch deep filing cabinets because I had again run out of ppace and, when I can, I continue the reorganization and carding of my files. These are an uneconomic size, but I could find space for them. I have replaced the old vanity on which the copyiers stand with them. They thus take no mowe of the limited space I have in my office. They will not be enough, but they will help, materially, for a while...Another aside: accumulation of material for AGENT OSWALD suggests that the part on his framing is now sufficient for a separate book...And now for your letter.

I never got the rest of the King stuff from Matt. Partly this is my fault. He gave it to me in N.O. Louis did not have time to copy, nor did I. So, I took a bit of it, intending to copy and return. I took only what I could carry onto the plane with me. A month or so ago I asked him to send the rest, registered, and when he didn't, again asked by phone. I have someone doing better than making photocopies. She is typing the notes (which are in little notebooks, on scraps of paper, etc.) in an organized way. I am making a set for him. I told him I would do this with all of them. Silence. I would like very much to use more of this in the book. I think this is now both possible and safe. I think I can get a separate use, too, and may know better this coming week, when I expect someone from a publication (no word from your LNS friend). Matt told me what he does not have in his notes on the radio diversion. He promised me a memo on this when I was there. I have reminded him. He hasn't done it. In fact, I twice had copies of COUP there and he did not take time to read it. He did read that portion dealing with his material, wanted to make a few changes, and hasn't. That is the

way he now is, half nipple, half discouraged.

Your assurance that Fred has changed is something I'd like to see proved. His attitude toward me is utterly irrational and 100% erroneous, as you should know. He is the offender, he the guilty one, coming, again, from his stregge but accute cowardice. His version of the film to you is not the one I got from Ray and others, who indicate that his wife saw to it that Ray got it because she knew what to expect of Fred. This is not to justify what Ray has/has not done, for that I cannot. I have seen much of his stuff that is promising, convincing at first glance, then does not pan out. That stuff with the rifle is something I asked him to do for me. I got him started on it. What he first sent me, the overlays, which we discussed when I was with him 2/68, is excellent. What I saw published in a small paper out there is also fine. Together they are not complete. There are things he should have spotted (as should his photog friend) and hasn't. He got interested in Willis 5 through me, as he told me, turned on by a correct reading of my published suspicions. What he then did for me was impressive, But when I had a chance to compare it with other published pictures, some of it did not pan out, For example, the touching up of the mullions. That now seems to me to be an effect of the sun/shadow. I think an expert should analyze this. I am not such an expert. On the railroad car immediately behind that point: I'd like to see a dated picture showing that, proving it was there at that particular moment. I began with this suspicion. I think he got it from me, in the first two books put together. I do not, therefore, say it did not happen. If you have seen proof, you have seen what I have not. But I do notk think it important enough for you to send me the slides with the consequent hazard to them. When you are here again will be enough time for that. I am aware that he believed/believes that the entire Z film was doctored. That is utterly illogical. Some of that he believes was edited out is irrational, unnecessary. I do not believe the unnecessary was done. Perhaps he has changed. But this is what he told me, repeatedly. With what was left in Z as destructive as it is, I can only imagine what was taken out! The question immediately arises, why was this destruction not removed? It does not make sense. I cannot argue that they made no mistakes, but superficially that they made such enormous blunders also is hard to believe. Nor do I believe it was necessary to so such extensive editing as he told me. What he now believes may be different. I do not know. I may have a copy of his thing. Before you copy it, when you get it back, give me a brief description and I'll compare it with what I was given in confidence. For what he postulates to have happened, the original had to have been edited when it was not in LIFE's possession (please keep this to yourself, but the fact is that I do know LIFE did not immediately get the original, and my source, who could be in error, is nonetheless in the best position to know- I'll tell you when you are here again), the two Secret Service copies, on in Dallas and one in Washington, had to be identically edited, and the <u>two</u> LIFE copies, which left Dallas immediately, also had to be identically altered. LIFE made a black and white print in Chicago as they were taking the film to NYC, in case you didn't know. The later the alterations allegedly made were undertaken, the more copies had to be identically altered, the more impossible the task became. Of course I know what I spotted and wrote about, know my own suspicions. However, in a major part of the film it is possible to check numbering with 885. And remember, the numbering was done much later, by Shaneyfelt. A few otners, like 161, can also be checked-could have been when Fred had the film and analyzed it....I fear a disaster if he ever uses this in public. His proof will have to be overwhelming to survive,...My fear is less of the planted stuff that what some of us come up with, like another, Sprague...Need I tell you how much I want him to be right when it is I who first charged alteratiin of the film?

It should be no less obvious that I have a vested interest in his being right on Willis, for there again he would be confirming me. If he has done this, he has what he did not show me, and this is possible for I referred him to other things and sources. What is the proof the shape of the pergola was altered? Is it the mullions? Is it a grain shown in the other film or a couple of cars parked? There was a train going past then, and this is not in accord with his allegation. Need I tell you that what was there in the afternoon need not have been there at the moment? I also have unpublished and unauthenticated reason to believe there was a northbound train, for I have a statement from a man who claims it was stopped near the Trade Mart and he saw a man removed by the police. He says he was i n the first car stopped for the motorcade, hence the first to be allowed to proceed from Dealey Plaza. He says when he got to the TM the police again stopped traffic. So, I still want proof. With my previous experience with Fred, I will want more from him than from others to be satisfied. I certainly hope, very much, that he has it, as you know. But I also think one Garrison is too much.

I am in an unaccustomed position in finding a kind of justification for what Mark told you about Boxley. I do not at all agree with his formulation, which is illustrative of his kind of thinking and other deficiences. I also suspected Boxley, from out first meeting. However, my reasoning was not Mark's, as possibly I then explained it to you. It was simply that if he were not for real, he had already made such a deep penetration that it was worth the risk of telling him what he wanted to know on the chance he would put it to good use. You know that I keep looking for evidence he was hurtful until I got it, and did something about it. Mark should have done this, was in an ideal position to, for he was living there and taking it easy. He just didn't care. His interest was in self advancement, and for this he cast himself in the role of sycophant. The tragedy there is perhaps more his fault than anyone elses.

I raised the same question with Bud, about providing or trying to provide Ray with counsel. He went to see Hanes without telling me, did not try and see Ray when he was so close. However, this need not be interpreted as you do. I think he has strong beliefs I do not share, about how we can accomplish what we seek. I think he also wants to be the one credited with the accomplishment thereof. Perhaps I have never fully explained to you what is significant to me in his making it possible for me to go to NO in November 1968. Before I left in October he told me he had just been to NO, found Jim in tiptop shape and firmly on top of everything, and that he had new and completely persuasive stuff. I told him he was full of what overflowed stuffed toilets, that Jim was nuts, had come up with nothing, that everything he told me was nonsense and worse, and that he was really doing no real work, merely engaging in self-deception and propaganda. It is with this background that when he learned I could not afford to go to NO that he reached in his pocket and gave me $100, saying it was more important than ever that I go there is this were the case. I was in his office when I called the travel agent trying to straighten out the ticket so that I could go to NO. When I learned there would be an extra charge, that this could not be a stopoff on the return, he reached into his pocket without a word, no hint at all, from me. He said he wanted me to be able to continue what I was working on and to get more evidence of what I had told him that was so entirely inconsistent with what he had just told me and clearly believed. He also then made a date for me to go to NO with him for two weeks beginning 12/1/68, saying he would pay all the expenses, even that he wanted me to have the better accomodations of a hotel or motel rather than staying with Matt. These are not in accord with suspicions of him as an agent.

On the 5:14 Camp ictures, I am certain I have duplicates and can give

you a set to keep. They are in the unclassified part of my files, where there is still chaos. If not, of course you can borrow them. However, before you spend the money, Bud was here a month ago and made slides for himself of whatever of my pictures he wanted for his own appearances. Why do you not ask him for dupes of these and whatever else you think you can use? It is easier and cheaper to make them for his 35mm copies, and he may have more. I think he'll do it for you and I know he will for me. Do you not also want the Wall reports? Did I give you a set of them? I think you should use them in this part of your presentation also.

Now that I have space, as soon as I can, perhaps today, I'll go through that Thornley material page by page, carding it as I go, to be certain the comparison of testimony is not there. I'll do it as soon as I can, anyway.

I'll ask Bud for whatever you think can be helpful on Shaw, but what can be that should be used now? Until I know what you want to say, I do not know what to ask him for. My own feeling is that we should not leave Shaw alone. I do not know what he has, but I will ask him. I expect to see him Wednesday. I do have some things, but I am not using them.

I asked you about "destriction" (it is what you seem to suspect, of that ex session) because I told only three people about it, you, Carl and Bud. I had Bid check the court reporter's files, where he got a kind of confirmation for me. When I saw Sylvia in New York and started to tell her about this, she said she knew. I asked her what it was and she told me correctly. I said that is not in the Commission stuff (which it was, for that is where I got it, but I also knew she hadn't and couldn't have and that no one else had) she said she knew but she got it from the reporter's files. This, of course, bears on what you seem to believe. It troubled me. It remains to be seen whether Bud told her, and I'll ask him directly Wednesday. She is clever, articulate, convincing, all the things you say and more. She has had a thing on Epstein from the first ( I think the denied mother in her turned on). She makes subtle shifts, as first telling me how important Forman's work is and how it troubled her to sit on it for a year then agreeing with me when I said it was incompetent and erroneous, that the few things in it we already had independent of him and going back to an earlier period ( and with one exception, I did-that exception I also had independent of him and before I read his work). I do not like this, but I also do not think it need means she is with the other side. On Garrison I assume this, and have from the first. But, aside from her thing with Thornley, which is really part of Garrison, nothing else. In fact, I have offered recently to tell her things I thought would help her undertanding, including of Garrison, on her word she would never in any way make any use, and she declined. Not consistent with being with the other side, not to me. I'd have told her, too, as she knew. Nonetheless, it is troubling, I do detect some of the things your report, and I do not understand them or this part of her.

What makes you connect Jaffe's father with the BU? I thought he was in private, successful medical practise. But try and get this entire story (next to last par, second page). As you must be aware from the copies of recent correspondence I have sent you on this, that is of especial interest to me. I will soon be sending you more of this, as I get to writing it. Jaffe is an odd one. Not very bright, no special competence, but very much wanting to be important. He has an unfailing knack for getting with the bad ones, in complete trust and confidence, for doing the wrong thing at precisely the time it can hurt most, is a self-serving liar whenever it seems to him to be expedient, and has an infinite capacity for the utmost trust in malodorous horseshit.

He is an instinctive sycophant, and when I have said these things I have said the best I can muster for him. Watch him- being careful, not to be deceived by his obvious belief in anything he may at any moment say.

In your comment on "desstruction" you correctly understand my insistence on maintaining certain things in confidence. If I want to share them with those I trust, with those who can use the knowledge, I alsom want to reserve the right to use them in context, not to use them for one-shot, cheap sensations. If those who have made misuse possible were innocent, they nonetheless did make it possible, sometimes with costly consequences.

If you see a good, brief, professional commentary of the "scientific" Sirhan evidence, I'd like it to quote. When you can put your own beliefs on paper, I'd like to be able to drew on them. I think it is worth little more than a denunciation, the result being the practise of an art rather than a science, I would like to do more than just condemn.

Your new projects sound interesting and worthwhile. I have some ideas on how to reach disturbedm withdrawn kids, almmst had a chance to put somex into practise about 10 years ago. I'll tell you when we are together, on the chance they suggest something to you.

If this has taken longer than I'd planned, I have also addressed everything you raised. I think it had to be done, if it cuts down on what else I can do today. I hope you can get the Goulden stories, because I'd like to know what they say so I can, in odd moments, carry forward whatever might be prior to getting to that writing.

I have discovered I have a copple of carbons of the text of PM III if you know anyone wants them. They are close to the finished thing, though entirely without even the incomplete appendix. Lil has typed the lengthy excerpts from Cyril's testimony. I've let you know through copies of letters what else I plant for that.

I regret having to inflict the typos on you. Have a good holiday, and good luck at Cornell!

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

April 3, 1969

Dear Harold,

Enclosed are the following items: 2 carbons of letters to Rothermel and also a carbon of a letter for the Martinsburg file, &The Bevel interview. The Bevel interview is mine and I need it back since I want to make a slide of it, or part of it.

Did you ever get that stuff on King from Matt. I knew you got part of it. Originally, I was promised copies of it (at my expense) by both Matt and Chris, since I was very much interested in it and would have gone myself (Vince called and offered to pay) had I not been swamped with work.

Since I will be going to Cornell on the 15th, I would greatly appreciate a loan of Coup D'Etat during the period from the 15th until the 21st. I hope to be meeting with Harry Edwards up there, and some other influential blacks. I can't promise anything, but as always, I will try to dig up money for the book. Harry is the only big black radical I know, and there will be others there who are friends of my old Cornell girlfriend.

I will try to get the Goulden stuff from Vince--I expect him to call sometime soon.

On the Z film and Fred, there is no way Fred can make an appendix of exhibits so that experts can check his work unless he can borrow the film. The presence or absence of splices is easy to settle empirically. In terms of the numbering of the frames, the Z film out there is the same as the volumes and Archives, and ostensibly the same as LIFE. If the latter isn't true, than Life & the FBI conspired to defraud the Warren Commission and public. The problem which currently confronts Fred is that he can't have his work checked or even check it himself unless he can borrow the film and make copies of the spiced areas. Fred does not plan public use for a long time, even if it pans out. He first wants experts who will attach their names to it. (A number have on the 133A and B work.) Then he wants to circulate it among the critics for ideas, criticism, and suggestions. He is very down to earth and thinking clearly about this, and is now much calmer, rational, and aware of the potential danger of planted stuff than ever before. During the period which I have known him, he has changed a great deal in that direction. The typed version has been checked by Ray and Lifton who were both trying to shoot it down, by myself and Vince, and a few others. Due to my forgetfulness, Vince still has my copy and should be mailing it back. When it arrives I will# xerox you a copy. Bear in mind that Fred's finding is 100% consistent with something we have all observed in these two spots in the Z film in the Archives, and which you took care to point out when Chris, Vince, you, and I were in the Archives.

On the Willis stuff, Fred has a set of 75 slides. It is thorough and well reasoned. He uses for comparison to Willis 5, Betzner, Cancellare, Bond, etc. He also utilizes the Nix film analysis by Itek, which verifies everything, plus extensive plat maps and aerial views. What is involved is just what you once pointed out to me and I agreed with and said that I had noticed, but knot known what it meant. The brushing of a railroad car, which is behind the pergola, off of the slide. In the process then distorted the shape of the pergola, and also brushed off enough of the tree to show. The latter is not

a crucial point. All other photos but Willis 5 show the ##### train. By the way, Sprague went to great lengths to convince Fred that the only train was the one several hundred feet back in the yard, but Fred can prove, I think conclusively, that there was also one behind the pergola on that second siding. It is behind the depository in an aerial view done that afternoon. Fred has no memo on it yet, only instructions to use with the slides, which mean nothing without the slides. If you want to see the slides, I may be able to lend them to you sometime, although bear in mind that I will be needing them for my class on the assassination.

On Mark and Boxley: The last time Mark was in Minneapolis, sometime early in the Fall of 1968, I brought up the question of Boxley and our suspicions, voiced as my own. Mark said that if Boxley were an agent, it was too late to prevent him from doing harm to the investigation, because he was doing very sensative work. He didn't argue that he wasn't, but only that it was too late to do anything about him, ### rather than suggest# ing that it might be wise to look into the reasons for the suspicion. It sounded like the ostrich burying its head in the sand. What is unfortunate here is that although removing Boxley at that time couldn't recoup the loss, it could have prevented the danger of the press conference of Nov. 22. By the way, I asked Mark some pointed questions about Gurvich when he was here in the Spring of 1967 (the appearances I arranged) on the basis of Mark's bragging about ### Gurvich's ability to find Gordon Novel in one day. I asked about Gurvich's background and whether his investigative talents weren't a bit too good to be true. Last fall I also asked about Bethell and all of the new directions of work (Bradley, Grissman).

I sent Bud a pointed letter suggesting that if the committee can't do the simple job of getting Ray a lawyer, then it would be hard to justify its existance. Getting Ray a good lawyer, in my mind, is more important that all of the press releases and pretences at investigation. Bud's excuse just doesn't wash with me.

On 544 I wanted those pictures you had when you were in Minneapolis of the intersection, showing the building and street signs. I can have them copied and return them.

On the Thornley thing, I did bring it back to MLPS with me last summer, but mailed it to you sometime with in the past two months because you had need of it.

Could you ask Bud to send me things which would be useful with Shaw. Since you know what they are, you could help avoid confusion. I agree that it is doubtful that I can learn much, but you never know until you try.

I am more and more sure that Sylvia is bad business. She has many times given me indications that she gets inside information from people. She is quite clever, and knows enough to try to confince you that she knows about something, so as to get you to elaborate on it. I haven't been writing to her for some time, because she hasn't written me, but am disgusted with her anyway. When I speak with her I feel that I have to exercise the same type of caution one does with someone on the other side. The same goes for Lifton, but Sylvia, despite my respect for her knowledge of the case, bothers me more, perhaps because she is so sure about all of her theories about things of which she has so little info.

Jaffe tells me that a Justice Dept source (not necessarily his father), in complete confidence, told him that the FBI covered up in# the assassination case to cover its own failures. I told him that we had guessed## that long ago.

Your question about the"destruction and burning" was lost on me. To what ###### were you refering. It may be something you have written me about which I missed somewhere. I still haven't read all of the enclosures from your letters from the past several months, although I have sorted them and am through almost all of them now. Many of them came

During times of maximum problems and work for me, so I was only able to glance at them. In any event, I would be quite interested in what it is. I very rarely talk about even the more public of the things you send me to anyone, since I never have occasion to. I speak to other critics only of ongoing work--generally of Fred's or stuff of that sort. There are few people, if any, except Paul, who I write to who would understand or appreciate any of your work, discoveries, or analysis. Many of your discoveries are quite important, but important only in the context of an analysis of the government's investigation, and as pieces in a puzzle. For instance, Burkley's initials on the autopsy, mean nothing unless one understands the autopsy and the serious questions it raises of high level involvement. So, if I have failed to notice something in one of your letters, please accept my apology, for I know you spend much time in sending me things. Does the burning and destruction in your letter of 3/30 refer to the "burning and destruction of the special session" which you referred to in your letter of 3/2;9 in the context of Sylvia knowing of it? If it is a special session of the autopsy surgeons or the Clark Panel, I do not know of it. If it is the session about LHO as an agent, which you mentioned to me, I didn't know that you could prove that there had been such a session.

Take it easy and drop me a line when you have time. So much is going on now with the case, Ray, Sirhan#, that it is hard for me to keep up with it. The psychiatric testimony at the Sirhan case is incredibly bad. What they did with Ruby and Oswald is just as bad. I will be putting together my thoughts on that soon.

This term my schedule will be light, but I will be more involved in community affairs, and the one trip to Cornell will take quite a bit of time, but will make up for a batched up "vacation" in Philadelphia. We have a newly# organized chapter of psychologists for social action which will be studying police and military tactics and training and doing many other things. I will be doing some hypnosis research and working with a severely disturbed 3 year old girl, plus taking some course work on therapy techniques#. We may be doing some de-sensitizing of cops to foul language, something which will prevent cracked heads this summer, through a theraputic method called systematic desensatization.

Give my regards to your wife.

Gary

PS: added enclosures include--a letter to Lou Ivon # (You have copies of what I sent him--I sent it only because I had made copies for them which were lying around, and they will complete the files)
a letter to Barbara Reid which will give you some info on KT, a carbon of a Rothermel letter, an addition to the Martinsburg file which should interest you, and an archives letter (answer to my short letter asking about the page discrepancies in the Betty Parent report, which is in the Bertrand file)

Box 392 Mayo Hospital

March 31, 1969

Mr. Louis Ivon
Head Investigator
District Attorney's Office
2700 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

Dear Mr. Ivon:

Enclosed are the following items to be added to the files of materials I have given Jim Garrison or sent through Harold Weisberg or you:
1. a carbon of my letter to the Archives regarding the Betty Parent report which mentioned Clay Bertrand which I sent you
2. a memo for the file on Dave Kroman (of the Nagell affair)--by the way, a pretty good source of information suggests that Kroman is the same as Don Morgan, who played a role in that affair through letters he sent to Garrison
3. an item for the Bolden file--my Christmas card which didn't get through
4. a pile of items for the file of things from Martinsburg, Penna.; related to CE 3067 and that piece of paper which was allegedly found by Mrs. Hoover

Might I suggest, if you plan to do anything more with Julia Ann Mercer, that she be shown a photograph of Larry Crafard, if this hasn't already been done. If that was really Ruby driving the truck, then Crafard is a good bet for the guy carrying the package. His phyical size and actions after the assassination would also be consistent with this.

You might be interested to know that the switchboard operator at the States-Item told one of my researchers (in a phone conversation) that despite their editorial, most everyone backed the DA's office down there.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Richard Schoener
Box 392 Mayo Hospital
Minneapolis, Minnesota
55455

grs

cc:Vince S.
Harold W.