

3/29/69

Dear Gary,

I've just returned from my speech and first of all I'll answer your letter of 3/24. On Penn: I know nothing of what he writes for he has sent me no issue of the paper since the first attack on Vince, Bud and me.

C On Fred, Vince and Z: I think it possible Vince's fear is not unreasonable. I also think once I see the work I can eliminate any possibility of error. It is, in my opinion, as you know, likely that this was an agency job. I do not think Fred stole the film as much as I think he was intended to have it. Ray's conduct is strange. I phoned him, having considered it likely Paul would make copies for a copy and make slides, in addition. He was going to get back to me but he never did. He has been silent, completely. Not a word. And Paul has backed off.

O My reasoning is not identical with Vince's, and I'd prefer not putting it all in the trust of so public a medium. But if you remember the one with whom you were staying when we first met and try and understand why I so much wanted him to make an analysis, you can perhaps guess one of the things that has for so long troubled me. I began working on this with the first suspicion, never got anyone's cooperation, and was able to do nothing.

P
Y In referring to Fred's work, I am not speaking of the typed version but what would be photographic. It might be possible from the typed. I think no public word should be uttered about that, by anyone, under any circumstances, until those with the greater knowledge and best judgement have had a chance to exhaust it. I have given you my opinion of him and his work often enough. This could have very bad consequences if it turned out to be wrong. I will not write him. In fact, I think the best thing I can do with this is stay entirely out until everything is completed. However, although I will not tell you by this means what it is, I do have information no one else has from the original source, the very first, the completely original one. He is not my friend. This knowledge could be vital in any consideration of whether something was done. My hope is that whatever he does he will be able to do by summer, that you can have it, and that we can chew it over, here and near here.

I am aware of what F is speaking about. I mentioned one such in one of my books. I noted another in one particular version. In that one I also noticed marked color differences, changes, that I can not recall from any other. I then formed the opinion this had been specially built in.

On Willis, until I know definitely what is involved, I must have the same opinion. When it was known that I was going out there in 2/67 and that I was going to stay with him, he went to work on some of the suspicions he correctly read from my work. When I was there he spelled it out to me. He already had that work done and gave me copies. I was impressed. However, from time to time I have re-studied it and I have changed my mind. What I know of does not stack up, not a bit. I still have the same suspicions. I believe he has not proved them and that his own work falls apart on analysis. Of course, he may be talking to you of something else. Again I urge no use until after the most thorough checking. Let me know what it is. If it deals with millions and trees, nix. Also cars.

One of our problems is that we have too many self-appointed geniuses,

elder-statesman variety. They have less understanding than they have done nothing in years, and seem not to realize that if this version was doctored, that in itself is important to know. How convenient it would be if it turns out that one (really more than one) was left where it could be conveniently "found" or "stolen".

I'd like to see the new Willis stuff.

Vosj: probably this is the same as what Schmitt found. I've asked them to get and send copies to those who saw the man I suspect he might be in this new operation. I am anxious to see the entire thing.

On Slater: on your word, I will help him if he wants help. On Marl and Box, I've forgotten what comment you said M made.

On BudL check. I tried the same thing with him, immediately and he had not do it. I also know he went down to see Hanes a week ago. I'll find out what he learned when I see him.

I am not aware of the Guevera thing Russo produced at the trial. I am aware of other things I had learned and tried to alert them to for perhaps 20 months.

Tell me what you want on 544 and I'll send it. I have done nothing on Youngblood-Rich for ~~them~~ several reasons: those I had planned to use are no longer in the area (I have replacements) and you has yet to send the copies of the picture with identifications removed. I can use one with the ident. masked if necessary. I'd rather have both men see her at once and one is away. Until he gets back and is clear, it'll have to wait.

I'll have to check to be sure, but I think you took the Thronay thing with you and were going to send me a copy. I'l too tired and my knees do not want to work, so I'al not check the file this minute.

Think chances of proving Shaw slight. One would be the Credit Mondiale-Bloc field thing. I do not know where my copies are but Bud can supply if you decide to try.

Saw Sylvia for about an hour in NYC today. I was surprised that she knew of the destruction of the special session. She stumbled for a while when I asked her how she knew and then said from the stenographer's records. She had no direct access to this. It means someone has breached confidence.

Hope I didn't miss anything.

Hurriedly,

C
O
P
Y

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

March 24, 1969

Dear Harold,

Thanks for all of the stuff. Sorry I didn't write while I was home but the vacation wasn't much of a vacation. I broke off the long standing relationship I have had with Marion which took a lot out of me emotionally. I had a very big argument with Vince over something which happened on the West Coast: basically, it boils down to the fact that when Fred had the Lamarre Z film he discovered some slipes in the area of the film prior to frame 171. Where the splices are is where the film appears to have been edited in that as we have all observed, the car jumps quite a few feet. Unless LIFE and the FBI conspired to falsify this for the Commission, then what LIFE has is not the original Z film, and was doctored before they got it. In addition, LIFE and the FBI together are responsible for failing to ever have made note ~~##~~ of the fact that the film was altered, and is not the original since it has been spliced and has had material removed. Ray is now sitting on that copy of the Z film and refused to give it back to Fred, who originally stole it from Jaffe, and in addition won't be making copies available to the critics for some time. Fred wants to get it copied through a friend who can guarantee safety and good work and low cost and make it available, but at the very least wants to be able to copy the areas with the splices so that photo experts can check his work and conclusions. Fred is very low emotionally about this thing and very discouraged. Vince add I spoke to Ray and Letha on the phone and Vince sided with Ray completely and ended up actually yelling at me, which is pretty hard to believe given our friendship and his past complete reliance on my judgement. Both of them were bull headed, and with Ray's wife who knows nothing on the line throwing in red herrings, it was very frustrating add totally useless. Vince apologized but still has the same views towards Ray's protecting us from the CIA copy of the film.

By the way, the stuff in Penn Jone's last editorial which he credits to either Fred or Sprague was Fred's. It is conclusive that the Willis slide 5 was doctored, and Fred proved it over Sprague's objections. It is first rate work and photo people here say that it is conclusive and as good as the stuff on 133A and B.

With Bud I still continue to correspond but am keeping my eyes open. The greatest danger in his case is that given their board of directors, two of whom I don't even know, with a complete absence of legitimate critics, plus Garrison, Turner, Sprague, et. al. there could be trouble due to grotesque irresponsibility. My talks with Bud lead me to believe that he will do little to prevent this. I am concerned more with irresponsibility and bad judgement than "agency." I am afraid that these things have cost us more than any agent could have hoped to have done.

ON Vosjoly, check Life magazine for April of 1968 (April 26 I think). There is an entire article written by Vosjoli, but all that is show of him is the back of his head (cover) and top of his head (inside). There is a very old passport photo inside which might help, and also the fact that he is balding on top and that they might be able to tell something from the back and side of his head shown on the front cover. The article is quite interesting. I doubt that we will be able to get his picture from the news media if Life wouldn't print ~~##~~ it, but will try some sources. Uris' wife's death still intrigues me.

On LNS I know one guy who is OK in every department--Giuseppe (Richard) Slater--

he is bright, concerned, reliable, and quite honest, something the rest are not. By the way, Mark's comment on Boxley was made to me in Minneapolis in case I didn't so identify it. That was my last meeting with him, after he had failed to see me for a 4 day period when he was here, having managed only a few short radio and TV shows plus only a few hours of autographing books. He spent much of the time being escorted by a classic dumb blond who worked for a department store. I had to lower myself to chase him out to the airport and talk with him in her presence while he ran around trying to get his plane, and it cost time, money, and led to me briefing him rather than the reverse. That was the end of the line for me with Mark.

On Ray, I am quite angry that Bud refuses to help get him a lawyer. Bud has told at least one person that he wants to be a disinterested party so he can comment on it. Perhaps he plans to say a few verses over the grave. The best thing we could do now is get Ray a good lawyer. There must be many who would take the case, and probably many who would do it free of charge, or for expenses.

On N.O., Vince says that Russo produced many things in the trial which he had never mentioned to the staff and which surprised the staff, such as the poster of Che Guevara. My comments on the Sirhan trial would not add much to Coup--the psychiatric testimony was a joke, and is much talked about in professional circles.

If you can, send me the 544 Camp things and I will make copies for future use, so you won't be bothered. I have letters from Rothermel I will send you copies of when I can. By the way, Don Morgan, is the mystery figure in the Nagell thing. Remember the deal about placing an ad in the Berkeley Barb saying something like "contact Don Morgan" and a 5 page letter to Garrison from him, etc. Well, I suspect that Paul R. is correct in saying he is Kroman. Kroman was out on the West Coast at that time and it all begins to fit together. I suspect more and more that Kroman is an agent of some sort and may play a role in false leads. By the way, if you get the chance to make a copy, could you send back the comparison of Thornley's testimony that I sent you. I think that the girl who did it would like to work with it some more, and that's the only copy there is.

I hope to have more stuff on Vosjoli when I hear from some of the researchers. I think that it was wise to calm Barry down. It is hard to do with letters, especially with Penn Jones interfering. Those who don't know the case were greatly disturbed by the Shaw verdict and felt cheated, and some of them, like Barry, have the potential for doing some useful work and should be helped through this. By the way, what ever happened to the photo of Youngblood and what did Rich have to say about it?

Well, I've got to go. Take care and give my regards to your wife. Our spring will be much later in coming than yours, unfortunately, and I await it impatiently.

Gary

PS: From the 15th to the 20th I will be at Cornell and Ithaca College. It was arranged so that I could get to see and talk to Clay Shaw, who is apparently giving speeches now, and who will be there on the 20th. I would greatly appreciate any suggestions and will be only too glad to try and probe any areas I am able to with him.