4/22/69

Dear Hal,

Your letter of the 19th has just arrived and I respond immediately to assure you that what is involved is not your integrity, your ho nesty, our friendship, your selflessness, dedication or anything of this nature. You have been very helpful to me personally, and you know I appreciate it. What is involved is very poor judgement, doing something than can be, may have been hurtful, served no useful purpose. Because I must protect my source I ask you to take this on trust: do not discuss this with any of those you may think may have been involved. Paul or Jim, that's some thing else. If you feel my complaint is unwarranted, for example, by all means you can discuss it with them and get their independent judgement. Because I do not want to finger my source, although when it is safely possible I will tell you all of it, I will not be more specific. I will respond in terms of your letter.

First, on Bud: I told him what I did, gave him what I did, in strictest confidence. He was under no circumstances to have mentioned this to anyone. So, he goes to California and gets one soap box with it. Worse, he knows my deep distrust for Turner, knows the enormous damage Turner did in New Orleans (as you cannot begin to imagine), so he tells Turner. Now I happen to regard this as one of the more significant, more useful of the things I have discovered. It is not only for literary purposes I wanted it keep in deepest security. There are others things I do, other uses I intend for my materials, and I should be able to have the use of my material the way I want while being able to entrust the knowledge to others so their work can benefit from it. If we do not keep each other's confidences we emasculate ourselves as no enemies can. With Turner's well-established record of uninhibited thievery, he could not have spoken before one I wanted less to know about this - and that is putting the best possible face on Turner. I'll return to him in reference to those mentions in your letter. But this material is not what is involved. I had earlier picked up the leakage, not in California, and having told, besides Bud, only Paul and Gary, I asked each. Neither had spoken to anyone about it. Paul knows that what I send him is available to you and Jim, and he did not have to tell me he made it available. I assumed he would have and so intended. So, Bud either repeated this to me serious breach of my trust or someone to whom he had mentioned it in California immediately retailed it. This would trouble me even more. I do not know and will not be able to find out, unless he elects to discuss it with me when I raise the question with him.

It was not about Thornley, nor was it about Hepburn. In this connection I ask you not consider the present comments on this by all of the LA people as being what you should read. Ask their initial attitudes, participations and staunch refusals to do what was necessary when they were told why it was necessary. To this day they have not performed, but they talk real big. They all bears a very large share of responsibility in this direction, before and after the fact.

You say you are aware that I am talking about Fred. I will neither affirm nor deny for the stated reasons. I will tell you that I heard long ago that you had been in LA with your girl-friend (congratulations. Hope it ripens and matures into something real good). Let me suggest you ask yourself what you took with you and to whom you showed it. Here I note that what is confidential need not bear numerous official stamps to establish its character. You saw no one not in contact with all the others. Therefore, ask yourself what purpose could have been served by taking any material of any kind of any one of us to show any of them. Ask yourself further, if you had the correspondence of others in any form, if this was even proper to have with you, leave alone show others. And you might ask yourself if you had and showed things that are not central in the case, that were none of the business of those with whom you were. If in addition you face your own knowledge

++

that there are those in LA who consider themselves my enemy or proclaim their dislike for me and that despite any protestations of mutual dislikes and mistrust, some of these are on terms of intimacy with each other, do you think you should have had anything from em with you whether or not you showed it? To the best of my knowledge, you saw no one in LA unknown to me, therefore you saw no one to whom I would not have given anything I wanted him to have. You know that Lifton has been talking of suing me. I presume Fred has told you of me what he has told others. You mentioned these two (and I do not respond to your suggestion that I may have had Lifton in mind).

You are correct in interpreting what I mean by a frightening hole but not in ~~xxx~~ assuming I attributed any self-seeking of personal profit to you. No thoughts could have been farther from my mind. But one of the possibilities, not in reference to you, is not to be ignored: blackmail. There are those who would not eschew this if they thought they could advance what they want thereby. I do not anticipate it, however, and not in the normal sense in any event. Blackguarding might be closer to the capabilities I visualize. What you do not understand is that those you know may not be in all respects and with all people as they have been with you. Therefore, since we all tend to evaluate people on the basis of our own experiences and estimates, you may be entirely unaware of this. Because of your own trust in your own judgement, what you have been told of some of these people just has not registered on you.

You address "truth" as thought it is an absolute. What Fred, for example, might regard as truth I assure you I do not and am confident you also would not. It is in connection with him that you make your definition. Whether or not he seeks truth, as he or as I understand it, is entirely unrelated to what you bracket with it, "If there was something about the Thornley matter that we discussed I knew of nothing that I couldn't really tell him that would endanger any confidence". This is in every respect wrong. First, you know what he did to me about the Thornley matter. Next, you know he is, despite his clamor, close to Lifton. You also know that I told you not to mention it to anyone. And above all you know I send to those I want to have it what I have that I want them to have. You should never under any circumstance consider discussing what I have on or relating to Thornley with anyone. It is this simple thing you must come to understand or with the best of intentions you will do great damage. You must not discuss other people's materials or business without their assent. Each of us may have special reasons for not wanting this done, but in my case I have repeatedly made it explicit that I have no confidence in most of the people you deal with and I have repeatedly made it specific and send what I do for Paul, you and Jim only. This, it seems to me, should be enough. Please think this through so you may come to understand it. In addition, I am a writer in a competitive field, and you know my stuff is stolen regularly, you know that Turner does it and considers it right and proper. You were present when I told him in confidence what you next read under his name in Ramparts as his own thinking. You know only too well too much more.

In the Whites I have implicit trust. They are two of the finest people I have ever met. In addition, they live with the need for maintaining confidence, for he is in a field where it is and must be done and the need is well understood and respected. It was not them. Even with this high regard I have for them, however, I have placed a restriction I expect you to respect: no one else knows of any of this I send. If you have other desires, ask me. With them I can offhand think of nothing I would deny them if they wanted it or you thought they should have access to it. On a simple basis, I must know how we deal with each other. I must know that I can trust you to abide by the restrictions I ask you to respect. Otherwise, I am faced with the possible necessity of not sending you certain things and this I do not want to come to pass. You cannot know all that may be in my mind, nor can you anticipate whether or not I have special uses or purposes in mind.

Your purposes, your next point, are not in question at all. I have no question here. I do doubt the last part of that sentence, "other than to get information". This could not in any sense relate to that of which I complain. If it is Dave or Fred, for example, do you have to cajole them to get information, or bribe them? Aside from this, what I specifically refer to is not of such a character. You do not exaggerate when you say you go to trouble and expense to help my work. This has always been true, it has always been unselfish, and it has always been valuable. You know I do appreciate it and you know that in the limited ways I can I do reflect this.

Now I do acknowledge that there may be times when with some of those you are in contact with, you may, from your greater intelligence and superior knowledge, understand what they do not and cannot and may decided that it is necessary to pass on to others what they prefer that you not. However, with, for example, Paul or Jim, or Mary and me, this is not the case. If you ever felt this way with one of us, you should ask. With Lifton and Fred, whose judgement is miserable, you may have to impose your own. In fact, I believe that with what some of what Fred has told you, you have not and should have. I do not belabor this, but think about it.

Endlessly I must address these two and Turner, for you persist in not respecting my opinion about them. Where I am involved, you simply must or I cannot trust you, and this I do not want to come to pass. The best that can be said for what Lifton has done to me is that it is very wrong. You know this. The best that can be said for him personally is that, bright as he is or not, he is like sick. Such a man simply cannot be trusted. Now I ask you to consider less ~~pleasant~~ possibilities. That he did in blackjacking Fred (and what kind of man is Fred to have permitted this-to have collaborated, really, from what he himself sent me) is wretched, inexcusable and had the sole and exclusive purpose of hurting me. In his own twisted mind Lifton may have decided it was to help Hornley. But to do that he had to deliberately misconstrue and misrepresent what he intimidated out of Fred, one is hardly a match for a fluttering but mortally-wounded moth. This is open, malicious dishonesty. If he is capable of this he simply cannot be trusted with anything, for you have to assume he will have no more scruple with n any other material. It is that simple. Need I add anything about Fred? Well, I do, and when you are here again you will see these things in letters he wrote me: he knows the entire thing was not dishonest, was not designed to frame Hornley, was a mechanism for his protection, was not in any sense a doctoring of photpgrpahs or photographic evidence and. above all, he knew it could be used to hurt Garrison (for whom he proclaimed such undying love and repect) and me. If, knowing these things, he still gave Dave and Hornley's lawyer what he knew they could not use except by misrepresentation, need anything else be said of him? It is not simply that he has no judgement and often displays very bad judgement. It is very simple: he is a terrible coward. And believe me, it was so used-and may yet be again and again in different contexts. There was no way in the world Lifton or Hornley could have gotten this except with Fred's assent, for there was no other way, save theft, to obtain it. Fred, who is full grown, knows nothing if he did not know this. When you are here, as always, you can see the entire file. If you have any doubt of my representation, tell me what you want and I'll copy it and send it. Now, with these facts, this history, you are on thin ground on giving them anything, either of them (unless you want it hanging on the papier-mache trees or buring in the Brown and Root invisible tunnels). But how in the world can you justify showing or discussing anything of mine with either? What need could there have been? What conceivable use ful prupose, what constructive end to serve? Or with Turner, to whom I now turn.

He is, I know, your friend, therefore, I have been less pointed than is more than warranted. I do not and have not called him an agent, though it if

I were pressed, I'd have to acknowledge the possibility, that a number of things do point in that direction. I do not think he is. I think he is merely unscrupulous and incompetent. Mithel very self-seeking. With this understating of what can be said against him, I ask you to enlighten me: what single, viable, important thing has he brought to light on this entire subject? What useful purpose has he served? What one important witness has be found, from whom he extracted what valuable information? What single good interview has he conducted with those discovered by others? In short, tell me what he has done, for all the talk, all the pose, all the big reputation of an FBI-agent background and this fine thing on exposing them? (And even here, what has he brought to light that is new, what more than is necessary, as the very minumum, to establish a phoney bona fides if he were an agent, as Vince would argue?). Competence? Why when Johann Rush was pointed out to him and he was told what to ask for, he couldn't even do that. He did take what Rush volunteered and posed this as a great achievement, when it was nothing, not even new. He did tell Rush how important, how knowledgeable he is. But to get what we needed, what he was asked to get to begin with, Paul and I had to go to great trouble and what for us is considerable expense. Here let me digress, for you were not there. Paul was afraid he could not do it. He did magnificently. I do not think there was a single question to be asked of Rush after Paul saw him. Paul may be timid about such things, but he certainly is competent, at least with people who are not antagonistic, and with his fine mind, when he has time and there are people to be questioned who can not be assumed to be antagonistic, as Jeanne, I do think it would be good to have him along. Especially because of the debth of knowledge he has of the material and his innate conservativeness on fact and truth. I am serious in asking this question about Turner. If there is a single plus mark on this score, I want to know it, or if there are more. I know of nothing with which he has been associated that has not been a fiasco, a disaster, or, where there has been less that great tragedy, anything better than an enormous waste of time and money, a bankrupting of our side. I, for example, have had my considerable indebtedness greatly increased because of the frittering of money and resources for which he was responsible. Some day you wil know the full import of the great harm he did in New Orleans, how close to the end of everything. Gary has seen some of it. I am not impartial (which is unrelated to my knowledge or judgement), so ask Gary. There simply can be no doubt about anything but why. Here Vince and I are in disagreement. In fact, the last time I spoke to Garrison, he was convinced Turner was an agent (confidential-not to go to Turner) and I spent some time showing him and, I think, convincing him, of the other possibilities. On this occasion I learned more of the enromosu waste Turner had caused in that office, and of other great costs he had inflicted, others than I had learned on my own. And I add that on everything of which I have knowledge where Boxley was wrong and so obviously wrong, there was Turner backstopping him, authenticating him (Boxley returned the favor, often). This includes the overt manufacture of evidence. I say and mean "manufacture". It is that bad. It got to the point where they were so contemptuous of Garrison or so certain of his unquestioning trust that they attacked those he did trust, calling them agents and other things, and did not even fear leaving obvious gaps in their "investigation", giving him false information that would fall apart from a mere glance. It seems pretty clear that they preyed on his paranoia, really terrifying him. But let me get to your letter on this.

You say Turner told you he got a poster from Madrid with Nagell's picture, from Wilmington, and he is mystified by this. First I tell you that I have no confidence in the Nagell story at all, nor did. Now I say Turner deceived you or not is even more important than I believed. Nagell is in Spain and has been keeping no secrets. He has no apparent means of support, but has been in Europe for months, including three in an east-German jail from which he was sprung by out government, with all the open signs of intelligence involvement. Turner knows Nagell's close friend Greenstine lives in Wilmington ("Equipment Times"). Do you need any more?

In the light of what is without question of open CIA involvement in New Orleans at least, how can you sit still for his "expounding on the theme of non-CIA participation"? Boxley was on the same tack. Between the two of them you should have seen and heard what they convinced Garrison - what he was about to do and say on this! Boxley's formulation is that is was a "secret FBI cell" in N.O. No evidence at all. All the CIA clues? FBI plants, going back to the early 60s. How far in advance they worked on that one! Back to where JFK was their boy. They ~~shall~~ could read the future! On this there is no CIA-FBI rivalry. It is their fiction. You know better. The FBI covered the CIA on everything. It does not "make sense". And when you say "His remarks were made in the context of discussing Boxley", do not lose sight of the fact that here you cannot discuss Boxley without discussing Turner. They simple cannot ve separated, not on any of it, and I can show you their own written proof of it. How can you attribute relevance to Hoover being a #1 degree mason "and the CNI is 'solid mason'", even if it is true. Has not the time come for questioning every one of these "facts" from Turner, even the minor ones, like the masonry of the CNI? The government is full of them, as is private life, so if true, what does it mean? "Regis Kennedy hanging around Guy Banister's office". It is also my information (and perhaps he is using mine, for there is no indication he ever did any private investigating in N.O.) that Kennedy hung around there. What does it mean, aside from that he had knowledge he didn't report? His behavior was normal for his job, has nothing to do with any kind of conspiracy, but to do with reporting or friendship. "...with Kennedy sending all his reports on to the FBI #1 man under Hoover." What, if anything, does this mean, and where is the proof that Kennedy went outside office channels with his reporting? What conceivable need could there have been for this? And John P. Moore is not the "#1 man under Hoover". That is deLoach, who may actually run the joint. True about Arcacha and CNI help, but how does this relate exclusively to him, or that no other agency asked this help? Not that I can prove it is true, but I have heard it. Arcacha ran a CIA, not an FBI front. What proof is there that "Banister sends his reports to the FBI", that he made and sent any reports, to anyone? Turner's word? And while you are at it, ask yourself if FBI interest in Banister is inconsistent with their having wind of his being up to something the government wanted to know about, if the FBI wanted to keep tabs on it. Like simple theft. Or the political activities of various sorts. Have you seen the letter B sent Guy Johnson? Without it, can you believe it exists? What should it, when they were friends and in the same town, within easy walking distance of each other? Between two men so long experienced in clandestine work? On Banister, I tell you what someone in a position to know tells me, that Banister suffered brain damage in Chicago and his subsequent career and conduct are in accord with the medical appraisal made at the time...What proof do you have of Bradley's involvement in anything? True Garrison(read Turner) said this. Do you know his sources, his evidence? Do you know that Garrison knew he had nothing, but just believed it? When next you are in L.A, speak to Kevin about this. Ask yourself what kind of men persuades a public official he has proof he does not have and on this basis gets that public official to make charges he cannot substantiate, to conduct the investigation after the charge that should have been made in advance of it. What did any subsequent investigation prove? Absolutely nothing. Reagan could have done us nogreater favor than in denying extradition. Grisman was Turner's, too, and he went before the grand jury. What happened? Zero. Again, nothing to it. And what proof is there that Bradley ever had any "intelligence" connections in the past? That he was a guard during World War II? Or a labor spy? That Banister attended a reserve officer's training school on 1960 is extremely improbable, especially if as a teacher.

If you have no independent proof of those foolish things Turner convinced you of, ask yourself what proof he offered? Can you authenticate a single one of these far-out things, or did he offer you any? You, like Garrison, are taking him on trust. He is either sick or outting you on, is as contemptuous of you as of Garrison. To me what he fed you is irrationality, with the ingesting and the other

end reversed.

After all the things I have told you about Turner, is it not past time for asking yourself some questions, or for asking tangible proof of him? He keeps you all running between privvies.

Now put it all together, and what do you/we have of Turner? Anything more or better than the most enormous, unending diversion, sweetened a little with poisoned bait, the involving of the radical right (the right kind of bait, no? For most of us, Ramparts, Garrison, etc?

Bradley? Shit, nothing else.
Farewell America? Shit, but poisonous, almost fatal.
The FBI letter he gave Work to use in the L.A. Free Press? Fabrication.
Rose? According to Jaffe, still with the other side. And who authenticated Rose? Turner.
Potemkin? Turner again "authenticated". And entertained on their money. Ask Gary about this one. I was there and had never heard of them. But they would not let me show Garrison the Alyea film on their equipment -and Turner was there - and now it has disappeared with Holmes (have you any news on him? Could be very important.
Underhill? Their own file disputes them. Fiction.
Owen? For the indiscriminate, most indiscriminate birds. And his "interrogation"? Designed as confirmation.
Those pictures-sketches of "Frenchy" (any proof there ever was such a person?) and the man wanted for King's murder that he used in June because he noticed it in April - well, I got them from Fred and sent them to Lenski in April. He steals from Fred, too- and after Couch does.

What is left? If anything that sticks up, please tell me. Now how much of this leaves any of you people with the slightest confidence in him? Cannot any of you analyze, ask questions? Is it also not time to question your own judgement, that you could trust him after this long history of not a single thing that is ever proved and so awfully much that was so frightfully costly, almost ruinous? Ask Paul what he may recall of what I told him when I was in N.O. in December. So, he is a personable, persuasive guy. How much does that derive from his connection with Ramparts and the glammor of being ex-FBI? While I do not trust the Overstreets, I do suggest you read what they published about him (with no argument of which I am aware) and see if you can refute it. Hal, you have seen enough snakes to recognize a rattler before it strikes.

On Brandon: it is time for his woman to let herself be known. There is no reason for her to be afraid of us, every reason for her to have a complete story recorded, for that is her only protection. I still want to know about the hospital bit, who asked them to be there and why, who suspected she might kill herself and why, all the many personal things this woman must know because she knows as much as she does. On Odio's clothing: she had a millionaire boyfriend of whom I know. What is the woman's ethnic background? We had to show her the pictures, but there was no reason to expect any to have been familiar and ground to suspect her had she recognized any of them. Who else did Sylvia know? They had to know some of her friends to have been her bedside guard. What was the real relationship between her and Powell, or what has happened to Powell? What is the real Father Mechenn story (asked without priming)? Ask her about Butler, on the off chance she might know or have heard anything. This loud girl knew him, and his wife got up tight. She also had a story about being offered much money for her assessination knowledge, which is what got her to Butler. Her suspicions are important, and they go in the right direction, but her conclusions seem to be off. Like Marcus for Ferrie (here not that

this name is in and is also disguised in 1953. The fact of which she may not know the meaning is what interests me.

Until we can destroy it, the Odio story remains one of the more provocative things about which we must learn more -all we can. This is one of the better possibilities. I do wish you could get past Brandon on it and if and when you do, forget about Odio and connection with the radical right, for she had no such politics. It is possible to theorize about internal Cuban politics, that the right sought to plant suspicion on the "left" this way, by having people go to her. It is also not unreasonable to take her story straight. I am willing to.

My recollection is that Brandon told me his women friend was in DF or the area, not Dallas. (Please tell him I use and find the little case he gave me convenient for small files.) If he cannot get you through to her, push and prod a little bit about her to be certain he is genuine. We are taking him at face, for what he said stacks up with what I had already learned. It adds nothing to it save these two women, and what they might know we still do not, save for invalid suspicions point in what seems like the wrong direction.

If you get to see her, tape and send me dub. Ditto on Jeanne. If you can take Paul, please do, for in his own quiet, self-effacing way he is terrific, potentially a great asset because he is so rigid in his standards of what is factual, his knowledge, and his mind.

I have spent more time on this than I should have. I want to try and make you understand what I believe is right, what I believe is the hazard we face and the next effort that will be made to get us going the wrong way, or is being made. I want you to look for real credentials among "us", and to ask yourself the questions you should have asked without prodding. I also repeat that this task we have undertaken is no game, no child's play of any kind, no reason for the indulgence of petty pleasures of various sorts. Each has assumed responsibilities toward others and must exercise them in the most responsible way. Also, remember that you were burglarized, and that next time it could be a different kind of burglary. Therefore, you really should not be making copies of some of the things you have been, for there is no need to and they do not relate to this work. You can always get them, if need be , from Paul or me, and they do, by thereX mere existence in your possession, present a special kind of jeopardy because of other intrests that can focus on you, for other reasons. These are not singular interests. There are several that come to mind immediately. You should have some mature concept of security, not paranoia. There are essential risks and there are others. Motive, intent, are not controlling. Result is. There should be no unnecessary risks, and we should not visualize a conspiracy more leaborate than necessary (like having a paymaster on the scene, to count out the loot while the esacpe is delayed!)...I wish you had found the time to respond to my request that you tell me who said what when you were in LA, especially but but exclusively, about Jaffe. You said you would and you didn't. This may be important. I assure you that your evaluation of the people involved, as you reflect it to me, is inadequate, wrong. I hope you/we do not learn the hard way. You should have made a detailed memo....Sorry to have to inflict the typose on you.

Sincerely,

April 19, 1969

Dear Hal,

I just received your letter of the 17th today and am replying immediately because of the disturbing questions you raised in your letter.

Let me first say that in reading your letter the first time I was very puzzled at just what you were referring to. At first, I thought it might have had something to do with a letter that Paul had received from you concerning your anxiety that the knowledge of the Baxter & Ward memos on the executive sessions had somehow gotten into the wrong hands of someone. I told Paul and I again state here that at no time did I show this to anyone. Bud Fensterwald had mentioned the existence of these memos but I had gathered from this that you had informed him so I merely told him that I had seen something you had mailed. Since I was not really familiar with the nature of this material, I wasn't even in a position to discuss it.

In going over the letter the second time, I became aware of just who it was that you were referring to and that is, Fred. If I am wrong, then let me know. It does, however, look as if he is the one you have in mind.

But now just exactly what it is that your referance is to I must admit I have no awareness. It is true that when I was there I let him look at my correspondence file but before I did I made sure that nothing of a confidential nature was shown him that could endanger any relationship. But let me add that I felt most positive that he took nothing from me and I don't think he could have. Besides, I trusted him and although his judgment about certain matters may not necessarily be the best I truly felt that his inquiry into this entire affair of a assassination was based on nothing but the desire for truth as ^mine. If there was something about the Thornley matter that we discussed I knew of nothing that I couldn't really tell him that would endanger any confidence. As for other matters, such as the Hepburn affair I did discuss this with him but since the people down there are much closer to this thing than I have certainly been how could I have discussed something I really had little knowledge of. Somehow, your letter suggests that Lifton may be involved but how I am not sure.

I am also wondering at your reference to "getting out of the frightening hole in which this work has buried me is by the sale of my work." In the next sentence, you say that "Your giving it, under any circumstances, jeopardizes this." Here, again- are you saying that I have sold what you have written which was given in confidence through the mail?

The only other persons who see my correspondence have been the Whites but here, again, I trust them absolutely and when I show them things it is because I want them to be in a position to offer comments which will be of help.

Let's assume that you are correct and that I did show whatever it is you're referring to, to whomever you are writing about. What purpose could I have in mind other than to get information? It all winds up in your possession because I let you know everything I learn about. You would have to ask yourself why I would do such a thing? To break confidences? Financial reasons? Blackmail?

As for making money out of this or anything like that, I only wish I had a zerox machine that was inexpensive because the costs of sending you zerox copies can be quite costly. (I remember my last mailing to you was several bills). However, I know that these are important for your work and the cost means nothing to me, really. When I know that you need things I send them to you and I say to myself: So you'll be a little short of cash, but what's more important, anyway. I'm being honest whenI say that.

For example, after I send you this letter I have to get copies of the stuff I promised you I would send to you zeroxed. You will get those and the only reason I didn't send them with this letter was that I answered your letter immediately as I finished reading it.

Well, I hope that this clarifys it. If not, you'll have to explain further because it is very disturbing to receive the kind of letter you just sent. Please, believe me Hal, I regard you not only as a person of high integrity whose concern in this whole matter is one of truth but I also regard you as a friend apart from this. I recognize that your suspicion of whatever it is that I may have done is motivated by the concern for truth and I respond on that basis. If I have done anything to destroy this mutual confidence it would be very unsettling to me. If my judgment has been bad then let me know for I know that I am not perfect.

Now, I'd like to tell you about other matters that I have learned about. The first of these will deal with the interview I had two days ago with Brandon. This is what he told me.

Brandon said that his Dallas contact provided very little information about Odio to add to what he told you when you interviewed him. He did say that his contact was interested in any list of names that could be provided her beyond that of the CD 1553 file which I gave to Brandon and she read and examined. She recognized none of the photographs that were sent her with these documents. (These included all the ones of which I could think might in some way have been involved, such as the arrest photos).

As for the girl you mentioned to Brandon who had purple lipstick she said that no such person means anything to her. One thing that Brandon's contact did say was that she continued to press him about the fact that Odio was extremely well-dressed and wore expensive clothes. As she put it, "If you found out that she was playing around with Stanley Marcus I wouldn't be surprised." (This comment probably came up in connection with Odio having worked there). Brandon suggested that it would be a good idea for someone in the Dallas area you might know checking with a credit bureau to find out where and who paid for her expensive clothes. He also suggested that it might be a good idea to find out if anyone sent Odio flowers while she stayed at the hospital.

The only other thing mentioned byBrandon's contact that may have significance was the fact that Odio was bi-lingual. Somehow Brandon's contact felt that whatever company Odio worked for must have made use of her talents. I then suggested that he again contact his friend in Dallas and see if she could find this out pointing out that Odio did work for Nieman-Marcus.

Before typing this letter I spoke with Bill Turner.

Turner said he had received a bullfight poster with a picture of Nagell on it and someone had written on it that the "traveller sure beats Leavenworth." He couldn't make heads or tails of it except to say that the poster was from Madrid and that it was mailed from Delaware.

Turner also expounded on the theme of non-CIA participation in the assassination and suggested that too much emphasis had been placed on their alleged role. His remarks were made in the context of discussing Boxley so I gathered from this that both he and Boxley were theorizing. From what Turner says, it would appear to make sense. He pointed out these things point to ONI involvement: (1)The rivalry that exists between the CIA and the FBI is unlike that of the ONI and the FBI which are much closer to each other. (2)Hoover is a 33 Mason and the ONI is "solid mason". (3)Regis Kennedy hanging around Guy Bannister & the 544 Camp St. Address with Kennedy sending all his reports on to FBI #1 man under Hoover, John P. Moore. (4) Sergio Arcacha Smith gets his family out of Cuba through the help of the ONI. (5) Guy Bannister sends his reports to the FBI. (6)Bannister sends a letter to Guy Johnson and talks about "cutting off" the CIA from an operation, suggesting the ONI. (7) EDGAR Eugene Bradley's past Intelligence connections were too far back in the past for him to have been connected with the CIA and it is more likely his connections were with the older established Intelligence organizations such as the FBI, OSS and the ONI.

One other interesting thing that Turner told me that I'll mention here is that when Turner spoke recently in Oregon at a college there someone came up to him. This person said he recognized the name of Bannister which Turner had mentioned in his talk and after Turner described him physically he registered in this person's mind as the same one he had attended an ONI Reserve Officers training session in Norfolk, Virginia in 1960. Bannister told thi person that a constant complaint of Bannister's was his crying about being assigned to Butte, Montana for the FBI whose office he headed there. Turner said that this was true in so far as Turner being in Butte and that he had been in the ONI. When Turner told this person that Bannister had died it was a complete surprise to him.

Well, Hal, I thought this was going to be a short letter but it didn't turn out that way. So I'll close now and hope that I do hear from you soon.

Best to you in themeantime.

Your friend,
Hal
Hal